

INTRODUCTION

- Taking a new perspective: studying the layperson's view of what is "healthy" versus focusing on outcome variables
- Perceptions of certain aspects of relationships as "healthy" may vary based on attachment style
- Concepts were derived from Interdependence theory and Investment Model, Responsiveness, Self-Expansion Theory, Suffocation Model (constructs mapped onto models in Table 1)

METHOD

- Prolific; $N = 390$, Age $M = 33.28$, $SD = 11.64$
- ~50% female
- English speakers
- Countries represented include: UK $N = 226$, US $N = 94$, Canada $N = 44$, Australia $N = 7$, Ireland $N = 3$, Spain $N = 2$, Chile $N = 1$
- **Rate 19 constructs** from -50 "Makes relationship unhealthy" to 50 "Makes relationship healthy", with 0 "Does not influence relationship health"
- **The Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised Short Questionnaire** (9 items) from 1 "Strongly disagree" to 7 "Strongly agree"

RESULTS

- Attachment avoidance negatively predicted influence of all constructs except for security
- Attachment anxiety negatively predicted the influence of commitment
- Interaction between avoidance and anxiety was significant for satisfaction, caring, core similarities, and mutuality
 - Avoidance is a stronger negative predictor of ratings of influence for all three constructs at low anxiety

DISCUSSION

- Informs how attachment anxiety and avoidance influence how important relationship constructs are thought to be to romantic relationships
- Application for counseling individuals to understand opposing perspectives or expectations within relationships
- Better understanding of preconceived notions of importance
- **Limitations**
 - Self-report
 - Subjective constructs
 - Limits of definitions

Higher attachment avoidance is associated with rating relationship constructs (e.g. commitment, validation, mutuality) as **less important** for a healthy relationship

Table 1. Regression coefficients; Relationship between attachment and construct influence ratings

| | Anxiety | Avoidance | Anxiety*Avoidance |
|--------------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|
| Interdependence/ Investment | | | |
| Commitment | -1.40* | -2.64* | 0.73 |
| Ignoring Alternatives | 0.59 | -4.79*** | 1.14 |
| Interdependence | 0.24 | -3.20*** | 0.12 |
| Investments | 0.49 | -4.00*** | 0.66 |
| Satisfaction | 0.12 | -3.42*** | 0.95* |
| Responsiveness | | | |
| Understanding | 0.14 | -4.09*** | -0.12 |
| Validation | 0.12 | -3.56*** | 0.26 |
| Caring | 0.06 | -2.96*** | 0.80* |
| Security | -0.37 | -3.14 | 0.41 |
| Trust | -0.55 | -1.39* | -0.14 |
| Self-Expansion | | | |
| Core Similarities | 0.68 | -3.13*** | 1.19** |
| Emotional Attraction | 0.23 | -2.73*** | 0.47 |
| Physical Attraction | 0.22 | -3.20*** | 0.59 |
| Knowledge | 0.20 | -2.55*** | -0.12 |
| Mutuality | 0.65 | -4.93*** | 2.12*** |
| Suffocation | | | |
| Help Attain Self-Actualization | -0.16 | -4.34*** | 0.52 |
| Meets Physical Needs | 0.12 | -2.67* | 0.64 |
| Self-regulation | -0.38 | -4.01*** | 0.09 |
| Separate Identities | -0.44 | -2.14* | 0.72 |

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Figure 1-3. Interaction effects for influence ratings of Satisfaction, Mutuality, and Core Similarity

