DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 461 CG 030 842

AUTHOR McCarthy, Christopher J.; Lambert, Richard G.; Seraphine, Anne E.

TITLE Relationship of Psychological Coping Resources and Attachment to Negative Emotions Experienced by College Students following Parental Conflict.

PUB DATE 2001-04-00

NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Conflict; *Coping; *Emotional Response; *Family Characteristics; Family (Sociological Unit); Influences; Measurement Techniques; Measures (Individuals); Parent Attitudes; Parent Child Relationship; *Psychometrics; *Sex Differences; Social Desirability

IDENTIFIERS United States (Southwest)

ABSTRACT

Family sources of stress and conflict are critical variables in the well-being of adolescents. This paper assesses the relationship of coping resources to negative emotions produced by parental conflict after controlling for social desirability; age; financial resources; and measures of parental attachment and family functioning. Undergraduate students (n=304) in a large southwestern university were given four instruments: Inventory of Parental and Peer Attachment (IPPA); Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale II (FACES II); Coping Resources Inventory for Stress (CRIS); and Parental Conflict Emotions. Four separate models were created for: (1) male participants describing maternal conflict; (2) male participants describing parental conflict; (3) female participants describing maternal conflict; and (4) female participants describing parental conflict. The results provide support for the literature that a person's family background and coping resources are related to emotional functioning in the context of family relationships. The emergence of social desirability as a statistically significant predictor of variance at step one of each model was noted. The pattern of results with respect to female participants included more predictors emerging as statistically significant. Both family functioning and psychological coping resources were suggested as areas in which counselors could intervene. (Contains 6 tables and 32 references.) (Author/JDM)

Running Head: COPING AND EMOTION

Relationship of psychological coping resources and attachment to negative emotions experienced by college students following parental conflict

Christopher J. McCarthy

University of Texas at Austin

Richard G. Lambert

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Anne E. Seraphine

University of Florida

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 10 – 14, 2001, Seattle, Washington.

Relationship of psychological coping resources and attachment to negative emotions experienced by college students following parental conflict

Family sources of stress and conflict are critical variables in the well-being of adolescents and early adults (Neighbors, Forehand, & McVicar, 1993). There is considerable agreement that important developmental tasks of adolescence and early adulthood find their resolution within the context of family relationships (Lapsley, Rice, & FitzGerald, 1990) and there is evidence that intense emotions can be associated with the initiation, maintenance, and disruption of family bonds (Ainsworth, 1989). However, despite increasing interest in relationships and emotions over the past several decades, little has been done to examine the role of emotion in family relationships (Fitness & Strongman, 1991).

Helping clients develop psychological coping resources for dealing with family stress may be important for counselors working with late adolescents (McCarthy, Brack, Brack, Liu, & Carlson, 1998), but research is scant as to whether such resources contribute to emotional capacities beyond the influence of other aspects of family functioning. The present investigation was designed to shed light on this process by assessing the relationship of coping resources to negative emotions produced by parental conflict after controlling for (1) social desirability, age, and financial resources, and (2) measures of parental attachment and family functioning. Before presenting our findings, we will first provide a rationale for the inclusion of these constructs.

The notion that adult emotional dispositions develop from early interactions with one's caregivers is widely held (Bradford and Lyddon, 1993; Izard, 1991). Magai, Distel,

and Liker (1995) noted past obstacles to progress in this area such as the lack of a coherent theory of emotion or clear conceptualization of the developmental process by which capacities for emotional functioning develop, but went on to suggest that many of these barriers have been overcome due to recent advances in theory. For example, attachment theory has been labeled a theory of affect regulation (Feeney & Noller, 1996) and attachment researchers have proposed that level of attachment to one's caregivers is closely linked to the regulation of negative affect (Ainsworth, 1989; Lopez, 1995). Attachment refers to the emotional bond experienced with another who is sensed as a source of security and who provides a secure base, anchoring exploration, which in turn contributes to autonomy and competence (Bowlby, 1988). Accordingly, individual differences in attachment reflect rules and strategies that children learn about handling emotions that can persist across the lifespan. Research has indicated that parental attachment is related to how an individual cognitively processes experiences (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Lapsley et al., 1990) as well as emotional self-regulation capacities (Simpson, Rholes, & Neligan, 1992).

A second related area of research suggests that individuals learn methods for dealing with stress by watching how their family deals with various difficulties (Olson, 1990). Family Adaptability is defined as the ability of the family system to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational or developmental demands. Cohesion is the "emotional bonding that family members have toward one another" (Olson, Bell, & Portner, 1982, p.1). These dimensions are hypothesized to be related to family functioning and Lambert, McCarthy, Mejia, Liu, & Wolter (1998) found that both family adaptability and cohesion were related to one's

expectations of being able to regulate and monitor negative moods. The Circumplex model is of particular interest because it provides not only a theory of family functioning, but also a means of assessment. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale (FACES) was developed to measure the constructs of family cohesion and flexibility by members of one's family (Olson et al., 1983).

Stress theorists argue for the importance of adequate levels of psychological coping resources as essential components of the ability to handle events that involve emotional upset (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988; Matheny, Aycock, Pugh, Curlette, & Cannella, 1986). Folkman and Lazarus (1988) have been at the forefront of efforts to understand the relationship between stress and emotion and maintained that coping serves two primary functions: the regulation of stressful emotions (emotion-focused coping) and the alteration of the person-environment relation causing the distress (problem-focused coping). Problem-focused strategies are conceptualized as those aimed at influencing the nature of a demand whereas emotion-focused coping strategies are aimed at eliminating or lessening the stress-produced emotions.

Previous research has suggested specific coping resources that may be related to emotional functioning with respect to certain events. McCarthy, Lambert, and Brack (1997) studied the relationship of individual coping resources to emotions, both positive and negative, associated with relationship breakups and work transition (McCarthy & Lambert, 1999). In their studies, graduate students attending a large university in the southern United States were asked to complete an inventory that measured coping resources, the Coping Resources Inventory for Stress (CRIS). The CRIS is a 280-item battery that has 12 primary scales measuring specific coping resources (Curlette, Aycock,

Matheny, Pugh, & Taylor, 1990). Participants were also given an inventory that asked them to evaluate their perceptions of relationship breakups and job transitions and to identify the extent to which they experienced positive and negative emotions as a result. Using structural equation modeling (SEM), McCarthy and Lambert (1999) found that combative types of coping resources (i.e., those which involve active or passive attempts to deal with a stressor that has already occurred) were related to levels of negative emotions experienced weeks, or even months, after both events. These resources included the ability to self-disclose one's feelings, acceptance of negative events that occur in life, and the adequacy of one's social support network.

While considerable caution must be exercised before generalizing these results to other populations and types of events, the results of these investigations offer tentative empirical support for the importance of psychological coping resources in emotional functioning. The purpose of the present study was to expand this research in two ways: (1) to extend this line of inquiry to the domain of family conflict, and (2) to attempt to control for other variables that might affect the intensity of negative emotions, such as social desirability, demographic factors, the existence of positive emotions, and one's level of family functioning.

Because of research suggesting sex differences in emotions (McGrath, Keita, Strickland, & Russo, 1990), separate analyses were conducted according to the gender of both the participant and parent involved in each conflict. Four separate research questions were addressed: 1.) could male participants' levels of negative emotions following maternal conflict be predicted by levels of self-reported coping resources? 2.) could male participants' levels of negative emotions following maternal conflict be

predicted by levels of self-reported coping resources? 3.) could female participants' levels of negative emotions following maternal conflict be predicted by levels of self-reported coping resources?, and?, and 4.) could levels of self-reported coping resources predict female participants' levels of negative emotions following paternal conflict by levels of self-reported coping resources? Each of these questions was examined using hierachical regression analysis in which the effects of social desirability, demographic factors, positive emotions, and family functioning were controlled.

Methods

Participants Participants were 304 undergraduate students enrolled in a large, southwestern university. Mean age was 20.69 (SD = 3.97); participants were 57% female and 43% male; 56% of the participants were European American, 17% were Asian American, 12% were African-American, 11% were Latino/a, and 4 % represented other racial/ethnic backgrounds. The students identified their academic year as freshmen (18.3%), sophomores (17.7%), juniors (15.4%), seniors (45.7%), and other (2.9%).

Procedures and Instrumentation

Participants were recruited from undergraduate educational psychology classes over the course of two semesters. Those who gave consent to participate in the study were then given a demographics survey and the instruments described below.

Inventory of Parental and Peer Attachment (IPPA). This 75-item inventory assesses affective and cognitive dimensions of the current attachment of college students and adolescents and is based on Bowlby's conceptualization of attachment theory (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; 1989). There are 25 items on each of three scales measuring attachment to the mother, father, and peers (peer scores were not used in this

study). While an earlier version of the IPPA assessed attachment to parents as a single construct (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987), the authors later revised the scale to assess attachment to mother and father separately (Armsden & Greenberg, 1989). This revised version of the instrument has been used in several studies of late adolescent attachment (Brack, Gay, & Matheny, 1993; McCarthy et al., 1998). Armsden and Greenberg (1987) reported internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) estimates that ranged from .86 to .91 and test-retest reliability values over a three-week period of .93 for scores on their overall parental attachment scale; internal consistency estimates for scores from the separate mother and father scales have been reported at .89 and .88 respectively (Papini, Roggman & Anderson, 1991). In this study, Cronbach's alpha for scores on the Maternal Attachment scale was .93 and .95 for scores on the Paternal Attachment scale.

Armsden and Greenberg (1987) provided evidence for the convergent and concurrent validity of scores from the IPPA with significant correlations between IPPA parent attachment scores and measures of family support, conflict and cohesiveness, self-esteem, life satisfaction, depression and anxiety and resentment and alienation. In addition, numerous subsequent studies have provided further evidence of the validity of scores from the IPPA (for a review, see Lopez & Gover, 1993).

Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale II (FACES II). The FACES II is a 30 item questionnaire designed to measure family cohesion and adaptability (Olson et al., 1983). This is a 30-item instrument that asks respondents to rate the occurrence of behaviors and situations within their families (e.g., "Our family does things together") using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). It has two subscales: (a) adaptability, defined as the ability of a marital or family system to change

its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress, and (b) cohesion, defined as the emotional bonding that family members have towards one another (Olson et al., 1983). Olson et al. (1983) report good internal consistency (.90) and test-retest reliability over a 4 - 5 week period (.84). Hampson, Hulgus, & Beavers (1991) found evidence for the concurrent validity of the FACES II; it was found to be correlated with a measure of family health.

Coping Resources Inventory for Stress (CRIS). The CRIS is a 280 item battery for measuring 15 coping resources, which contribute to the successful management of, stress (Matheny, Curlette, Aycock, Pugh, & Taylor, 1987). The CRIS manual (Curlette et al.) indicates CRIS subscales that are most closely related to emotion-focused coping functions described by Folkman and Lazarus (1988): self-disclosure, acceptance, and social support are among these. The following CRIS subscales were used in this study: social desirability, a scale that measures the tendency to respond to items in a socially desirable direction; financial freedom, which measures the extent to which a person is free from stress related to financial difficulties; self-disclosure, which measures the tendency to freely disclose one's feelings; confidence, which asses faith in one's ability to cope successfully with stressful life experiences, acceptance, which measures a set of beliefs and behaviors indicating acceptance of self, others, and the world; and social support, which measures the availability of friends and significant others who may act as buffers against stressful life experiences (Curlette et al., 1990).

Matheny, Aycock, Curlette, and Junker (1993) found good reliability and strong support for the convergent and divergent validity of the CRIS scales. The CRIS scales provided significant convergent correlations with 29 of 32 measures of relevant

personality scales, but no significant divergent correlations. Curlette et al. (1990) reported a coefficient alpha of .97 for the overall coping resources effectiveness scale and a test-retest reliability coefficient of .95 over a four-week period for college students. The coefficient alphas for the coping resource scales used in this study were .92 for self-disclosure, .83 for acceptance, .88 for social support, and .91 for financial freedom. The test-retest reliabilities for the scales used in this study were .82 for self-disclosure, .95 for acceptance, .91 for social support, and .87 for financial freedom.

Parental Conflict Emotions: Emotions reported as a result of parental conflict were measured using questionnaires adapted from Roseman, Spindel, and Jose (1990). Participants received two versions of the questionnaire, one that asked about the last time they experienced a conflict with their mother (or the female who acted as their mother) and the other which asked about conflict with their father (or the male who acted as their father). The order in which they received these two versions was random. In the first part of each questionnaire, participants were asked to identify the extend to which they experienced emotions associated with this event after being provided with a list of all the emotions in Roseman et al.'s (1990) model and were then asked to rate the intensity with which they experienced each emotion on a 10 point Likert scale from 0 ("not at all") to 9 ("very intense").

Results

A total of four separate models were created, one for each of the following conditions: 1.) male participants describing maternal conflict, 2.) male participants describing paternal conflict, 3.) female participants describing maternal conflict, and 4.) female participants describing paternal conflict. Each model was formed using

hierarchical regression and the criterion variable in each case was the average rating for intensity of negative emotions experienced as a result of parental conflict (maternal or paternal) by participants. In each of the four analyses, the social desirability scale from the CRIS was entered first to control for response bias. In the second step, scales from the IPPA (attachment to the parent involved in the conflict) and FACES (adaptability and cohesion) were included to control for pre-existing differences in family functioning. The variable of positive emotions produced by the conflict was included in this step to control for desirable aspects of the event leading non-negative emotions. It was also hypothesized that negative emotions associated with parental conflict might be related to various demographic factors, including the age of the participant and how independent the respondent was from the direct financial and material support from their parents. Therefore, the participants' ages and the financial freedom subscale scores on the CRIS were entered at step 2 to control for the effect of these constructs. Finally, in the third step, the self-disclosure, acceptance, and social support subscales from the CRIS that were entered in each analysis.

Table 1 reports the means and standard deviations for all the variables in the models as well as the results of tests for gender differences. An inspection of Table 1 reveals that females (1) reported stronger negative emotions for both maternal and paternal conflict, (2) females also reported weaker positive emotions toward the parent following the conflict, and (3) females scored much higher than males on the self-disclosure coping resource scale. No other statistically significant gender differences were found.

As an additional preliminary analysis prior to conducting the regression models, the correlations between coping resources and the other variables in the model were examined for males and females separately. Table 2 reports these results. Coping resource scale scores from the CRIS were either not related to, or modestly correlated in the negative direction, with the reported strength of negative emotions following conflict with a parent. These values ranged from essentially zero to $r = -.282$ for correlation between the acceptance coping resource when correlated with negative emotions experienced by female participants following maternal conflict. The social desirability scale score was negatively correlated with levels of all coping resource scale scores among participants of both genders (r's ranged from -.168 to -.422), suggesting that those who attempt to fake good on the CRIS tended to score lower on the measures of coping resources. The family functioning variables, cohesion, adaptability, attachment to parent, and financial freedom, were all positively correlated with coping resources (r's ranging from .117 to .645).

Fisher's z test for the difference between correlations from independent samples was used to test for gender differences in the pattern of correlations. Several gender differences emerged. Self-disclosure, while only modestly related to weaker negative emotions following paternal conflict for females, was not related to the negative emotional response of males. Similarly, while self-disclosure was weakly related to stronger positive emotions following paternal conflict for females, it was not related to the positive emotional response of males. Social desirability and financial freedom both had a stronger association with acceptance scores for males than for females. Attachment to father had a stronger association with social support for males than for

females. All of these descriptive findings were taken as evidence for the need to conduct separate models for males and females and suggest that some aspects of processing emotions and coping, as well as reporting about such constructs, might be different for males and females.

In the model for maternal conflict reported by male participants (see Table 3), the final model was statistically significant (F (10, 193) = 1.91, $p < .05$; $R^2 = .09$). However, only the social desirability scale was associated with the reported magnitude of the emotional response to the conflict ($B = .24$). This modestly positive beta weight suggests that reporting a more negative emotional response to maternal conflict was associated with socially desirable responses to the coping resources inventory as a whole. The family functioning and relationship variables did not add account for any statistically significant additional variance in the outcome variable. None of the coping resource scale scores resulted in statistically significant associations with the outcome either.

In the model for paternal conflict reported by male participants (see Table 4), the final model was also statistically significant (F (10, 182) = 2.93, $p < .01$; $R^2 = .14$). Again social desirability was associated with the outcome measure. Financial freedom was also associated with the magnitude of the negative emotions following the conflict ($B = -.17$), suggesting that as financial freedom increases, the magnitude of the negative emotional response tends to be somewhat lower. The family functioning and relationship variables as a block accounted for 7% of the variance in the outcome in addition to social desirability. When the coping resources were added to the model, only self-disclosure was associated with the outcome ($B = .19$). The positive direction to this weight suggests that male participants who freely disclose their thoughts and emotions, in the context of

controlling for other family functioning and relationship variables as well as response bias, tended to also feel more intense negative emotions as a result of paternal conflict. The family cohesion scale from the FACES emerged as the only other statistically significant predictor (B = .22), suggesting that male participants from cohesive families also experienced higher intensities of negative emotions following the parental conflict.

In the model for maternal conflict reported by female participants (see Table 5), the final model was statistically significant (F (10, 239) = 5.31, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .18$). The social desirability scale from the CRIS emerged as a statistically significant predictor (B = .24) on the first step. Age and positive emotions about the conflict were statistically significant predictors of the magnitude of the emotional response on the second step and family variables accounted for an additional 12% of the variance after controlling for response bias. In the third step, the acceptance scale from the CRIS emerged as a statistically significant predictor (B = -.22) on the last step as coping resources accounted for an additional 6% of the variance in the outcome variable.

Finally, in the model for paternal conflict reported by female participants (see Table 6), the final model was also statistically significant (F (10, 225) = 6.23, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .22$). Consistent with the other three models, the social desirability scale from the CRIS emerged as a statistically significant predictor (B = .17) on the first step. Positive emotions toward the father following the conflict (B = -.30) and financial freedom (B = -.17) were associated with the magnitude of the reported emotional response and the block of family variables accounted for an additional 15% of the variance after controlling for response bias. The acceptance and social support scales from the CRIS emerged as statistically significant predictors (B = -.15 and -.20, respectively), suggesting that

females who have a more accepting attitude toward the inevitability of stressful events as a part of the usual course of human interaction, and who have better social support systems, feel less intense negative emotions in response to such conflicts. These resources account for an additional 4% of the variance in the outcome after controlling for response bias and family variables.

Discussion

Overall, the results of this study appear to provide general support for suggestions in the literature that one's family background and coping resources are related to emotional functioning in the context of family relationships (Gilbert, 1992; Matheny et al., 1986). It is not surprising that with regard to one specific event involving parental conflict, the set of predictor variables used in this study explained only a modest amount of the variance ($\underline{R^2}$ values ranged from .09 to .22). Specific aspects of each event not assessed in the study (for example, specific events or persons causing the conflict) might be expected to explain more of the variability in emotional intensity experienced with each event than the rather more global constructs of coping resources and family functioning. What does seem important is that even in this context, and controlling for a range of other factors, at least one coping resource related to emotional functioning emerged as a statistically significant predictor in three of the four regression models. However, the specific pattern of findings resulting from these analyses varied considerably.

The emergence of social desirability as a statistically significant predictor of the variance at step 1 of each model seems important to note. In each model, the direction of this relationship was positive, suggesting that the tendency to "fake good" on the CRIS

was associated with higher levels of negative affect following parental conflict. An inspection of Table 2 also reveals that social desirability was negative correlated with the coping resource measures from the CRIS: self-disclosure, acceptance, and social support. This might suggest that participants concerned with an overly positive presentation of their coping resources are both less able to cope and less able to handle emotions following parental conflict. In our review of the literature, we found few studies that attempted to control for this factor, and these results might argue for its inclusion in future research. This might be particularly relevant with regard to family conflict, since the culture seems to put a premium on harmonious family relationships.

Using separate regression models for male and female participants resulted in some interesting sex differences among the variables that predicted negative emotions following parental conflict. Male participants who experienced more negative affect following paternal conflict also reported higher levels of both family cohesion and the ability to self-disclose their emotions (see Table 4). While interpretation of these results is speculative at best, it might be inferred that because of societal norms against males expressing emotions, particularly with other males, it only in the context of a cohesive family and an individual whose resources for disclosing are sufficiently developed that such feelings are even acknowledged. Support for this tentative hypothesis of cultural prescriptions against males acknowledging such feelings in such relationship with their fathers is the fact that neither variable emerged as a significant predictor with males experiencing conflict with their mothers. In fact, social desirability emerged as the only significant predictor (see Table 3).

The pattern of results with respect to the female participants in this study included more predictors emerging as statistically significant and might therefore be described as more complex. The existence of positive emotions following the conflict and the tendency to present coping resources in a socially desirable manner emerged as significant predictors in the final step for conflict experiences with both parents. The importance of positive emotions as a predictor is a consistent with the limitation to this study acknowledged above, namely that specific features of the event that may have led to these positive emotions were not taken into account. For example, to some extent the participants might have viewed this event as positive, relationship-enhancing event, thus explaining the existence of positive feelings.

It is interesting to note that the acceptance scale from the CRIS, which measures acceptance of self, others, and the world, emerged as the one significant predictor in both of the regression analyses conducted with the female participants. Higher scores on acceptance were related to lower levels of negative affect for the female participants in the study, and this same relationship was observed with social support with paternal conflict experiences. While the strength of these relationships was modest at best, the overall pattern of these results appear to suggest sex differences in the relationship of family functioning and psychological coping resources to negative emotions following parental conflict (McGrath et al., 1990).

Both family functioning and psychological coping resources have been suggested as areas in which counselors can intervene (Lapsley et al., 1990; Matheny et al., 1986). If these results are replicated in future research, the relationships observed among these variables might suggest a constellation of factors that could be targeted for interventions

by counselors working with late adolescents experiencing family conflict. Several important limitations need to be acknowledged, however. First, due to restrictions in the measures, methods, and population used many cautions should be observed before generalizing the results of this study. Although we attempted to evaluate the possible influence of gender on our study, the sample was relatively homogenous with respect to ethnicity and educational background. In addition, the possible impact of different family constellations was not investigated, including for example whether respondents were describing interactions with biological parents, step-parents, other family members acting as the parent such as older siblings. Additionally, the fact that participants were recruited from undergraduate classes also might have influenced the study. A more diverse sample would be necessary to generalize the results of this study. In addition, only the event of parental conflict was investigated in this study, and other types of family events need to be researched to investigate the generalizability of the models developed in this study. It also should be noted that caution is warranted in the use of self-report methodology and in inferring causal relations from correlation-based studies. It will be important to test this model with experimental methods that allow for firmer conclusions about causality.

The results of this study may suggest a tentative linkage between family variables such as attachment and variables related to capacities for handling negative emotions such as coping resources. and mood regulation expectancies. However, the moderate degree to which the variance in negative was explained may indicate the need to include other constructs that would improve the prediction utility of these models. For example, the specific strategies that participants used to cope with their emotions were not

specifically assessed in this study. Future investigations might include the evaluation of actual coping behaviors used to deal with an event such as parental conflict.

References

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. American Psychologist, 44, 709-716.

Armsden, G. & Greenberg, M. (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(5), 427-454.

Armsden, G. C. & Greenberg, M. T. (1989). The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment: Preliminary Test Manual. (Available from G. C. Armsden, Department of Community Health Care Systems, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 98195).

Bowlby, J. (1988). Developmental psychiatry comes of age. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 145, 1-10.

Bradford, E., & Lyddon, W. J. (1993). Current parental attachment: Its relation to perceived psychological distress and relationship satisfaction in college students. Journal of College Student Development, 34, 256 - 260.

Brack, G., Gay M. F. & Matheny, K. B. (1993). Relationships between attachment and coping resources among late adolescents. Journal of College Student Development, 34, 212-215.

Curlette, W. L., Aycock, D. W., Matheny, K. B., Pugh, J. L., & Taylor, H. F. (1990). Coping Resources Inventory for Stress manual. Atlanta, GA: Health Prisms.

Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1996) Adult attachment. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. (1988). The relationship between coping and emotion: Implications for theory and research. Social Science Medicine, 26, 309-317.

Gilbert, S. P. (1992). Ethical issues in the treatment of severe psychopathology in university and college counseling centers. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 695-699.

Hampson, R., Hulgus, Y., & Beavers, W. (1991). Comparisons of self-report measures of the Beavers systems model and Olson's circumplex model. Journal of Family Psychology, 4, 326 - 340.

Izard, C. E. (1991). The psychology of emotions. New York: Plenum.

Lambert, R. G., & McCarthy, C. J., Mejia, O. L., Liu, H. T., & Wolter, C. D. (August 1998). Structural Model of Coping, Attachment Emotions with Parental Conflict. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Lapsley, D., Rice, K., & FitzGerald, D. (1990) Adolescent attachment, identity, and adjustment to college: implications for the continuity of adaptation hypothesis. Journal of Counseling & Development, 68, 561-565.

Lopez, F. (1995). Contemporary attachment theory: An introduction with implications for counseling psychology. The Counseling Psychologist, 23, 395-415.

Lopez, F. G., & Gover, M. R. (1993). Self-report measures of parent-adolescent attachment and separation-individuation: A selective review. Journal of Counseling and Development, 71, 560 - 569.

Magai, C., Distel, N., & Liker, R. (1995). Emotion Socialization, attachment, and patterns of adult emotional traits. Cognition and Emotion, 5, 461-481.

Matheny, K. B., Aycock, D. W., Pugh, J. L., Curlette, W. L., & Cannella, K. A. (1986). Stress coping: A qualitative and quantitative synthesis with implications for treatment. The Counseling Psychologist, 14, 499-549.

Matheny, K., Curlette, W., Aycock, D.W., & Junker, G. (1993). The Coping Resources Inventory for Stress: A measure of perceived resourcefulness. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 49(6), 815-830.

Matheny, K.B., Curlette, W.L., Aycock, D.W., Pugh, J.L., & Taylor, H.F. (1987). The Coping Resources Inventory for Stress. Atlanta, GA: Health Prisms, Inc.

McCarthy, C. J., Brack, G., Brack, C. J., Liu, H. L., & Carlson, M. H. (1998). Relationship of college students' current attachment to appraisals of parental conflict. Journal of College Counseling, 1, 135-153.

McCarthy, C. J. (1998). Relationship of parental attachment and gender to beliefs about mood. Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 12, 39-59.

McCarthy, C. J., & Lambert, R. G. (1999). Structural model of coping and emotions produced by taking a new job. Journal of Employment Counseling, 36, 50 – 66.

McCarthy, C. J., Lambert, R., & Brack, G. (1997). Structural model of coping, appraisals, and emotions after relationship breakup. Journal of Counseling and Development, 76, 53-64.

McGrath, E., Keita, G., Strickland, B., & Russo, N. (1990). Women and depression: Risk factors and treatment issues. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Neighbors, B., Forehand, R., & McVicar, D. (1993). Resilient adolescents and interparental conflict. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 63, 462 - 471.

Olson, D.H. (1990). Family circumplex model: Theory, assessment, and intervention. First International symposium of Family Psychology. Japanese Journal of Family Psychology, 4, 55-64.

Olson, D.H., Bell, R., & Portner, J. (1982). FACES-II. St. Paul: Family Social Science, University of Minnesota.

Olson, D. H., Portner, J., & Bell, R. (1983). Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales: Second Edition. St. Paul, Minn.: University of Minnesota, Department of Family Studies.

Papini, D. R., Roggman, R. L. & Anderson, J. (1991). Early-adolescent perceptions of attachment to mother and father: A test of the emotional-distancing and buffering hypothesis. Journal of Early Adolescence, 11, 258-275.

Roseman, I., Spindel, M., & Jose, P. (1990). Appraisals of emotion-eliciting events: testing a theory of discrete emotions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 899-915.

Simpson, J. A. Rholes, W. S., & Nelligan, J. S. (1992). Support seeking and support giving within couples in an anxiety-provoking situation: The role of attachment styles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 434-446.

Winnicott, D. W. (1965). The family and individual development. London: Tavistock.

Table 1.
Descriptive statistics for all variables in the models.

Variable	Males Mean SD	Females Mean SD	t
Negative emotions toward mother following conflict	2.52 0.79	2.76 0.78	3.44***
Negative emotions toward father following conflict	2.61 0.89	2.79 0.80	2.34*
Positive emotions toward mother following conflict	1.84 0.77	1.67 0.75	2.55**
Positive emotions toward father following conflict	1.79 0.79	1.60 0.74	2.78**
Social Desirability	68.51 16.64	70.95 16.91	1.58
Cohesion	56.47 11.94	57.40 12.44	0.88
Adaptability	43.37 8.61	43.81 10.39	0.53
Attachment to mother	93.42 17.14	94.55 19.60	0.71
Attachment to father	87.39 19.78	87.08 20.52	0.18
Age	20.29 1.92	20.49 3.04	0.88
Financial Freedom	58.64 30.26	62.25 30.20	1.3
Self-Disclosure	57.87 28.70	69.45 27.11	4.52***
Acceptance	50.03 22.63	46.92 22.75	1.49
Social Support	73.23 21.65	76.85 23.95	1.71

Note. ***-p<.001, **-p<.01, *-p<.05.

Table 2.
Correlations of coping resources with other variables in the models.

Variable	Male Self-Disc.	Female Self-Disc.	Male Acc.	Female Acc.	Male Social Support	Female Social Support
Negative emotions toward mother following conflict	-0.106	-0.145*	-0.181**	-0.282***	-0.195**	-0.200**
Negative emotions toward father following conflict	***0.028***	***-0.202****	-0.175*	-0.204***	-0.125	-0.230**
Positive emotions toward mother following conflict	0.007	0.088	-0.002	0.055	0.024	0.169**
Positive emotions toward father following conflict	***-0.020***	***0.139****	0.066	0.019	0.026	0.126*
Social Desirability	-0.286***	-0.168**	***-0.422*****	***-0.261*****	-0.211**	-0.131*
Cohesion	0.218***	0.335***	0.117	0.187	0.645***	0.625**
Adaptability	0.279***	0.344***	0.167*	0.200***	0.558***	0.583**
Attachment to mother	0.322***	0.299***	0.170*	0.091	0.528***	0.583**
Attachment to father	0.303***	0.208***	0.138*	0.127*	***0.503*****	***0.371****
Age	0.014	0.014	0.000	0.076	-0.054	-0.001
Financial Freedom	0.144*	0.273***	***0.300*****	***0.135****	0.353***	0.383**

Note. ***-p<.001, **-p<.01, *-p<.05. Bolded values indicate p<.05 for test of difference between correlations from two independent samples.

Table 3.
Correlates of Negative Emotions for Male Conflict with Mother.

Variable	B	r^2	r^2 change
Step 1			
Social Desirability	0.238***	0.057***	0.057***
Step 2			
Social Desirability	0.227**	0.065	0.009
Positive Emotions	-0.032		
Cohesion	0.039		
Adaptability	0.035		
Attachment to Mother	0.004		
Age	0.023		
Financial Freedom	-0.081		
Step 3			
Social Desirability	0.189*	0.090*	0.025
Positive Emotions	-0.051		
Cohesion	0.096		
Adaptability	0.071		
Attachment to Mother	0.062		
Financial Freedom	0.014		
Age	-0.036		
Self-Disclosure	0.011		
Acceptance	-0.098		
Social Support	-0.182		

Note. ***-p<.001,**-p<.01,*-p<.05.

Table 4.
Correlates of Negative Emotions for Male Conflict with Father.

Variable	B	r^2	r^2 change
Step 1			
Social Desirability	0.200**	0.040**	0.040**
Step 2			
Social Desirability	0.134	0.110**	0.070*
Positive Emotions	-0.075		
Cohesion	0.181		
Adaptability	-0.140		
Attachment to Father	-0.080		
Age	0.108		
Financial Freedom	-0.167*		
Step 3			
Social Desirability	0.148	0.139**	0.028
Positive Emotions	-0.058		
Cohesion	0.219*		
Adaptability	-0.150		
Attachment to Father	-0.111		
Financial Freedom	0.108		
Age	-0.140		
Self-Disclosure	0.192*		
Acceptance	-0.079		
Social Support	-0.079		

Note. ***-p<.001,**-p<.01,*-p<.05.

Table 5.
Correlates of Negative Emotions for Female Conflict with Mother.

Variable	B	r^2	r^2 change
Step 1			
Social Desirability	0.244***	0.060***	0.060***
Step 2			
Social Desirability	0.215**	0.122***	0.063*
Positive Emotions	-0.138*		
Cohesion	-0.109		
Adaptability	0.011		
Attachment to Mother	0.084		
Age	0.131*		
Financial Freedom	-0.109		
Step 3			
Social Desirability	0.174**	0.182***	0.060**
Positive Emotions	-0.135*		
Cohesion	-0.056		
Adaptability	0.070		
Attachment to Mother	0.125		
Financial Freedom	-0.067		
Age	0.159**		
Self-Disclosure	0.051		
Acceptance	-0.220**		
Social Support	-0.182		

Note. ***-p<.001,**-p<.01,*-p<.05.

Table 6.
Correlates of Negative Emotions for Female Conflict with Father.

Variable	B	r^2	r^2 change
Step 1			
Social Desirability	0.169**	0.029**	0.029**
Step 2			
Social Desirability	0.156*	0.176***	0.148***
Positive Emotions	-0.299***		
Cohesion	-0.025		
Adaptability	0.084		
Attachment to Father	-0.129		
Age	0.050		
Financial Freedom	-0.165**		
Step 3			
Social Desirability	0.137*	0.217***	0.040**
Positive Emotions	-0.305***		
Cohesion	0.017		
Adaptability	0.184		
Attachment to Father	-0.101		
Financial Freedom	-0.112		
Age	0.084		
Self-Disclosure	0.020		
Acceptance	-0.145*		
Social Support	-0.204*		

Note. ***-p<.001,**-p<.01,*-p<.05.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Relationship of Psychological Coping Resources and attachment to negative emotions experienced by college students following parental conflict	
Author(s): Christopher J. McCarthy, Richard G. Lambert, Anne E. Seraphine	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: April 2001

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→

Signature: CJMcC	Printed Name/Position/Title: Chris J. McCarthy, Ph.D., Assistant Prof.
Organization/Address: Univ. of Texas @ Austin, Education Psychology Dept., SZB 202G, Austin, TX, 78712-7296	Telephone: 512-471-4409 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: chris.mccarthye mail.utexas.edu Date: 5/5/01

(over)