

Parenting Styles and Attachment Styles in the Development of Secure/Insecure Attachments

Dr Eugene Newman Joseph

Introduction

Probably the strongest influence in our lives is the family we grew up in. Our birth order, the personality's of our parent(s), the way we were treated by our siblings, the socio-economic status of the family, their education, the place we lived all of these shaped us at the time when we were most vulnerable to being shaped. Besides these tacit influences, our parents taught us all the basics of *proper* behaviour. Of the four important influences on personality: identification, ordinal position, social class, and parental socialization-identification is the most important. By six years of age, children assume that some of the characteristics of their parents belong to them and they experience vicariously the emotion that is appropriate to the parent's experience. The process of attachment to parents and their style of parenting has great significance to personality development, optimal functioning and wellbeing. Depending on the degree of early parenting styles and their responsiveness, humans live with basically secure or insecure attachments later in life. Attachment and parenting styles profoundly influence human

relationships throughout life, including aspects of religion. Throughout its history, the Catholic Church has regarded the family as the most influential factor in shaping and nurturing the faith of each generation. Within the family, parents are considered to be the first and primary educators of the faith, well being and development of their children.¹ John Paul II says that, they possess a fundamental competence in this area: they are educators because they are parents.² Research in the field of psychology of religion has validated to a great extent this hypothesis that early secure attachment with the primary caregiver and authoritative parenting style in turn enhances optimum functioning in all relationships, as well as one's religious expressions of attachment to God.

Cognitive and Social Emotional Processes

Many anthropologists and other scholars in varying disciplines consider the ability to consciously process information as the defining human characteristic. Thus investment in the field of cognition has for a long time dominated developmental psychology with cognitive processes³ being viewed as quite separate to social emotional processes.⁴ No doubt cognitive processes have received considerably more attention than social emotional processes. However in recent times, studies in neuro-behavioural and social-emotional development has amalgamated previously incongruent factors⁵ and has understood that social emotional processes which was formerly overshadowed by cognition is an exciting, rapidly expanding area of research.⁶ These developments in science have provided us with hope that we are moving towards a time, when we will more fully understand the interdependence of nature and nurture.⁷ With the emergence

of research in the field of neuroplasticity, it is understood that brains are more well-equipped for change, and more at risk from the impact of the social environment, than was previously thought.⁸ Today brain is thought of as a *social organ* that is developed through our social and emotional experiences with significant others, and moreover social emotional experiences influence the development of a young brain.⁹ This has led to conclude that our emotional connectedness with others is significant both to the mental and physical health.¹⁰ The swiftly escalating field of neuroscience is constantly highlighting the importance of human relations. In this framework, the relevance of parenting styles and attachment theory for understanding social emotional relationships in early childhood and consequences for development through the lifespan was developed before the recent explosion of the understanding of brain function.¹¹

Parenting Styles

The long concern of developmental psychology has been to find out how parents impact child development. However, finding the actual cause-and-effect links between specific actions of parents and later behaviour of children is very difficult. Some children raised in dramatically different environments can later grow up to have remarkably similar personalities. Conversely, children who share a home and are raised in the same environment can grow up to have astonishingly different personalities. Despite these challenges, researchers have uncovered convincing links between parenting styles and the effects these styles have on children. During the early 1960s, psychologist Diana Baumrind conducted a study on more than 100 preschool-age children.¹² Using naturalistic observation,¹³ parental interviews and

other research methods¹⁴ she identified four important dimensions of parenting and suggested that the majority of parents display one of three different parenting styles. Further research suggested the addition of a fourth parenting style.¹⁵

1. Authoritative Parenting

An authoritative parenting style establishes rules and guidelines that their children are expected to follow. It attempts to direct the child's activities but in a rational, issue-oriented manner. It encourages verbal give and take, shares with the child the reasoning behind the policy and solicits objections when the child refuses to conform. Both expressive and instrumental attributes, autonomous self-will and disciplined conformity are valued. Firm control at points is exerted of parent-child divergence, however the child is not hemmed with restrictions.¹⁶ The authoritative parenting style affirms the child's present qualities, but also sets standards for future conduct. It enforces its own perspective as an adult, but recognizes the child's individual interests and special ways. By the use of reason, power, shaping by regime and reinforcement to achieve the objectives authoritative parenting attains the desired goal, but is also conscious not to regard all the admonitions and corrections as infallible or divinely inspired. This parenting style is more democratic in the sense, authoritative parents are responsive to their children and willing to listen to questions. When children fail to meet the expectations, these parents are more nurturing and forgiving rather than punishing. Baumrind suggests that these parents,

monitor and impart clear standards for their children's conduct. They are assertive, but not intrusive and restrictive. Their disciplinary methods are supportive, rather than punitive. They want their children to be assertive as well as socially

responsible, and self-regulated as well as cooperative.¹⁷

2. Authoritarian Parenting

In this style of parenting, children are expected to follow the strict rules established by the parents. Failure to follow such rules usually results in punishment. Authoritarian parenting is a restrictive, punishment heavy parenting style in which parents make their children follow their directions. Authoritarian parenting style fails to explain the reasoning behind these rules. If asked to explain, the parent might simply reply, "Because I said so." These parents have high demands, but are not responsive to their children. The parents of this style of parenting generally tell the child what to do, instead of allowing the child to choose by him or herself.¹⁸ According to Baumrind, these parents "are obedience and status-oriented, and expect their orders to be obeyed without explanation".¹⁹ In short, authoritarian parenting involves low parental responsiveness and high parental demand; the parents tend to demand obedience without explanation and focus on status.

3. Permissive Parenting

Permissive parents, sometimes referred to as indulgent parents, have very few demands to make of their children. These parents rarely discipline their children because they have relatively low expectations of maturity and self-control. According to Baumrind, permissive parents "are more responsive than they are demanding. They are nontraditional and lenient, do not require mature behaviour, allow considerable self-regulation and avoid confrontation."²⁰ They are generally nurturing and communicative with their

children, often taking on the status of a friend more than that of a parent. They try to be *friends* with their child and fail to play a parental role.²¹ They are likely to allow their children to make their own decisions, giving them advice as a friend would. The expectations of the child are very low and hence there is little or no discipline. This type of parenting is very lax, with few punishments or rules. Permissive parents also tend to give their children whatever they want and hope that they are appreciated for their accommodating style.²² Other permissive parents compensate for what they missed as children, and as a result give their children both the freedom and materials that they lacked in their childhood.²³

4. Uninvolved Parenting

An uninvolved parenting style is characterized by few demands, low responsiveness and little communication. The uninvolved parents are low in warmth and control, are generally not involved in their child's life, are disengaged, undemanding and do not set limits. Neglectful parenting can also mean dismissing the children's emotions and opinions.²⁴ Parents are emotionally unsupportive of their children, but will still provide their basic needs. However, they are generally detached from their child's life. In extreme cases, these parents may even reject or neglect the needs of their children.²⁵

The Impact of Parenting Styles

What effect do these parenting styles have on child development outcomes? Researchers have conducted numerous studies that have led to a number of conclusions about the impact of parenting styles on children.

Authoritative parenting styles tend to result in children who are happy, capable and successful. Children are more likely to respond to authoritative parenting punishment because it is reasonable and fair. A child knows why they are being punished because an authoritative parent makes the reasons known. As a result, children of authoritative parents are more likely to be thriving, well liked by those around them, generous and capable of self determination.²⁶

Authoritarian parenting styles generally lead to children who are obedient and proficient, but they rank lower in happiness, social competence and self-esteem. They have less social competence because the parent generally tells the child what to do instead of allowing the child to choose by him or herself. These children often suffer from depression and self blame.²⁷

Permissive parenting often results in children who rank low in happiness and self-regulation. These children are more likely to experience problems with authority and tend to perform poorly in school. Children of permissive parenting style were immature, more impulsive and irresponsible. As adolescents they are likely to engage more in misconduct such as drug use.²⁸

Uninvolved parenting styles rank lowest across all life domains. These children tend to lack self-control, have low self-esteem and are less competent than their peers. They lack external structure and internal sense of discipline. They are emotionally withdrawn from social situations and lack external expression of love so as a result they try to get love from whatever sources they can. This disturbed attachment also impacts relationships later on in life. In adolescence, they may show patterns of truancy and delinquency.²⁹

The advantages of authoritative parenting over other styles has been due to the fact that children perceive their parents' requests as fair and reasonable and are more likely to comply with the requests. Second, the children are more likely to internalize (or accept as their own) the reasons for behaving in a certain way and thus to achieve greater self-control. In a world of working parents and makeshift day care, the need to assess the impact of parenting styles and the bond between child and caregiver is more urgent than ever. In addition, to different parenting approaches the attachment between a child and the primary care giver shows a new understanding of how it impacts the behaviour and relationship throughout a person's life. More than an eye-opening presentation of the fierce debates that have transformed the way we think about human bonds, *becoming attached* is also a voyage of personal discovery.³⁰ In order to create a cohesive approach to parenting, it is essential that parents learn to integrate and combine attachment styles to their unique parenting styles.

Attachment Theory

The first months of the child's presence in the mother's womb bring about a particular bond.³¹ Attachment theory originated as an explanation of the bond that exists between an infant and the primary caregiver, typically the mother.³² Konrad Lorenz, a prominent ethologist noticed in the 1950's that in some species of birds, strong bonds between mother and offspring was very apparent. Later, John Bowlby, a psychoanalyst and psychiatrist drew on Lorenz's work in addition to that of Renee Spitz who was looking at the ill effects of maternal deprivation and finally published his theory of attachment.³³ In this work, he alluded to the apparent fact

that in the countryside, animals with young, tended to stay together (lambs and ewes, ducklings and ducks, foals and mares, calves and cows etc.) and that this behaviour obviously serves a purpose. He postulated that this purpose was based on a two way security function, i.e., the mother *looking out* for their young and the young seeking solace and safety in this mothering approach/bonding. Extrapolating on this idea, he hypothesised that young children similarly will seek physical proximity to a recognised carer in order to experience this same felt security. Once in this framework the child can continue their *normal* exploration of the world around them. Thus the concept of 'Attachment Theory' was born, despite the fact that this is very possibly how all animals have operated since the origins of time.

A large body of research supports the concepts inherent to attachment theory. The theory includes ideas from control systems theory, cognitive psychology and learning theory, and has steadily been used by social psychologists, and in research in the field of the psychology of religion.³⁴ Bowlby the pioneer of attachment theory integrated insights from psychoanalysis, ethology, evolution, cognitive psychology, and child development to understand the bonding between the infant and its caregiver.³⁵ This bond not only is important for general well being³⁶ but also functions as a template for all relationships across the lifespan.³⁷ As early as infancy, children can mentally represent their attachment figures and construct ideas and expectations for relationships with both these original figures and others. Bowlby called this the internal working model of attachment. Attachment in infancy is conceptualized as distinct but integrated behaviours that are exhibited by the infant in response to the caregiver's

behaviours. Bowlby conceptualized attachment as a behaviour system which serves the biological function for the infant and develops during fixed periods for each species.

Characteristics of Attachment Relations

The four major characteristics of attachment relations are *maintenance of proximity* to attachment object; *distress upon separation* from the attachment figure; *approach towards* attachment figure when there is external threat (*safe haven*); and *exploration of external environment* when the attachment figure is available (*secure base*).³⁸

Maintenance of proximity describes the physical closeness of infants to their caregiver. *Distress upon separation* refers to the unwillingness to separate from the caregiver, which is translated through behaviours such as crying. Child's *secure base* describes an attachment figure as a foundation from which the child tries to explore the environment and seek out non-attachment related pursuits. Related to the secure base phenomenon is the idea of an attachment figure being a *safe haven* because of representations of the attachment bond. Representing an attachment figure as a safe haven, consequently, means that the infant goes to the caregiver when distressed or in need of comfort or support, thus using the attachment figure as a secure base.³⁹ Since, Bowlby's papers on *Attachment Theory* were published, many practitioners have put his theories to the test through action research approaches.

Strange Situation

Ainsworth, who worked with Bowlby at the Tavistock Clinic in London, extended the theory. She developed what is known today as the "Strange Situation",⁴⁰ which is an

assessment tool of attachment styles for infants and young children.⁴¹ In the Strange Situation, the infant and mother interact, generally in some form of play, and the infant is allowed to explore the surroundings.⁴² The mother then leaves the room and the infant is alone. At this point, in most cases, a non-familiar adult enters. Following this, there is a reunion of mother and infant. Observing each point of change in the Strange Situation helped explain the security of the infant involved by looking at the levels of stress and comfort that the infant and mother exhibit. One major outcome of this experiment was that Bowlby's hypothesis, i.e., that children under stress will automatically seek physical proximity to a primary caregiver was found to be flawed in that children fell into one of three specific categories with regards their responses and reactions to the primary caregiver re-entering their immediate world. Thus children were classified in three categories according to their behaviours during reunion episodes: secure, anxious-avoidant and anxious-ambivalent.

Secure Attachment:⁴³ Secure according to the Oxford Dictionary means "feeling no care or apprehension".⁴⁴ Securely attached infants appeared comfortable playing in this new setting. This group of children approached their primary caregiver in varying degrees which appeared to be dependent on their own levels of stress to the primary caregiver's absence. An infant who is securely attached to its primary caregiver (or other familiar caregiver) will explore freely while the caregiver is present, typically engages with strangers, is often visibly upset when the caregiver departs, but immediately reconnected and comforted when she came back.⁴⁵ The extent of exploration and of distress are affected by the child's temperamental make-up and by situational

factors as well as by attachment status, however. A child's attachment is largely influenced by their primary caregiver's sensitivity to their needs. Parents who consistently (or almost always) respond to their child's needs will create securely attached children. Such children are certain that their parents will be responsive to their needs and communications.⁴⁶ In short, a secure infant seeks comfort from the caregiver because of representations that the caregiver has been and can be used as a secure base, and explores the environment with ease.⁴⁷

Insecure Anxious Avoidant: Avoidant means "holding aloof from".⁴⁸ This group of children with the anxious-avoidant insecure attachment style ignored their primary caregivers irrespective of the levels of stress they appeared to be under showing little or no emotion when the caregiver departed or returned. The child did not explore very much regardless of who was there.⁴⁹ This pattern of behaviour often appears to leave the child withdrawn, confused and uninvolved, so much so, that they choose to seek isolation as a way of dealing with their feelings of insecurity. It is also likely that this group of children will not always show that they are feeling insecure and therefore may look puzzled or confused in whatever role they are performing. In short, an anxious-avoidant infant does not show distress during the separation and upon reunion with the caregiver avoids contact due to conflicting representations of the caregiver.⁵⁰

Insecure Ambivalent: Ambivalent means "contradictory emotions towards the same person".⁵¹ This group of children were highly distressed when the caregiver departed. They were generally ambivalent and displayed anger towards their primary caregiver/s when they returned, sometimes hitting

out, kicking, pulling at hair and clothes etc. They generally displayed insecurity when experiencing fear and sought reassurance to the point of resisting being comforted yet at the same time clinging on to the primary caregiver.⁵² It is this group of individuals who will challenge in order to seek reassurance and in doing so will engage in testing out behaviour. An anxious-ambivalent infant seeks the comfort of the caregiver, yet is not soothed upon reunion.⁵³

Insecure Disorganised: Later, a fourth classification was added by Ainsworth's colleague Mary Main and was labelled as insecure disorganised. In this fourth category, children would make both avoidant and resistant behaviours, rapidly alternating between the two, often appearing dazed, confused, bewildered and apathetic. In the Strange Situation, the attachment system is expected to be activated by the departure and return of the caregiver. If the behaviour of the infant does not appear to the observer to be coordinated in a smooth way across episodes to achieve either proximity or some relative proximity with the caregiver, then it is considered *disorganized* as it indicates a disruption or flooding of the attachment system (e.g., by fear). Infant behaviours in the Strange Situation Protocol coded as disorganised/disoriented include overt displays of fear, contradictory behaviours or affects occurring simultaneously or sequentially, stereotypic, asymmetric, misdirected or jerky movements, or freezing and apparent dissociation⁵⁴.

Long term, stable, sensitive care is best, but not always possible. It is important to understand that the various attachment styles are adaptive. This is not a matter of right or wrong. For example, when the avoidantly attached child turns away from the mother, it may be to avoid hostile

treatment.⁵⁵ Infants make these adaptations in an effort to survive in their environment. Therefore, the function of attachment is fundamental for the species to survive, actually “fear and distress, activate the attachment system”.⁵⁶

Religion and Attachment Theory

“Likewise, every good tree bears good fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit” (Mt 7:17). “Make a tree good and its fruit will be good, or make a tree bad and its fruit will be bad, for a tree is recognized by its fruit” (Mt 12:33). The mother, even before giving birth, does not only give shape to the child’s body, but also, in an indirect way, to the child’s whole personality.⁵⁷ A securely attached adult capable of encouraging positive feelings in the child will help to influence that child in developing a positive image of God and to initiate a child-God relationship.⁵⁸ Children who like or identify with or have a close relationship with their parents are more likely to adopt their attitudes. Identification is a psychological process whereby the subject assimilates an aspect, property, or attribute of the other and is transformed, wholly or partially, by the model the other provides. It is by means of a series of identifications that the personality is constituted and specified. During this process of identification children adopt unconsciously the characteristics of their parents and begin to associate themselves with and copy the behaviour of their parents. Freud remarked that identification should be distinguished from imitation, which is a voluntary and conscious act. Because of this process of emotional attachment a child will develop a (super)ego that has similarities to the moral values and guidelines by which the parents live their lives. By this process children become a great deal like their parents and this facilitates learning to live in the world and

culture to which they are born.⁵⁹ Erickson found that the religiosity of children was a joint effect of parental religiosity and identification with the parents.⁶⁰

Outcomes of Attachment and Parenting Styles

Being rated as securely attached combined with an authoritative parenting style could bring about immense positive outcomes in both infants and children. Some of the positive outcomes include: a) responding in a more flexible way when placed in a frustrating situation, b) seeking help from adults and God more appropriately, c) showing more persistence and enthusiasm in problem solving situations, d) showing greater competence in interaction with peers, e) showing greater understanding of both self's and other's emotions, and f) placing trust and confidence in the power of God.⁶¹ Further studies have shown that young children who have a secure attachment system tend to be more self-reliant, more empathic and less hostile with their peers and at the same time, more co-operative with adults than those who do not have a secure attachment system to live their life by. Generally, securely attached children remain securely attached in adulthood, at least in the absence of extremely adverse life situations. Securely attached children as well as securely attached adults enjoy life more easily, and are usually more happily adjusted to their own culture.⁶²

Research suggests that it is considered ideal for all individuals during their early formative years, to establish an attachment system through which they can explore the world around them in a degree of safety and security from external harm. Thus people reporting secure attachments with parents were more likely to report religious beliefs in adulthood more consistent with those of their parents, that is, they were

religious if parents were religious.⁶³ Thus it is obvious that securely attached people perceived God as a *secure base* and showed greater tolerance towards Christian groups who differed from their own. They experienced *more peace* and did not find their religious experience distressing. It was very unlikely that they would break their connection to God.⁶⁴ While securely attached individuals are better able to cope with negative emotion, and are less likely to develop post-traumatic stress after trauma.⁶⁵

Formation of God Representations

It would be better for them to be thrown into the sea with a millstone tied around their neck than to cause one of these little ones to stumble (Cf. Lk17:2). What is involved in raising children? In answering this question the Church gives two fundamental truths: first, that the human being is called to live in truth and love; and second, that everyone finds fulfilment through the sincere gift of self. The person who *gives birth / begets* has a genuine apostolate of raising the children⁶⁶ in the most appropriate and sincere way. Failure to do this is a violation of the basic right of the child. The first *God representations* are forming in children from about two years of age.⁶⁷ Children are able to conceive of God as more than human, while often in a human form. A study that analyzed drawings of God by children found that 87% of these drawings showed God's face and it was interpreted that children saw God as "considerably more than human".⁶⁸ It was also found that children felt closer to church-going mothers and church-going mothers reported greater satisfaction with offspring and life in general.⁶⁹ In contrast, disheartened, depressed mothers are correlated with less religiosity in the child, possibly due to the home being low in

hope and lacking a sense of satisfaction.⁷⁰ A positive concept of God in the child is mirrored in their experience in early formative caregiver-child relationships. When the child experiences interaction with the primary caregiver as conflict producing or rejecting, insecure attachment styles follow.⁷¹ The safer the child felt with the parents, the more the child identified with the standards that the parents represented. While securely attached children slowly grew into a lifestyle with similar values as their primary caregivers, the anxiously-attached were more likely to report religious conversions of a sudden nature.⁷²

People with avoidant attachment individuals and those formed by authoritarian, parenting styles may well become those labelled as dysfunctionate, a loner or a social isolate, operating daily in a modicum of fear and despair. When stressed they are less likely to seek "spiritual comfort"⁷³ and are more likely to see God as controlling.⁷⁴ It is also found that among people who have an avoidant attachment style there are also more agnostics.⁷⁵ Anxious ambivalent people combined by the formation of permissive and uninvolved parenting styles are more likely to experience emotional fluctuations, showing greater likelihood to convert to another religion or to turn away from spirituality.⁷⁶ Those who underwent sudden conversions have narrated about unhappy childhoods, stressful adolescence, problems with mental health, or drug dependency.⁷⁷ Normally, the population that experienced sudden conversions had greater insecurity with both mothers and fathers.⁷⁸ Research suggests that the fathers of the converts tend to be absent, passive to the point of psychological unavailability or actively rejecting.⁷⁹ These sudden conversions often seem reactive to a difficult life

situation. In this way, a religious conversion is possibly a way of feeling better and regulating emotion wherein they experienced the relationship with God as renewing and possessed in this new identity a newfound sense of love and safety.⁸⁰

By fostering and exercising a tender and strong concern for every child that comes into this world, the Church fulfils a fundamental mission: for she is called upon to reveal and put forward anew in history the example and the commandment of Christ the Lord, who placed the child at the heart of the Kingdom of God: "Let the children come to me, and do not hinder them; for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven".⁸¹ Childhood attachment shapes concepts of God through the very socializing process of forming emotional bonds with significant others.⁸² In the years between early and middle childhood, children's aloofness from parents was in inverse proportion to nearness to God.⁸³ A sharper focus on God attachment occurs as children grow independent of their primary care givers.⁸⁴ When religion is a part of life from early on, this influences prayer.⁸⁵ People with attachment styles other than avoidant may use meditative and conversation prayer.⁸⁶ Securely attached children find closeness comforting and stress reducing and are more likely to see God as caring, warm, comforting and accessible.⁸⁷

Conclusion

Acceptance, love, esteem, many-sided and united material, emotional, educational and spiritual concern for every child that comes into this world should always constitute a distinctive, essential characteristic of all parents, in particular of the Christian parents: thus children, while they are able to grow "in wisdom and in stature, and in favour

with God and man,” (Cf. Lk 2:52) offer their own precious contribution to building up the family community and even to the sanctification of their parents.⁸⁸ The availability and responsiveness of an attachment figure, who serves alternately as haven and a secure base, separation from whom would cause considerable distress is a fundamental dynamic underlying Christianity and many other theistic religions. What infants understand cognitively and experience affectively, profoundly influences later socialization and spiritual expression. Parenting styles and attachment styles inform human interactions at home, at school, with peers, with life partners and with God at worship.⁸⁹ The children’s experiences of sensitive, accepting, supportive mothers and fathers start a pathway of positive psychosocial development for the child. Such experiences are rooted in the domains of secure attachment as well as authoritative parenting styles which in turn are likely to be carried forward to other close and enduring relationships with others and God and healthy self-reliance in the academic domain.

*Dr Eugene Newman Joseph
St Peter’s Pontifical Institute
Malleswaram West Post
Bangalore – 560 055*

Endnotes

¹ John Paul II, *Gratissimam Sane* (GS), Letter to Families, no. 16, 2 February 1994, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_let_02021994_families_en.html, accessed on 28 November 2014.

² GS, 16.

³ Cognitive processes has been credited with a definition as one encompassing all information processing even at the subconscious

level or as strictly the ability to think and reason, which is a conscious event exclusive to human beings (M. Matlin, *Cognition*, Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley & Sons, 2009, p.

5).

⁴ A.N. Shore, *Affect Regulation and the Origin of the Self: The Neurobiology of Emotional Development*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1994, pp. 5-10.

⁵ E. Tronick, *The Neurobehavioral and Social-Emotional Development of Infants and Children*, New York, W.W. Norton, 2007, p. 3.

⁶ L.E. Berk, *Child Development*, 8th ed., Boston, Pearson Higher Education, 2009, p. 399.

⁷ S.H. Brain, *Attachment, Personality: An Introduction to Neuro-affective Development*, D.H. Silver, Trans., London, Karnac, 2008, p. xiv.

⁸ N. Doidge, *The Brain that Changes Itself: Stories of Personal Triumph from the Frontiers of Brain Science*, Melbourne, VIC, Scribe, 2007, pp. 1-5.

⁹ L. Cozolino, *The Neuroscience of Human Relationships: Attachment and the Developing Social Brain*, New York, W.W. Norton, 2006, p. 7.

¹⁰ Tronick, *The Neurobehavioral and Social-Emotional Development of Infants and Children*, p. 5.

¹¹ K. Thompson, "With Jesus in the Family: How Early Childhood Attachment Styles Influence Later Relationships, Both With God and in the Workplace", *Teach* 4, no. 1, 2010, pp. 26-32.

¹² D. Baumrind, "Child-Care Practices Antecedent Three Patterns of Preschool Behavior", *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 75, 1967, pp. 43-88.

¹³ Naturalistic observation is a research method commonly used by psychologists and other social scientists. This technique involves observing subjects in their natural environment (cfr C.J. Goodwin, *Research in Psychology: Methods and Design*, Wiley, 2004; S.L. Jackson, *Research Methods and Statistics: A Critical Thinking Approach*, Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2005).

¹⁴ Psychology research can usually be classified as one of three major types: 1. Causal Research: Experiments on causal relationships

investigate the effect of one or more variables on one or more outcome variables. This type of research also determines if one variable causes another variable to occur or change. 2. Descriptive Research: seeks to depict what already exists in a group or population. 3. Relational Research: A study that investigates the connection between two or more variables is considered (cfr. C.J. Goodwin, *Research in Psychology: Methods and Design*, New York, Wiley, 2004; S.L. Jackson, *Research Methods and Statistics: A Critical Thinking Approach*, Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2005).

¹⁵ E.E. Maccoby, "The Role of Parents in the Socialization of Children: An Historical Overview", *Developmental Psychology* 28, 1992, pp. 1006-1017. Cfr also E.E. Maccoby & J.A. Martin, "Socialization in the Context of The Family: Parent-Child Interaction", in P.H. Mussen & E.M. Hetherington, *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, Personality, and Social Development*, 4th ed., New York, Wiley, 1983, pp. 1-102.

¹⁶ K.S. Berger, *The Developing Person Through the Life Span*, New York, Worth Publishers, 2011, p. 273.

¹⁷ Maccoby & Martin, "Socialization in the Context of the Family: Parent-Child Interaction", pp. 65-67.

¹⁸ Berger, *The Developing Person Through the Life Span*, p. 274.

¹⁹ D. Baumrind, "The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Use", *Journal of Early Adolescence* 11, no. 1, 1991, pp. 56-95.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 65-67.

²¹ Berger, *The Developing Person Through the Life Span*, pp. 274-275.

²² C.M. Rinaldi & N. Howe, "Mothers' and Fathers' Parenting Styles and Associations With Toddlers' Externalizing, Internalizing, and Adaptive Behaviors", *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 27, no. 2, 2012, pp. 266-273; C. Spera, "A Review of the Relationship among Parenting Practices, Parenting Styles, and Adolescent School Achievement", *Educational Psychology Review* 17, no. 2, 2005, pp. 125-146.

- ²³ M. Rosenthal, "Knowing Yourself and Your Children", http://www.drma.com/rosenthal_parent_children_knowing.php, accessed on 7 December 2014.
- ²⁴ S. Laurence et al., "Over-Time Changes in Adjustment and Competence among Adolescents from Authoritative, Authoritarian, Indulgent, and Neglectful Families", *Child Development* 65, no. 3, 1994, pp. 754-770.
- ²⁵ Maccoby, "The Role of Parents in the Socialization of Children", p. 1012.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 1009-1010.
- ²⁷ K.B. Stassen, *The Developing Person through the Lifespan*, New York, Worth Publishers, 2011, p. 274.
- ²⁸ S. Dornbusch et al., "The Relation of Parenting Style to Adolescent School Performance", *Child Development* 58, 1987, p. 1245.
- ²⁹ Laurence et al., "Over-Time Changes in Adjustment and Competence among Adolescents from Authoritative, Authoritarian, Indulgent, and Neglectful Families", pp. 754-770.
- ³⁰ R. Karen, *Becoming Attached: Unfolding the Mystery of the Infant-Mother Bond and its Impact on Later Life*, New York, NY, Warner Books, 1994, p. ix.
- ³¹ John Paul II, *Familiaris Consortio (FC)*, 2.
- ³² J. Bowlby, *A Secure Base: Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy Human Development*, New York, Basic Books, 1988, p. 5.
- ³³ J. Bowlby, *Attachment and Loss: Vol. I, Attachment*, New York, Basic Books, 1969, pp. 3-5.
- ³⁴ P. Granqvist & B. Hagekull, "Seeking Security in the New Age: On Attachment and Emotional Compensation", *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40, no. 3, 2001, pp. 527-545.
- ³⁵ M.D.S. Ainsworth, "Attachments Beyond Infancy", *American Psychologist* 44, 1989, pp. 709-716.
- ³⁶ K. Kreppner & M. Ullrich, "Talk to Mom and Dad and Listen to What is in Between: A Differential Approach to Family Communication and its Impact on Adolescent Development", in M.

Hoffer, J. Youniss & P. Noack, eds., *Verbal Interaction and Development in Families with Adolescents*, Westport, CT, Ablex Publishing, 1998, pp. 83-108.

³⁷ E. Waters et al., "Attachment Security in Infancy and Early Adulthood: A Twenty-Year Longitudinal Study", *Child Development* 71, 2000, pp. 684-689.

³⁸ C. Hazan & P.R. Shaver, "Attachment as an Organizational Framework for Research on Close Relationships", *Psychological Inquiry* 5, 1994, pp. 1-22.

³⁹ M.D.S. Ainsworth & J. Bowlby, "An Ethological Approach to Personality Development", *American Psychologist* 46, 1991, pp. 333-341; Thompson, "With Jesus in the Family: How Early Childhood Attachment Styles Influence Later Relationships, Both With God and in the Workplace", pp. 26-32.

⁴⁰ In the "strange situation", the mother and infant are in an unfamiliar environment and there are toys for the baby to play with near the mother. A stranger is present. This assessment task uses departures of the mother followed by reunions with her baby to reveal already established patterns of attachment (Cfr M.D.S. Ainsworth, M.C. Blehar, E. Waters & S. Wall, *Patterns of Attachment: A Psychological Study of the Strange Situation*, Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum, 1978; J. Gonzalez-Mena & D.W. Eyer, *Infants, Toddlers, and Caregivers: A Curriculum of Respectful, Responsive Care and Education*, Boston, McGraw Hill Higher Education, 2007, pp. 57-65). While the original strange situation was done with mothers, today the "quality of toddler's play" highlights security between child and father (Cfr N. Diamond & M. Marrone, *Attachment and Intersubjectivity*, London, Whurr Publishers, 2003, p. 73). Fathers engage in large-muscle activities, while mothers engage with more quiet activities (Cfr R. Harwood, S.A. Miller & R. Vasta, *Child Psychology: Development in a Changing Society*, 5th ed., Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley, 2008).

⁴¹ M.D.S. Ainsworth, "Attachments Beyond Infancy", *American Psychologist* 44, 1989, pp. 709-716.

⁴² L.A. Sroufe & E. Waters, "Attachment as an Organizational Construct", *Child Development* 48, 1977, pp. 1184-1199.

- ⁴³ Bowlby argued that the secure base infants are social creatures who thrive in the company of responsive mothers or sensitive substitutes. He terms the sensitive caregivers, other than parents, “a known and trusted substitute” (Cfr J. Bowlby, *Attachment and Loss Vol. III: Loss: Sadness and Depression*, London, Hogarth Press, 1980, p. 320). In short, when safe enough, infants enjoy exploring their environment. When fearful, tired or ill, they hurry back to their secure and trusted base, their attachment figure. Bowlby stressed that attachment relationships need to be permanent, sensitive and intimate (Cfr L.E. Berk, *Child Development*, 8th ed., Boston, Pearson Higher Education, 2009, pp. 78-82).
- ⁴⁴ Oxford English Dictionary, 1989, http://www.oed.com/search?searchType=dictionary&q=secure&_searchBtn=Search, accessed on 25 November 2014.
- ⁴⁵ Ainsworth et al., *Patterns of Attachment*, pp. 100-120; Thompson, “With Jesus in the Family: How Early Childhood Attachment Styles Influence Later Relationships, Both With God and in the Workplace”, pp. 26-32.
- ⁴⁶ D.L. Schacter et al., *Psychology*, 2nd ed., New York, Worth Publishers, 2009, pp. 441.
- ⁴⁷ Hazan & Shaver, “Attachment as an Organizational Framework for Research on Close Relationships”, pp. 1-22.
- ⁴⁸ Oxford English Dictionary, 1989, http://www.oed.com/search?searchType=dictionary&q=secure&_searchBtn=Search, accessed on 25 November 2014.
- ⁴⁹ M.D.S. Ainsworth & S.M. Bell, “Attachment, Exploration, and Separation: Illustrated by the Behavior of One-year-olds in a Strange Situation”, *Child Development* 41, 1970, pp. 49-67.
- ⁵⁰ Hazan & Shaver, “Attachment as an Organizational Framework for Research on Close Relationships”, pp. 1-22; E. Waters, C.E. Hamilton & N.S. Weinfield, “The Stability of Attachment Security from Infancy to Adolescence and Early Adulthood: General Discussion”, *Child Development* 71, 2000, pp. 678-683.

- ⁵¹ Oxford English Dictionary, 1989, http://www.oed.com/search?searchType=dictionary&q=secure&_searchBtn=Search, accessed on 25 November 2014.
- ⁵² P. Crittenden, "Danger and Development: The Organization of Self-Protective Strategies", in J.I. Vondra & D. Barnett, ed., *Atypical Attachment in Infancy and Early Childhood Among Children at Developmental Risk*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1999, pp. 145-171.
- ⁵³ Hazan & Shaver, "Attachment as an Organizational Framework for Research on Close Relationships", pp. 1-22.
- ⁵⁴ M. Main & J. Solomon, "Procedures for Identifying Infants as Disorganized/Disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situation", in M.T. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti, E.M. Cummings, *Attachment in the Preschool Years: Theory, Research, and Intervention*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1990, pp. 121-160.
- ⁵⁵ J. Bowlby, *A Secure Base: Clinical Applications of Attachment Theory*, London, Routledge, 1988, p. 315; Thompson, "With Jesus in the Family: How Early Childhood Attachment Styles Influence Later Relationships, Both With God and in the Workplace", pp. 26-32.
- ⁵⁶ L.A. Kirkpatrick, *Attachment, Evolution, and the Psychology of Religion*, New York, Guilford Press, 2005, p. 83.
- ⁵⁷ GS, 16.
- ⁵⁸ L.A. Kirkpatrick, "God as a Substitute Attachment Figure: A Longitudinal Study of Adult Attachment Style and Religious Change in College Students", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 24, 1998, pp. 961-973.
- ⁵⁹ H.H. Hart, "Problems of Identification", *Psychiatric Quarterly* 21, 1947, pp. 274-293.
- ⁶⁰ J.A. Erickson, "Adolescent Development and Commitment: A Structural Equation Model of the Role of Family, Peer Group and Educational Influences", *Journal for Scientific Study of Religion* 31, 1992, pp. 131-152.
- ⁶¹ P.M. Miller & M.L. Commons, "The Benefits of Attachment Parenting for Infants and Children: A Behavioral Developmental View", *Behavioral Development Bulletin* 10, 2010, p. 7.

- ⁶² R. Harwood, S.A. Miller & R. Vasta, *Child Psychology: Development in a Changing Society*, 5th ed., Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley, 2008, pp. 85-89.
- ⁶³ Kirkpatrick, *Attachment, Evolution and the Psychology of Religion*, p. 129.
- ⁶⁴ R. Beck, "God as Secure Base: Attachment to God and Theological Exploration", *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 34, no. 2, 2006, pp. 125-132.
- ⁶⁵ B. Ghafoori & R. Hierholzer, "The Roles of Love, Attachment and Altruism in the Adjustment to Military Trauma", in S.G. Post ed., *Altruism and Health: Perspectives from Empirical Research*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 230-245.
- ⁶⁶ GS, 16.
- ⁶⁷ J.M. Nelson, *Psychology, Religion, and Spirituality*, New York, Springer, 2009, p. 45.
- ⁶⁸ C.J. Boyatzis, "Religious and Spiritual Development in Childhood", in R.F. Paloutzian & C.L. Park eds., *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, New York, Guilford Press, 2005, pp. 123-143.
- ⁶⁹ L. Miller & B.S. Kelley, "Relationships of Religiosity and Spirituality with Mental Health and Psychopathology", in R F. Paloutzian & C.L. Park, eds., *Handbook of Religion and Spirituality*, New York, Guildford Press, 2005, pp. 460-478.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 476-478.
- ⁷¹ K. E. Grossman, K. Grossman & E. Waters, eds., *Attachment from Infancy to Childhood: The Major Longitudinal Studies*, New York, Guilford Press, 2005, pp. 305-319.
- ⁷² P. Granqvist & B. Hagekulll, Religiousness and Perceived Childhood Attachment: Profiling Socialized Correspondence and Emotional Compensation, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 38, no. 2, 1999, pp. 254-273.
- ⁷³ D.E. Davis, J.N. Hook & E.I. Worthington, "Relational Spirituality and Forgiveness: The Roles of Attachment to God", *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 27, no. 4, 2008, p. 299.

- ⁷⁴ W.C. Rowatt & L.A. Kirkpatrick, Two Dimensions of Attachment to God and their Relation to Affect, Religiosity, and Personality Constructs, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 14, no. 4, 2002, pp. 637–651.
- ⁷⁵ L.A. Kirkpatrick & P.R. Shaver, “An Attachment Theory and Religion: Childhood Attachments, Religious Beliefs and Conversion”, *Journal of Scientific Study of Religion* 29, 1992, pp. 315-334.
- ⁷⁶ Kirkpatrick, *Attachment, Evolution, and the Psychology of Religion*, pp. 130-131.
- ⁷⁷ R.W. Hood & J.A. Belzen, “Research methods in the psychology of religion”, in R.F. Paloutzian & C. L. Park, eds., *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, New York: Guilford Press, 2005, pp. 62-79.
- ⁷⁸ P. Granqvist & L.A. Kirkpatrick, Religious Conversion and Perceived Childhood Attachment: A Meta-analysis, *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 14, no. 4, 2004, pp. 223–250.
- ⁷⁹ C. Ullman, “Change of mind and change of Heart: Some Cognitive and Emotional Antecedents of Religious Conversion”, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 42, 1982, pp. 183-193.
- ⁸⁰ Granqvist & Kirkpatrick, “Religious conversion and perceived childhood attachment” pp. 243-244.
- ⁸¹ FC, 26.
- ⁸² S.A. deRoos, Young Children’s God Concepts: Influences of Attachment and Religious Socialization in a Family and School Context, *Religious Education* 101, no. 1, 2006, pp. 84-103.
- ⁸³ R.W. Hood, P.C. Hill and B. Spilka, *The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Approach*, 4th ed., New York, The Guilford Press, 2009, pp. 101-103.
- ⁸⁴ Kirkpatrick, *Attachment, Evolution, and the Psychology of Religion*, pp. 104-105.
- ⁸⁵ K.R. Byrd & A. Boe, The correspondence between attachment dimensions and prayer in college students, *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 11, no. 1, 2001, pp. 9–24.
- ⁸⁶ Hood, Hill & Spilka, *The Psychology of Religion*, p. 93.

⁸⁷ Hazan & Shaver, "Attachment as an Organizational Framework for Research on Close Relationships", pp. 1-22; Kirkpatrick & Shaver, "An Attachment Theory and Religion", pp. 315-334; L.A. Kirkpatrick, "God as a Substitute Attachment Figure: A Longitudinal Study of Adult Attachment Style and Religious Change in College Students", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 24, 1998, pp. 961-973.

⁸⁸ FC, 88.

⁸⁹ Thompson, "With Jesus in the Family: How Early Childhood Attachment Styles Influence Later Relationships, Both With God and in the Workplace", pp. 26-32.