

# Journal of Individual Differences

## **Individual Differences in Romantic Attachment: Shared Environment Does Not Predict Shared Attachment Style**

April Bleske-Rechek, Grace Nuck, and Michaela M. Gunseor

Online First Publication, April 1, 2021. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000347>

### CITATION

Bleske-Rechek, A., Nuck, G., & Gunseor, M. M. (2021, April 1). Individual Differences in Romantic Attachment: Shared Environment Does Not Predict Shared Attachment Style. *Journal of Individual Differences*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000347>



# Individual Differences in Romantic Attachment

## Shared Environment Does Not Predict Shared Attachment Style

April Bleske-Rechek , Grace Nuck, and Michaela M. Gunseor

Psychology Department, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, WI, USA

**Abstract:** In the 1980s, psychologists extended attachment theory into the domain of adult romantic bonds by proposing that romantic love can be conceptualized as a process of becoming attached (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). From this perspective, individuals differ in two primary attachment dimensions: *anxiety*, the extent to which they worry about abandonment in their romantic relationships, and *avoidance*, the extent to which they are uncomfortable with interdependence and closeness. Research suggests that people perceive the rearing environment as a primary cause of people's romantic attachment styles (Tillman et al., 2008). If it is, family members should be similar in attachment-related anxiety and avoidance. To test this idea, we collected romantic attachment data on 965 US college students and the family members they nominated (205 siblings, 245 mothers, and 182 fathers). The students and family members in our sample showed negligible-to-weak resemblance in attachment-related anxiety and avoidance. Because previous studies have shown substantial similarity between identical twins and weak similarity between fraternal twins in romantic attachment styles, our data reinforce the possibility that *nonshared* environmental influences (such as individuals' specific relationship histories) and genetic influences are the primary sources of individual differences in attachment-related anxiety and avoidance.

**Keywords:** romantic attachment, family similarity, sibling resemblance, family study, shared environment

Attachment research began when John Bowlby recognized the importance of emotional bonds, or “attachments,” between infants and their caregivers (Bowlby, 1982). In the late 1980s, psychologists extended Bowlby's ideas into the domain of adult romantic relationships by proposing that romantic love can be conceptualized as a process of becoming attached (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). According to the consensus model of romantic attachment, individuals differ in two primary dimensions: *anxiety* and *avoidance* (Brennan et al., 1998; Fraley & Shaver, 2000). Individuals who score low on attachment-related *anxiety* tend to see themselves as valued and worthy of others' affection; in contrast, individuals who score high on anxiety tend to feel unappreciated and they tend to worry about their romantic relationships and the possibility of being abandoned or rejected. Individuals who score low on attachment-related *avoidance* are comfortable being close with others and using others as a safe haven; in contrast, individuals who score high on avoidance tend to be uncomfortable with closeness and with depending on others or having others depend on them (Brennan et al., 1998).

Attachment anxiety and avoidance predict how people function in their romantic relationships (Collins, 1996; Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Simpson,

1990). For example, people who score low in both attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety (often referred to as “secure”) report higher levels of satisfaction in their romantic relationships than do their avoidant and anxious counterparts (Frei & Shaver, 2002), and they show less stress and negativity in response to conflict with their partner (Simpson et al., 1996). People who score high in attachment-related anxiety respond poorly to relationship conflict (Campbell et al., 2005) and engage in excessive reassurance-seeking that can cause stress for their partner and smother or drive their partner away (Shaver et al., 2005). Individuals who score high in attachment-related avoidance are more likely to experience relationship breakup (Feeney & Noller, 1992), perhaps because they tend to respond to their own stress by distancing themselves from their partner, and to their partner's distress with anger and a lack of support (Simpson et al., 1992). Notably, although anxiety and avoidance are linked with broad personality traits such as emotional instability and disagreeableness, these attachment dimensions are not redundant with personality traits and they serve as better independent predictors of romantic relationship functioning than personality traits do (Nofle & Shaver, 2006).

Given the importance of attachment-related anxiety and avoidance for predicting relationship dynamics and trajectories, social scientists have endeavored to explain why individuals differ in their romantic attachment orientations. According to the prototype model of attachment, the caregiver-infant attachment bond is an important influence on attachment over the lifespan (Verhage et al., 2016). From this perspective, early-life bonds shape the beliefs that individuals construct about their own worth and the responsiveness of significant others, thus affecting individuals' subsequent attachments. Consistent with the prototype model of attachment, individuals report similar degrees of attachment anxiety and avoidance toward multiple relationship partners; for example, individuals who report higher levels of attachment anxiety toward their mother also report higher levels of attachment anxiety toward their father and toward their romantic partner (Fraley et al., 2015). In addition, individuals who recall their early relationships with their parents as higher in quality (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) tend to report higher levels of romantic attachment security as adults. Moreover, people who have higher quality caregiver-child relationships early in life go on to display higher levels of romantic attachment security as young adults (Roisman et al., 2005), and those who experience negative maternal behaviors (such as low levels of sensitivity) early in life go on to display lower levels of romantic attachment security in adulthood (Fraley et al., 2013).

Positive associations between the quality of individuals' early-life attachment bonds and the quality of their subsequent romantic attachment bonds are consistent with the prototype model, but they do not demonstrate that early-life attachment bonds have a causal *influence* on romantic attachment styles. In a typical family, caregivers supply a rearing environment, but they are also genetically related to their offspring; in other words, genes and environment are confounded (Harris, 1998; Rowe, 1994). Thus, one cannot determine whether individuals' romantic attachment behavior is due to the early rearing environments they were provided by their caregiver or to the genes they share with that caregiver (or both).

Genetically informed designs, such as twin and adoption studies, are commonly used to disentangle the effects of environmental and genetic influences on individual differences in attitudes and behavior (Rutter, 2007; Turkheimer, 2000). The classic twin design compares the phenotypic similarity of identical twins to that of fraternal twins. Because identical twins are on average exactly twice as similar genetically as fraternal twins are, the comparison of phenotypic resemblance in the two types of twins provides an estimate of the proportion of variability in phenotype that is explained by genetic factors. Moreover, because both types of twins are raised together, a result that

reveals identical twins to be twice as similar in a trait as fraternal twins suggests that the resemblance that exists between family members in that trait is due to shared genes, not a shared environment.

Several teams of researchers have used a classic twin design to investigate the etiology of individual differences in romantic attachment styles (Brussoni et al., 2000; Crawford et al., 2007; Donnellan et al., 2008; Franz et al., 2011; Picardi et al., 2011). As reviewed by Barbaro et al. (2017), these studies of adult twins have shown that identical twins are consistently more similar to each other in attachment styles than are fraternal twins, and fraternal twins show only weak resemblance in their romantic attachment scores. For example, Picardi et al. (2011) reported correlations for identical twins of .45 (anxiety) and .38 (avoidance), and for fraternal twins of .22 and .18. In other words, identical twins were twice as similar as fraternal twins in their romantic attachment scores, exactly what one would expect if romantic attachment similarity is due to shared genes rather than a shared environment. Overall, previous studies have shown that 30–45% of individual differences in attachment-related *anxiety* can be accounted for by genetic influences, and the remainder by *nonshared* environmental influences – that is, environmental influences, such as peer groups and specific romantic relationship experiences and partners, that are unique to each individual within a home. The findings are similar but not quite as clear for attachment-related *avoidance*. For this dimension, two studies have found that differences in *rearing* environments explain 30% of the variance in attachment-related avoidance (Brussoni et al., 2000; Crawford et al., 2007), with nonshared environmental influences accounting for the remainder of the variance. Three other studies converge on 30–40% of the differences being accounted for by *genetic* influences, and the remainder by nonshared environmental influences (Donnellan et al., 2008; Franz et al., 2011; Picardi et al., 2011). In the aggregate, previous twin studies on romantic attachment dimensions in adulthood imply a moderate influence of genetic factors, a strong influence of *nonshared* environmental factors, and a negligible effect of shared rearing environment.

Despite what systematic research has documented about the actual etiology of individual differences in adult romantic attachment, an initial investigation out of our laboratory showed that people *believe* that rearing environments are a primary explanatory factor (Tillman et al., 2008). Given the task of explaining why a young adult would have high or low levels of attachment-related anxiety and avoidance, individuals frequently nominated explanations that referenced the quality of the parents' romantic relationship (e.g., "Her parents had a dysfunctional relationship") or the quality of the relationship the young adult had with their mother or father (e.g., "His parents were always

affectionate toward him”; Tillman et al., 2008). Similar to the prototype model of attachment, these explanations place rearing environment as a primary cause of people’s romantic attachment styles. They also generate clear predictions: If caregivers provide a model of attachment behavior and attitudes, then individuals should resemble their parents in romantic attachment scores; and to the extent that siblings live together for years and witness the same parental relationship role models or serve as models for each other, they should resemble each other in romantic attachment styles. In the current study, then, we collected romantic attachment data not on twins, but on young adults and their siblings and parents. Although such data do not allow for formal genetic modeling, they do allow us to look at familial resemblance among typical family members. If a shared environment is important, then these family members should show at least moderate resemblance in romantic attachment styles. Given what twin studies have shown, we expected that typical family members would *not* show moderate resemblance in their romantic attachment styles. Adult children and their siblings and parents share 50% of their genes, just as fraternal twins do, but they also differ in age and hence share less of their rearing environments than do fraternal twins (who show just weak resemblance in attachment). Thus, we predicted that young adults would show *negligible* resemblance to their siblings and parents in their romantic attachment styles.

## Method

### Participants

Over a span of 12 years in total, we collected four separate samples of data. The first two samples were selected with the specific purpose of investigating familial resemblance in romantic attachment styles. The third sample was originally collected for a study of links between sibling birth order and personality (Bleske-Rechek & Kelley, 2014); we appended a measure of romantic attachment styles to the personality inventory. The fourth sample was selected with the specific purpose of investigating familial resemblance in romantic attachment style, and we intentionally selected a slightly different measure (see below) in order to test for converging evidence of the pattern of effects we saw in the first three samples. We eventually aggregated all four samples to maximize power to detect weak effects.

For each data collection, we recruited an original sample of participants from lower-level psychology courses at a large Midwestern university in the US; after students completed their questionnaires, we mailed a blank copy of the questionnaire to each family member for whom students

gave us an address and permission to contact. Response rates varied: The lowest response rate was Sample 4, at 39%, and the highest response rate was Sample 3, at 85%.

For statistical analyses, we included only family members who were biologically related (or very likely to be based on the demographic information supplied by any responding member of a given family). When more than one sibling provided responses, we used only the responses from the sibling who was closest in age to the original participant. In Sample 2, siblings averaged 2.14 years apart (95% CI [1.04, 3.25]), in Sample 3 they averaged 1.74 years apart (95% CI [0.95, 2.53]), and in Sample 4 they averaged 2.45 years apart (95% CI [1.66, 3.25]) (Sample 1 did not include siblings).

Across samples, we obtained responses from one or both biological parents for 284 of our original student participants. Of those students, 154 (Samples 2 and 4) had been asked to report on their parents’ relationship status; 77% reported their parents were still married and 16% reported their parents had been married but were currently divorced or separated (the remaining reported one deceased parent or that their parents had never married). Unfortunately, we did not ask the young adult participants in Sample 1 for their parents’ relationship status. Across samples, we did not request details about family arrangements for those with divorced or separated parents, such as how long they had lived full-time with each parent over the course of their childhood.

Table 1 displays frequencies and descriptive statistics for each sample. For data analysis, the samples were compiled and then analyzed by type of familial pair (i.e., Participant-Mother, Participant-Father, Participant-Sibling). These datasets are available on the Open Science Framework at <https://osf.io/d9pvn/>.

### Measures

Participants in Samples 1, 2, and 3 completed the 36-item Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) inventory, which provides scores on continuous dimensions of romantic attachment anxiety and romantic attachment avoidance (Brennan et al., 1998). When we began collecting these samples of data, we were not aware of the ECR-R (Fraley et al., 2000). Notably, however, there is substantial item overlap between the measures, and the ECR shows similar test-retest reliability and differential stability compared to the ECR-R (Fraley et al., 2000). Sample items on the ECR include: “I worry about being abandoned by my romantic partners” (anxiety) and “I try to avoid getting close to my romantic partners” (avoidance). Participants responded using a 7-point rating scale (*strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*). Participants in Sample 4 completed a

**Table 1.** Sample sizes, descriptive statistics, and internal reliability coefficients for romantic attachment anxiety and romantic attachment avoidance scores from four data collection years

	Sample 1 (2006)				Sample 2 (2007)				Sample 3 (2013)				Sample 4 (2017)			
	N	M [95% CI]	SD	$\alpha$	N	M [95% CI]	SD	$\alpha$	N	M [95% CI]	SD	$\alpha$	N	M [95% CI]	SD	$\alpha$
Original participants																
Anxiety	182	3.68 [3.55, 3.81]	0.88	.88	167	3.62 [3.47, 3.77]	0.96	.91	92	3.80 [3.59, 4.01]	1.01	.90	524	3.61 [3.52, 3.70]	0.98	.85
Avoidance	182	2.75 [2.61, 2.89]	0.91	.93	168	2.81 [2.67, 2.95]	0.93	.92	92	2.59 [2.35, 2.80]	1.00	.94	524	2.83 [2.75, 2.91]	0.88	.84
Mothers																
Anxiety	97	2.71 [2.50, 2.92]	1.04	.92	86	2.90 [2.66, 3.14]	1.10	.93	–	–	–	–	30	3.21 [2.81, 3.61]	1.10	.85
Avoidance	101	2.42 [2.22, 2.62]	1.03	.93	88	2.62 [2.40, 2.84]	1.02	.92	–	–	–	–	30	2.86 [2.50, 3.22]	0.99	.85
Fathers																
Anxiety	71	2.93 [2.72, 3.14]	0.87	.90	63	2.97 [2.72, 3.22]	0.99	.89	–	–	–	–	15	3.25 [2.76, 3.74]	0.94	.90
Avoidance	70	2.45 [2.26, 2.66]	0.82	.92	64	2.53 [2.31, 2.75]	0.87	.91	–	–	–	–	15	3.23 [2.79, 3.78]	0.86	.82
Siblings																
Anxiety	–	–	–	–	43	3.91 [3.60, 4.22]	1.01	.90	66	3.67 [3.38, 3.96]	1.17	.90	65	3.55 [3.26, 3.84]	1.15	.88
Avoidance	–	–	–	–	43	2.86 [2.57, 3.15]	0.95	.93	66	2.72 [2.46, 2.98]	1.04	.94	65	2.80 [2.52, 3.08]	1.14	.90

Note. All romantic attachment scale scores range from 1 to 7. Sample 1 did not include siblings; Sample 3 did not include mothers or fathers.

40-item adaptation of the ECR called the Trent Relationship Scales Questionnaire (RSQ); scale scores for avoidance and anxiety were computed according to instructions given by Scharfe (2016). In past studies, ECR and RSQ scores correlate strongly (Scharfe, 2016). As displayed in Table 1, internal reliabilities for both the ECR and RSQ scales were high. For both the ECR and the RSQ, higher scores indicate more attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance.

After the first data collection period, we added personality inventories so we could check on the integrity of the data. Participants in Sample 2 completed the Ten-Item Personality Inventory, a brief measure of the Big Five (TIPI; Gosling et al., 2003); participants in Samples 3 and 4 completed the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John & Srivastava, 1999).

## Results

### Tests of Familial Resemblance

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on the four samples of young adult participants and their family members. Table 2 displays the results for tests of familial resemblance. Our main prediction was that there would be negligible resemblance between siblings and parent-offspring pairs. In support of that prediction, young adults were not similar to their fathers, mothers, or siblings in romantic attachment avoidance (see Table 2). Young adults did not resemble their fathers at all in attachment anxiety, and they showed slight resemblance to their mothers and siblings. The general pattern of results was consistent with our expectation:

familial resemblance in self-reported romantic attachment styles was very weak.

### Data Integrity Tests

The lack of familial resemblance in romantic attachment does not appear to be a product of measurement error or sampling oddities, because our participants functioned like previous samples in several ways. First, as shown in Table 1, the attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance subscales showed strong internal reliability. Second, as shown in Table 1, the young adults in our samples scored higher in anxiety than in avoidance and they scored higher in attachment anxiety than the mothers and fathers did; these patterns coincide with cross-cultural data (Chopik & Edelstein, 2014). Third, as documented across regions of the world (Chopik & Edelstein, 2014; Del Giudice, 2011; Gray & Dunlop, 2019), the young women in our samples scored higher in attachment anxiety compared to the men,  $t(960) = 3.15, p = .002, M_{\text{diff}} = 0.23, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.09, 0.37]$ , and tended toward lower attachment avoidance compared to the men,  $t(961) = -1.94, p = .052, M_{\text{diff}} = -0.13, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.27, 0.00]$ . Fourth, as shown in Table 3, individuals who scored high in attachment anxiety tended also to score high in attachment avoidance, which has been documented in other studies (e.g., Crawford et al., 2007; Donnellan et al., 2008; Picardi et al., 2011). Finally, consistent with previous studies (e.g., Donnellan et al., 2008; Noffle & Shaver, 2006) and as displayed in Table 4, individuals who scored higher in attachment anxiety also scored higher in neuroticism and lower in extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness; and individuals

**Table 2.** Intraclass correlation coefficients representing family members' resemblance in romantic attachment anxiety and romantic attachment avoidance

Family pairing	Attachment anxiety			Attachment avoidance		
	$N_{\text{pairs}}$	$r$	95% CI	$N_{\text{pairs}}$	$r$	95% CI
Participant-Father	147	.00	[-.16, .16]	147	.07	[-.10, .22]
Daughter-Father	105	-.06	[-.25, .14]	106	.06	[-.13, .25]
Son-Father	42	.08	[-.23, .37]	41	.13	[-.18, .42]
Participant-Mother	210	.13	[-.00, .26]	217	.02	[-.11, .16]
Daughter-Mother	156	.09	[-.07, .24]	163	.01	[-.15, .16]
Son-Mother	53	.30 <sup>a</sup>	[.03, .52]	53	.12	[-.15, .38]
Participant-Sibling	174	.18 <sup>a</sup>	[.03, .32]	174	.11	[-.04, .26]
Brother-Sister	74	.15	[-.08, .37]	74	.10	[-.04, .40]
Sister-Sister	83	.27 <sup>a</sup>	[.06, .46]	83	.12	[-.10, .33]
Brother-Brother	17	-.18	[-.60, .31]	17	-.24	[-.64, .26]

Note. <sup>a</sup>Because we ran multiple (20) analyses, a Bonferroni correction would require  $p$ -values under .0025 to be considered statistically significant; under this threshold, none of the correlation coefficients is statistically significant.

**Table 3.** Intraclass correlation coefficients representing within-person associations between romantic attachment anxiety and romantic attachment avoidance

Participant type	$N$	$r$	95% CI
Original participants	965	.22	[.16, .28]
Siblings	194	.32	[.19, .44]
Mothers	243	.44	[.33, .53]
Fathers	181	.39	[.26, .51]

who scored higher in attachment avoidance tended to score lower in agreeableness.

## Discussion

### Summary and Implications

Individual differences in romantic attachment scores – fear of abandonment or rejection (anxiety) and discomfort with closeness (avoidance) – are tied to people's psychological adjustment and behavior in their romantic relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Simpson & Rholes, 2017). But what are the root causes of individual differences in romantic attachment styles? Research suggests that people tend to attribute causal force to the rearing environment (Tillman et al., 2008). Indeed, attachment theorists and psychologists have attributed individual differences in romantic attachment to rearing environments, implying that individuals' parents and their parents' romantic relationship provide a model of attachment behavior and attitudes (e.g., see Gottman & DeClaire, 2001, pp. 138–162; Lamanna et al., 2015, pp. 33–43). If a shared rearing environment is important, then individuals should resemble their parents in romantic attachment scores; and to the extent that

siblings live together for years and witness the same parental relationship role models or serve as models for each other, they should resemble each other in romantic attachment styles, as well. When we compiled the data from four different samples of family members, the findings were consistent: family members showed negligible to weak, and not statistically reliable, the resemblance in their romantic attachment scores. These findings coincide with data from several studies of adult twins (Brussoni et al., 2000; Crawford et al., 2007; Donnellan et al., 2008; Franz et al., 2011; Picardi et al., 2011), and they imply that being raised together does not create similar attitudes toward romantic relationships. Instead, a substantial proportion of individual differences in romantic attachment styles is explained by differences in *nonshared* environmental influences. Nonshared environmental influences are those that are not shared by members of the same family, such as idiosyncratic life events and people's unique romantic relationship histories. Thus, our findings do not imply that environmental influences are unimportant; rather, they imply that the environmental influences that are important are the influences that are not objectively shared. An important next step will be to identify the idiosyncratic events and specific aspects of people's unique personal relationship histories that best predict attachment-related anxiety and avoidance. Previous research suggests that the specific nonshared environmental influences will be many in number and perhaps difficult to pinpoint (Turkheimer & Waldron, 2000).

The negligible-to-weak resemblance between family members' romantic attachment styles does not appear to be a product of measurement error or poor sampling, because our participants functioned much like previous samples in several ways: (1) the parents (middle-aged adults) scored lower in anxiety and avoidance than the

**Table 4.** Intraclass correlation coefficients representing within-person associations between romantic attachment dimensions and each of the Big Five personality factors

Participant type	Openness		Conscientiousness		Extraversion		Agreeableness		Neuroticism	
	<i>r</i>	95% CI	<i>r</i>	95% CI	<i>r</i>	95% CI	<i>r</i>	95% CI	<i>r</i>	95% CI
Attachment anxiety										
Original participants	-.04	[-.11, .03]	-.18	[-.25, -.11]	-.25	[-.31, -.18]	-.21	[-.27, -.14]	.43	[.37, .49]
Siblings	-.01	[-.15, .14]	-.24	[-.37, -.09]	-.10	[-.24, .05]	-.15	[-.28, .00]	.38	[.25, .50]
Mothers	-.17	[-.36, .03]	-.31	[-.48, -.11]	-.25	[-.43, -.05]	-.22	[-.40, -.02]	.54	[.38, .67]
Fathers	.01	[-.21, .23]	-.18	[-.39, .04]	.05	[-.18, .27]	-.19	[-.39, .04]	.36	[.15, .54]
Attachment avoidance										
Original participants	-.07	[-.14, .00]	-.15	[-.22, -.08]	-.18	[-.25, -.11]	-.16	[-.23, -.09]	-.07	[-.14, .00]
Siblings	-.13	[-.27, .02]	-.11	[-.25, .04]	-.23	[-.36, .09]	-.26	[-.39, -.12]	.06	[-.09, .20]
Mothers	-.13	[-.32, .07]	-.12	[-.31, .08]	-.11	[-.30, .09]	-.26	[-.44, -.07]	.36	[.17, .52]
Fathers	-.23	[-.43, -.01]	-.22	[-.42, -.00]	-.09	[-.31, .13]	-.27	[-.46, -.06]	.16	[-.06, .37]

Note. Original participants  $N = 781-782$ ; Siblings  $N = 181-182$ ; Mothers  $N = 95-98$ , Fathers  $N = 77-79$ .

young adults did, (2) the young women in our samples scored higher in attachment anxiety and somewhat lower in avoidance than the young men did; and (3) individuals who scored higher in attachment anxiety also tended to be more neurotic, and less agreeable, extraverted, and conscientious; and (4) those who scored higher in avoidance tended to be less agreeable. Indeed, the pattern of associations we documented between romantic attachment and Big Five personality traits is entirely consistent with other data showing the etiological overlap between Big Five personality traits and romantic attachment styles (Donnellan et al., 2008). That is, the same biologically-based individual differences in temperament might influence both personality development and internal working models of attachment as individuals react to and create their close relationship environments. As previously noted, individual negativity appears to elicit hostility from romantic relationship partners (Donnellan et al., 2007), thus contributing to conflict and dissatisfaction in romantic relationships that can feedback into one's romantic attachment attitudes. The idea that genetically influenced individual differences is tied to the ways that people construe their environments – including their relationship environments – helps to explain how relationship experiences can predict changes in personality, while at the same time individuals also tend to be generally happy (or unhappy), across multiple relationship partners (Robins et al., 2002).

## Limitations and Conclusions

Although several different research teams have used the basic twin design to study the genetic and environmental etiology of individual differences in romantic attachment styles, the current study is the first that we know of to use typical siblings and parent-offspring pairs. Our findings concur with other family designs in implying a trivial

influence of shared rearing environment on romantic attachment styles, however, the findings should be interpreted with caution. Our young adults were college students from the Midwestern US; they were mostly white, were mostly of middle-class background, and had parents who tended to be in enduring marriages. Such homogeneity in sample demographics is limiting because research has shown that for other psychological attributes such as intelligence, the estimates for the influence of shared environment are higher in samples that are drawn from lower socioeconomic conditions. We would like to replicate our basic study design with a more heterogeneous and representative sample of adults. The ideal sample would include family members of varying degrees of genetic relatedness (e.g., identical twins, fraternal twins, biological siblings, and adoptive siblings) and varying family structures (e.g., single parent versus two-parent households). Such a sample would not only be more broadly representative of the population, but it would also allow for systematic behavior genetic modeling that would yield specific estimates of the degree to which differences in rearing environments, differences in genes, and differences in individual-specific environments contribute to phenotypic differences in the enduring ways that people feel, think, and behave in their romantic relationships.

## References

- Barbaro, N., Boutwell, B. B., Barnes, J. C., & Shackelford, T. K. (2017). Rethinking the transmission gap: What behavioral genetics and evolutionary psychology mean for attachment theory: A comment on Verhage et al. (2016). *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(1), 107–113. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000066>
- Bleske-Rechek, A., & Kelley, J. A. (2014). Birth order and personality: A within-family test using independent self-reports from both firstborn and laterborn siblings. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56(1), 15–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.08.011>

- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1: Attachment* (2nd ed.). Basic Books.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46–76). Guilford Press.
- Brussoni, M. J., Jang, K. L., Livesley, W. J., & Macbeth, T. M. (2000). Genetic and environmental influences on adult attachment styles. *Personal Relationships*, 7(3), 283–289. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2000.tb00017.x>
- Campbell, L., Simpson, J. A., Boldry, J., & Kashy, D. A. (2005). Perceptions of conflict and support in romantic relationships: The role of attachment anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 510–531. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.510>
- Chopik, W. J., & Edelstein, R. S. (2014). Age differences in romantic attachment around the world. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5(8), 892–900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550614538460>
- Collins, N. L. (1996). Working models of attachment: Implications for explanation, emotion, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(4), 810–832. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.4.810>
- Crawford, T. N., Livesley, W. J., Jang, K. L., Shaver, P. R., Cohen, P., & Ganiban, J. (2007). Insecure attachment and personality disorder: A twin study of adults. *European Journal of Personality*, 21(2), 191–208. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.602>
- Del Giudice, M. (2011). Sex differences in romantic attachment: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(2), 193–214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210392789>
- Donnellan, M. B., Assad, K. K., Robins, R. W., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Do negative interactions mediate the effects of negative emotionality, communal positive emotionality, and constraint on relationship satisfaction? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24(4), 557–573. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407507079249>
- Donnellan, M. B., Burt, S. A., Levendosky, A. A., & Klump, K. L. (2008). Genes, personality, and attachment in adults: A multivariate behavioral genetic analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207309199>
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(2), 281–291. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.2.281>
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1992). Attachment style and romantic love: Relationship dissolution. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 44(2), 69–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049539208260145>
- Fraley, R. C., Hudson, N. W., Heffernan, M. E., & Segal, N. (2015). Are adult attachment styles categorical or dimensional? A taxometric analysis of general and relationship-specific attachment orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109(2), 354–368. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000027>
- Fraley, R. C., Roisman, G. I., Booth-LaForce, C., Owen, M. T., & Holland, A. S. (2013). Interpersonal and genetic origins of adult attachment styles: A longitudinal study from infancy to early adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(5), 817–838. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031435>
- Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of General Psychology*, 4(2), 132–154. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.4.2.132>
- Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(2), 350–365. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.350>
- Franz, C. E., York, T. P., Eaves, L. J., Prom-Wormley, E., Jacobsen, K. C., Lyons, M. J., Grant, M. D., Xian, H., Panizzon, M. S., Jimenez, E., & Kremen, W. S. (2011). Adult romantic attachment, negative emotionality, and depressive symptoms in middle aged men: A multivariate genetic analysis. *Behavioral Genetics*, 41(4), 488–498. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-010-9428-z>
- Frei, J. R., & Shaver, P. R. (2002). Respect in close relationships: Prototype definition, self-report assessment, and initial correlates. *Personal Relationships*, 9(2), 121–139. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6811.00008>
- Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(6), 504–528. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(03\)00046-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00046-1)
- Gottman, J. M., & DeClaire, J. (2001). *The relationship cure: A five-step guide to strengthening your marriage, family, and friendships*. Three Rivers Press.
- Gray, J. S., & Dunlop, W. L. (2019). Structure and measurement invariance of adult romantic attachment. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 101(2), 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2017.1391274>
- Harris, J. R. (1998). *The nurture assumption: Why children turn out the way they do*. Free Press.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511>
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102–138). Guilford Press.
- Lamanna, M. A., Riedmann, A., & Stewart, S. (2015). *Marriages, families, and relationships: Making choices in a diverse society* (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Noftle, E. E., & Shaver, P. R. (2006). Attachment dimensions and the Big Five personality traits: Associations and comparative ability to predict relationship quality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(2), 179–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2004.11.003>
- Picardi, A., Fagnani, C., Nistico, L., & Stazi, M. A. (2011). A twin study of attachment style in young adults. *Journal of Personality*, 79(5), 965–991. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00707.x>
- Robins, R. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2002). It's not just who you're with, it's who you are: Personality and relationship experiences across multiple relationships. *Journal of Personality*, 70(6), 925–964. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.05028>
- Roisman, G. I., Collins, W. A., Sroufe, L. A., & Egeland, B. (2005). Predictors of young adults' representations of and behavior in their current romantic relationship: Prospective tests of the prototype hypothesis. *Attachment and Human Development*, 7(2), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730500134928>
- Rowe, D. C. (1994). *The limits of family influence: Genes, experience, and behavior*. Guilford Press.
- Rutter, M. (2007). Proceeding from observed correlation to causal inference. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2(4), 377–395. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00050.x>
- Scharfe, E. (2016). Measuring what counts: Development of a new four-category measure of adult attachment. *Personal Relationships*, 23(1), 4–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/per.12105>
- Shaver, P. R., Schachner, D. A., & Mikulincer, M. (2005). Attachment style, excessive reassurance seeking, relationship processes, and depression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(3), 343–359. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271709>
- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 971–980. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.5.971>

- Simpson, J. A., & Rholes, W. S. (2017). Adult attachment, stress, and romantic relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 13, 19–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.04.006>
- 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(3), 434–446. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.62.3.434>
- Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Phillips, D. (1996). Conflict in close relationships: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(5), 899–914. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.5.899>
- Tillman, S. K., Baker, J. P., Remiker, M. W., Matteson, L. K., Kneisl, K., & Bleske-Rechek, A. (2008, April). *Roots of romance: The origins of adult romantic attachment*. Poster presented at the 16th annual University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire Student Research Day.
- Turkheimer, E. (2000). Three laws of behavior genetics and what they mean. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(5), 160–164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00050.x>
- Turkheimer, E., & Waldron, M. C. (2000). Non-shared environment: A theoretical, methodological, and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(1), 78–108. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.1.78>
- Verhage, M. L., Schuengel, C., Madigan, S., Fearon, R. M. P., Oosterman, M., Cassiba, R., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2016). Narrowing the transmission gap: A synthesis of three decades of research on intergenerational transmission of attachment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(4), 337–366. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000038>

### History

Received July 13, 2020

Revision received December 12, 2020

Accepted February 24, 2021

Published online April 1, 2021

### Conflict of Interests

We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

### Open Data

The datasets of familial pair (i.e., Participant-Mother, Participant-Father, Participant-Sibling) are available on the Open Science Framework at <https://osf.io/d9pvn/>

### Acknowledgments

This research was supported by faculty/student research collaboration grants from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire.

### ORCID

April Bleske-Rechek

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3578-2105>

### April Bleske-Rechek

Psychology Department  
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire  
105 Garfield Avenue  
Eau Claire, WI 54702  
USA  
[bleskeal@uwec.edu](mailto:bleskeal@uwec.edu)