



7-2020

Case studies: US-Japan comparison of attachment transmission

Kazuko Y. Behrens

SUNY Polytechnic Institute, behrenk@sunypoly.edu

Karen Jones-Mason

University of California, San Francisco, kjmason@sbcglobal.net

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc>

Recommended Citation

Behrens, K. Y., & Jones-Mason, K. (2020). Case studies: US-Japan comparison of attachment transmission. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1166>

This *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* Article is brought to you for free and open access (provided uses are educational in nature) by IACCP and ScholarWorks@GVSU. Copyright © 2020 International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology. All Rights Reserved. ISBN 978-0-9845627-0-1

Case studies: US-Japan comparison of attachment transmission

Abstract

Today, attachment research has become increasingly more quantitative and complex, utilizing extremely sophisticated statistical analyses often based on enormous synthesized datasets across the globe (Verhage et al., 2016). This marks a significant advancement in the attachment field in particular and developmental fields in general. However, this phenomenon arguably restricts the ability to visualize interactions of each parent-child dyad, on which the relationship quality is assessed. Notably, the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) and the Strange Situation Procedure (SSP) are the most validated, widely-used attachment measures world-wide, known to predict attachment transmission. This paper demonstrates the qualitative presentation of attachment transmission data, comparing samples from the US and Japan. We present case studies for each main attachment category through AAI excerpts, SSP behavioral summaries, and the expected transmission process. We also compare case studies cross-culturally to confirm the universality of attachment phenomena as well as to explore any cultural differences that may affect attachment expressions.

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

Introduction

A quick survey of attachment research in recent years indicates that published studies, especially those in high-impact journals, are increasingly highly quantitative, more complex, and utilize enormous data sets often comprised of combined or synthesized data from nearly 100 samples (Verhage et al., 2016). Because attachment researchers are painfully aware of the extremely time consuming and resource demanding nature of conducting high quality attachment studies, true collaboration by synthesizing data across time, place, and populations appears to be the best possible option to produce innovative and uncompromised findings based on massive samples. Perhaps, the most notable and recent successful collaborations have been actualized through efforts initiated by Carlo Schuengel's team in the Netherlands, led by Verhage and colleagues, which they termed the Collaboration on Attachment Transmission Synthesis (CATS). With the CATS data, Verhage et al. (2016) produced a meta-analysis of attachment transmission with a significantly larger sample size than the first meta-analysis of this kind by van IJzendoorn (1995). Collaborators who contributed to the CATS data can be considered as members of *one attachment community* who will continue to be productive (e.g., Verhage et al., 2018) and add new qualified groups/data into their ever-growing database. Although such impressive data and analyses are now conducted with unparalleled sophistication, we feel that the qualitative aspect of the data, comprised of babies' attachment behaviors and parents' verbal recollections of attachment experiences in their childhood, has been lost. How do infants with different classifications differ in their attachment behaviors? How do parents with different states of mind with respect to attachment differ in terms of coherence when discussing their childhood attachment experiences? More importantly, how can we actually *decipher* the phenomenon of intergenerational transmission of attachment cross-modally (i.e., verbal to behavior) to best estimate the transmission? We are aware that no study to date has attempted to investigate the actual transmission or transition process, and perhaps such investigation would not be empirically possible. However, we believe we can at least attempt to *visually* present a child's attachment behaviors and a parent's attachment states of mind in the form of case studies, rarely seen in attachment literature. Further, if we compare case studies cross-culturally, the estimate of the transmission process might be more effectively demonstrated. The initial report of attachment work was in fact presented in the form of a case study. John Bowlby chronicled his examination of 44 children with behavioral problems, uncovering the commonality among them to be their experience of extended separations from their mothers in early life and published as a case study (Bowlby, 1944). Mary Ainsworth (1967) also published her case study of 26 families she observed for the child's first year, copiously recording each child's behaviors during the process of attachment formation.

Here we propose to step back and re-evaluate the *transmission process* by observing *how* the mother talked about childhood attachment experiences and *how* the child responded to an attachment-provoking situation. We focus on a few selected cases to demonstrate a tacit link between child behaviors during the Strange Situation Procedure (SSP: Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978) and maternal verbal coherence, similarly to the subtle, implicit connection that Mary Main initially discovered (Hesse, 2016), which ultimately led to the development of the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI: protocol, George, Kaplan, & Main, 1996; scoring and classification

systems, Main, Goldwyn, & Hesse, 2003). Thus, the qualitative presentation of attachment data is our focus for this paper with three specific goals:

- a) to present case studies for each main attachment category through excerpts from AAI verbatim transcripts, and behavioral summaries from SSP videotapes;
- b) to hypothesize a transmission process; and
- c) to compare case studies cross-culturally in order to explore similarities and differences between these two diverse cultures.

In this cross-cultural comparison of parenting practices, Japan and the United States (US) were selected for comparison as was done frequently in '80's and 90's (e.g., Bornstein, Azuma, Tamis-LeMonda, & Ogino, 1990; Bornstein, Toda, Azuma, Tamis-LeMonda, & Ogino, 1990; Fogel, Toda, & Kawai, 1988; Toda, Fogel, & Kawai, 1990), precisely because both countries share some important similarities such as a highly industrialized economy, a high standard of living, and mass formal education. Differences we may identify between the two samples then should be more or less *purely* cultural, recognized through values, religious beliefs, or traditions as opposed to grossly different political regimes or economic status which would necessarily affect family relationships and upbringing experiences.

It is also important to keep in mind that the excerpts of verbatim transcripts and behavioral summaries are from the actual data collected and assessed by the first author and the author's collaborators; these excerpts may not be immediately recognizable to un-trained eyes as meaningful features that are indicative of a certain quality or a particular type of attachment relationship. Relatedly, when we describe each case, especially those with excerpts from the AAI, we sometimes necessarily use technical terms (often italicized) to identify certain characteristics recognized in the discourse as the best fit to features detailed in the AAI classification manual (2003) for a certain scale and/or classification. It is our hope that the reader can still envision how the mother's current state of mind with respect to attachment appears to be connected to the child's behavior when the attachment behavioral system is activated.

Below we briefly introduce attachment measures and classifications, focusing only on those relevant to understanding the case studies. We also discuss the concept of attachment transmission, specifically the intergenerational transmission of attachment security to explain the expected categorical match between caregivers and their offspring while also exploring potential reasons why mismatches occur as shown later in case studies. But first, we present a brief overview of attachment theory.

Bowlby's Attachment Theory

Bowlby's formal introduction of attachment theory was in the form of his trilogy, starting in 1969. Heavily influenced by Lorenz and Harlow, Bowlby's eclecticism in formulating attachment theory is evidenced by the inclusion of ethological perspectives to explain an infant's exhibition of attachment behaviors via an innate behavioral system (Hinde, 2005). His use of evolutionary perspectives is reflected in his assertion that "crying, calling, following, clinging, and other

behaviors that become focused on one or two selected caregivers during the first year of life have come over evolutionary time to be virtually universal among primates (including, of course, humans)” (Main et al., 2005, p. 252). These behaviors are thought to have evolved precisely to maintain proximity to attachment figures for survival. Bowlby (1982) also incorporated cognitive perspectives, proposing that the attachment behavioral system includes mental representations of the attachment figure, the self, and the attachment figure and the self together, which he referred to as “internal working models” (IWMs) that children form based on actual experiences over as little as several months. Differential interactive experiences with caregivers are likely to lead to different IWMs, leading children to form different attachment behavioral patterns toward each caregiver. For example, the child whose mother consistently rejects the child’s attachment needs (as opposed to the child whose attachment needs are met quickly and adequately) is likely to develop an avoidant strategy because minimizing the expression of negative emotions (e.g., anger or distress) may actually enhance the possibility of maintaining proximity to the caregiver and thus gain protection when needed (Main, 1981). It is important to recall, however, that Bowlby’s (1982) theory of attachment formation is not focused only in infancy but continues throughout the years of immaturity. In fact, Bowlby (1982) cautions us not to place too much significance on parent-child interactive patterns around the first birthday because “All that means is that for most couples a pattern that is likely to persist is by that time present” (p. 349). Therefore, behavioral summaries from the SSP tapes we present here should be considered only as a snapshot of the mother-child relationships at the time of the laboratory procedures taken place in the US and Japan, although once again, one that is likely to persist.

Not all infants form secure attachments, reinforcing the need for recognizing the potential roots of such differences. Differences in the quality of attachment were first identified in infants’ behavioral patterns toward their caregivers, which led to the development of a *behavioral* measure of attachment – the SSP. A *representational* measure was then developed to assess adults’ states of mind with respect to attachment – the AAI. The AAI is thought to reveal the speaker’s inner representations of childhood experiences with his or her parents that are in turn *believed* to guide parent-child interactive behaviors shown in its powerful predictability of the SSP as further discussed below.

Attachment Measures

It was Mary Ainsworth who operationalized Bowlby’s theory through her extraordinarily extensive field work in Uganda (1967), observing 26 mother-child interactions during the first year of the child’s life, during which she saw attachment phenomena unfolding and witnessed the attachment behaviors that Bowlby had depicted. Although Ainsworth initially expected attachment behaviors to be similar across all infants, due to the evolutionary nature of behaviors that Bowlby claimed, she was surprised to observe variations in attachment behaviors. She noted that these differences in attachment behaviors appeared to be related to differences in the way mothers had interacted with their children. Upon returning to the U.S., Ainsworth first intended to replicate the Uganda study, only to realize that contextual differences were too great to assume children of the middle-class families in Baltimore would be similarly exposed to natural clues to danger in their homes

as would the Ugandan babies. Hence, a situation in which children would experience mild stress needed to be artificially created to validate Bowlby's theory, necessitating a systematic laboratory procedure in a controlled environment to observe attachment behaviors to obtain empirically verifiable, replicable data. Ainsworth and her colleagues then developed a seminal laboratory procedure, the SSP, through which a formal categorization of infants' patterns of attachment became possible (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

The Strange Situation Procedure (SSP)

The SSP is a laboratory procedure consisting of eight episodes¹, each three minutes long (except for the first brief introductory episode), including two episodes of infants' separation from the parent, and two episodes of reunion with their parent. A visual documentation of the SSP procedure can be found under <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PnFKaaOSPmk>. Again, to ensure observation of attachment behaviors, Ainsworth and colleagues (Ainsworth et al., 1978) incorporated three natural clues to danger that Bowlby previously identified: strange place, stranger, and separation with a design to gradually increase the level of distress to reach the threshold where the attachment behavioral system would be activated.

SSP categories. According to Ainsworth and colleagues (1978), three distinct attachment behavioral patterns were identified: infants who showed distress during separations and actively sought physical contact, or happily greeted/interacted across a distance with their mother upon her return, and settled quickly to resume exploration, were judged *Secure* (B); infants who often showed little distress during separations and clearly avoided their mother upon her return either physically or by averting gaze, focusing more on toys or other objects, were judged *insecure-Avoidant* (A); infants who were apparently preoccupied with the caregiver's whereabouts throughout the procedure, and rarely explored but did not actively seek physical contact upon reunion, or sought contact but showed anger when being picked up, and failed to recover from their often extreme distress upon achieving contact were judged *insecure-Ambivalent* (C). To reach a final classification for each child, however, coders must give a score for each of four 7-point behavioral interactive scales (*proximity seeking*, *contact maintenance*, *contact resistance*, and *proximity-avoidance*) for two reunions separately. As stated above, a child judged as prototypical *Secure* usually seeks proximity upon reunion, often signaling to be picked up. The child will also attempt to maintain contact if put down too quickly. Accordingly, a child classified as secure receives a relatively high score on both *proximity seeking* and *contact maintenance* scales, while scoring low in both *contact resistance* and *proximity-avoidance* scales. A child judged as *insecure-Avoidant* does not approach but notably avoids the mother physically or visually, thus receiving a high score on *proximity-avoidance* scale and scoring low in other scales. A child judged as *insecure-Ambivalent* usually seeks proximity and attempts to cling to the mother

¹ Episode 1: parent and infant are introduced to the room; Episode 2: infant explores and parent assists only if necessary; Episode 3: stranger enters the room, converses with the parent, and approaches/interacts with the infant; Episode 4: first separation while stranger remains; Episode 5: first reunion; Episode 6: second separation with infant alone; Episode 7: stranger returns; Episode 8: second reunion.

while also resisting contact, thus showing ambivalent behaviors. The child therefore will likely score high in *proximity-seeking*, *contact maintenance*, and *contact resistant* scales, but low in *proximity-avoidance* scale. Keep in mind, however, there is a variation within a particular attachment group (i.e., four B subclasses, two A subclasses, and two C subclasses). For example, some *Secure* children do not approach the mother upon reunion, some *Avoidant* children do greet the mother upon entering the room, or some *Ambivalent* children are too passive to approach the mother. Thus, analyses of scale scores alone will not automatically predict a correct classification, but all contextual factors must be considered and synthesized to finalize an attachment classification.

Main and Solomon (1990) later added a fourth attachment category when they identified some infants who showed behaviors that did not quite fit into the A-B-C patterns, calling this group of behaviors *Disorganized/disoriented* (D) because of its apparent lack of interactive strategy or organization. Disorganized behaviors are thought to demonstrate the “paradoxical situation created when an attached infant is frightened by its ‘haven of safety’” (Hesse, 2000, p. 1103). Here we introduce a list of seven categories of D behaviors with the following headings (Lyons-Ruth & Jacobvitz, 2018) originally identified by Main and Solomon (1990) for the described child’s behaviors to make sense for the reader:

- 1) Sequential display of contradictory behavior patterns;
- 2) Simultaneous display of contradictory behavior patterns;
- 3) Undirected, misdirected, incomplete, and interrupted movements and expressions;
- 4) Stereotypies, asymmetrical movements, mistimed movements, and anomalous postures;
- 5) Freezing, stilling, and slowed movements and expressions;
- 6) Direct indices of apprehension regarding the parent; and
- 7) Direct indices of disorganization or disorientation.

These infants exhibited brief bouts of anomalous or conflicting behaviors, showing apprehension toward their mother, or were inhibited from approach toward the mother. *Disorganized* behavior is assessed separately, using a 9-point scale to reach D or non-D classification. Children who were judged D as a primary classification were also given a secondary classification to characterize their overall organized behavioral pattern based on the three main typologies. Coders often need to be able to first identify multiple D indices, and then synthesize contextual elements to reach a correct classification. As such, SSP coders must be formally trained².

The Adult Attachment Interview

The AAI is a one-hour, semi-structured interview with 20 questions including a set of probes, mainly asking about the adult speakers’ perception of childhood experiences with their parents (primary caregivers). The AAI is thought to “surprise the unconscious” (Hesse, 2016, p. 556) and assesses the current state of mind with respect to attachment. The speakers’ narratives are

² SSP coders must attend a 2-week SSP training workshop, held annually in Minnesota, and pass reliability tests based on 35 reliability coding tapes.

painstakingly examined for the level of coherence by rigorously trained, reliable AAI coders, using a scoring and classification system (Main et al., 2003).

AAI categories. According to Main et al.'s (2003) classification criteria, speakers who coherently and openly discuss their childhood experiences with their parents while demonstrating that they clearly value attachment relationships are judged *Secure-autonomous* (F). Speakers who positively describe their childhood experiences with their parents but are unable to present evidence to support these positive descriptors, or who devalue attachment relationships, are judged *insecure-Dismissing* (Ds). Speakers who ramble on, often angrily discussing their childhood experiences with their parents or showing current, involving anger, are judged *insecure-Preoccupied* (E). Speakers who show a significant lapse in monitoring their discourse during their discussion of a significant loss and/or trauma (often with respect to their parent(s) or other significant figures) are judged *Unresolved* (U). Those who are judged U as a primary classification are also given a secondary classification (F, Ds, or E). Additionally, speakers who show two contradictory discourse strategies (e.g., characteristics of both Ds and E), speak with pervasively low coherence, or flatly refuse to engage in the interview, are given a *Cannot Classify* (CC) classification (which was later added). Like U, those who are judged CC as a primary classification are given a secondary (or multiple) classification(s).

As with the SSP, the AAI classification system includes a number of 9-point scales, beginning with five experience scales, estimating a speaker's probable childhood experiences with each parent – four un-loving experience scales (*rejecting, involving/role-reversing, neglecting, pressure to achieve*) and one *loving* experience scale. Following the scoring of the five experience scales, coders score eight or more state-of-mind scales, taking the experience scale scores into account. This is to assess the coherence/truthfulness of the speaker's response to the interview questions, ultimately to reach a final classification. *Secure-autonomous* classification is typically associated with high scores in *coherence of transcript, coherence of mind* and *metacognitive monitoring* scales. The *Insecure-Dismissing* classification is typically associated with high scores in the *idealization* scale, *lack of memory* scale, and/or *derogation* scale. The *Insecure-Preoccupied* classification is typically associated with high scores in *involving anger* and/or the *passivity* scale. *Unresolved* scales with regard to either loss and/or abuse is separately assessed for the degree to which speakers show *lapses in the monitoring of discourse or reasoning*, and high score in U scales will likely lead to a U classification as a primary classification. AAI coding requires extraordinarily detailed linguistic analyses of verbatim transcripts, applying bottom-up and top-down approaches. As such, again with the SSP, coders must attend a formal training workshop³ (see Hesse, 2018, pp. 553-597 for a full review on the AAI).

The AAI has provided an opportunity to empirically test how specific parental internal states promote certain behavioral responses in the child (toward the parent). In fact, the AAI alone promoted a surge of studies; within two and a half decades 10,000 AAIs had been administered across populations and cultures around the world (Bakermans-Kranenburg & van IJzendoorn,

³ AAI coders must attend a 2-week AAI training workshop, held at multiple locations world-wide, and pass reliability tests administered once every 6 months over a period of 18 months. Coders assess a total of 32 transcripts. Thus it takes 18 months at a minimum to become certified as a reliable coder.

2009). Thereafter, several thousand more AAIs were administered (Hesse, 2016). Today, the SSP and the AAI are considered by many to be the gold standard measures of attachment, both of which require extensive training to become reliable in assessing. With these two measures, studies of intergenerational transmission of attachment have compiled data providing evidence that caregivers' attachment security, as assessed by the AAI, appears to transmit to offspring, thus predicting infants' attachment security, even prior to the birth of the child (e.g., Benoit & Parker, 1994; Fonagy, Steele, & Steele, 1991; Kondo-Ikemura, Behrens, Umemura, & Nakano, 2018).

Attachment Transmission

The ability of maternal AAI classifications to predict their children's SSP classifications has been well established by numerous replication studies. A decade after the AAI was introduced (Main et al., 1985), the first meta-analysis of intergenerational attachment transmission studies (van IJzendoorn, 1995) reported a significant link between the AAI and SSP. Research thus validated the power of the AAI to predict infant offspring attachment classification with a large effect size d of 1.06 (18 samples, $N = 854$). Two decades later, Verhage et al. (2016) conducted a meta-analysis with a substantially larger sample size (95 samples, $N = 4,819$), including both published and unpublished data. Similar to van IJzendoorn, this study empirically showed a significant association between parent and child attachment status but with overall smaller effect sizes. Both *publication bias* and *decline effect* (Schooler, 2011) were identified, indicating smaller effect sizes occurring for unpublished studies as well as more recent studies (which often included diverse samples across cultures).

These studies firmly established a correlation between parent and child attachment, suggesting the intergenerational transmission of attachment. But what exactly does *transmission* mean and how does it occur? As stated earlier, trained reliable coders for the AAI use extensive, complex linguistic analyses to determine attachment security based on coherence/truthfulness or *how* interviewees speak about their childhood experiences rather than content or *what* they say. Trained reliable coders for the SSP use intricate behavioral analyses to determine attachment security, primarily based on infant behaviors in response to reunions with their parents. But again, how can we explain the AAI-SSP link? The rational supposition to connect the two is, as stated above, that mothers' states of mind with respect to attachment (measured by the AAI) affect their interactive behaviors with their children, forming the internal working model (IWM) of the quality of the relationship (potentially based on only several months) or the interactive history, which guides the children to form certain interactive strategies or patterns of attachment behavior toward the parents (measured by the SSP). Despite the reasonable assumption that parents' states of mind with respect to attachment *inspire* or at a minimum *influence* their interactive behaviors with their children (measured by sensitivity measures), the link has been found modest, known as *transmission gap* (van IJzendoorn, 1995). The investigation to understand this phenomenon had begun with a number of attempts to narrow the gap by, for example, revisiting the mediating role of maternal sensitivity or examining ecological factors but without not yet being able to fully close it (e.g., Behrens, Haltigan, & Bahm, 2016; Bernier, Matte-Gagne, Belanger, & Whipple, 2014;

Tarabulsy et al., 2005; Verhage et al., 2018). Discussion of this phenomenon, however, is beyond the scope of this paper.

Challenge to the Cross-Cultural Applicability of Attachment Theory and Measures

Universality

As stated earlier, the most fundamental aspects of Bowlby's attachment theory were built on evolutionary and ethological perspectives, namely that the young are programmed to display species-wide attachment behaviors for survival. Attachment formation and mechanisms are thus assumed to be universal. The universality hypothesis is summarized as; "When given an opportunity, all infants without severe neurophysiological impairments all become attached to one or more specific caregivers" (Mesman, van IJzendoorn, & Sagi-Schwartz, 2016; p. 854). This is the extent to which Bowlby made his claim on universality of attachment phenomenon. Yet, one of the most well-known controversies surrounding attachment in modern times was ignited by Rothbaum and his colleagues (Rothbaum, Weisz, Pott, Miyake, & Morelli, 2000) who challenged the core claims of Bowlby's attachment theory, speculating that sensitivity, competence, and secure base hypotheses are Western-biased hypotheses, implying that attachment theory itself is not universal. Rothbaum et al.'s claim was immediately met with a series of criticisms not only from attachment researchers but also from cultural experts, based on: insufficient evidence (Kondo-Ikemura, 2000; van IJzendoorn & Sagi, 2000); killing theoretical generality by insisting only cultural specifics (Chao, 2000), and incomplete understanding of an indigenous concept of human relatedness specific to Japan – *amae*, which they assumed would override attachment relationships in Japan (Behrens, 2004; Gerde, 2000). Nevertheless, this provocative and daring claim did lead to productive debates and research in the field of cross-cultural attachment (see Behrens, 2016 for a comprehensive review). To date, the findings from cross-cultural attachment studies have mostly supported Bowlby's claims, specifically with regard to the universality hypothesis, but the sensitivity and the competence hypothesis have not yet been tested fully across cultures and thus, are not conclusive (Mesman et al., 2016).

Intergenerational transmission studies conducted in non-Western cultures find strong categorical matches, similar to studies conducted in the West (e.g., van IJzendoorn, 1995). These studies can be considered additional support for the universality assumption because they confirm that regardless of potential differences in proportions or distributions of attachment patterns, strong correlations exist between parent and child attachment status, suggestive of attachment transmission (Behrens, Hesse, & Main, 2007; Kondo-Ikemura et al., 2018). Yet, cultural psychologists continue to challenge attachment theory as a Western-biased theory and attachment measures as lacking cultural considerations (e.g., Gaskins et al., 2017; Gottlieb, 2014; Keller, 2003; Keller & Otto, 2014; LeVine, 2014; Morelli, 2015; Otto, 2014) even when necessary cultural adjustments are employed (e.g., Behrens et al., 2007; Grossmann, et al., 2005; Kondo-Ikemura et al., 2018; True, Pisani, Oumar, 2001).

In the chapter titled "Meaning and methods in the study and assessment of attachment," Gaskins et al. (2017) assert that they are "committed to the argument that attachment is a

universal process in humans and other primates” (p. 201), but question the applicability of attachment measures that were developed in the Western cultures to non-Western cultures. Specifically with respect to the SSP, Gaskins et al. appear to have already concluded it is not appropriate for use across cultures, in essence rejecting or devaluing all the SSP studies conducted in multiple non-Western cultures in Africa (e.g., True et al., 2001), Asia (e.g., Archer et al., 2015; Grossmann et al., 2005), and Latin America (e.g., Gojman et al., 2012). Most of these studies included careful modifications in the procedure to accommodate contextual differences. It is also a bit puzzling that Gaskins et al. seem to endorse the cross-species, but not cross-cultural, applicability of the SSP for primates.

We do appreciate, however, their reminder that attachment researchers need to be open-minded when observing attachment phenomena as a whole, and give careful attention to cultural and social contexts. They encourage us, for example, to reconsider what attachment truly means to families in a given culture and who is acting as an attachment figure. These reminders are reasonable and important especially to those who attempt to hastily administer one instrument to measure attachment. Gaskins et al. (2017) focused on three aspects of caregiver-child interactions to point out cultural differences in attachment systems;

- a) differing parenting response behaviors to a child’s distress (e.g., proactive or reactive) as argued by Keller and Otto (2009);
- b) differing socialization practices to encourage or discourage approaching strangers (e.g., Gottlieb, 2014); and
- c) differing expressions of desire for affection such as extending a hand for handshake or lifting both arms to signal for pickup (e.g., Ainsworth, 1967).

These differences in mother-child interactive behaviors are indeed intriguing and helpful to better understand the dynamic of each family relationship but do not necessarily affect assessing the quality of attachment using traditional attachment measures, particularly the SSP. Within a secure group, for example, some show more distress than others, some approach and some do not approach stranger, and some signal for pickup and some don’t. Attachment researchers have always focused on examining individual differences within a target sample. The first meta-analysis of world-wide SSP studies that only investigated distributions of SSP categories reported that there were more variations within a culture than between cultures (van IJzendoorn, 1988). Therefore, just as cultural psychologists propose attachment researchers be open-minded to the possibility that attachment measures that were initially developed based on Western samples *may not* accurately reflect meaningful attachment relationships in some cultures, attachment researchers may ask cultural psychologists to be open to the possibility these measures *may* work in some non-Western cultures rather than maintaining a fixed dichotomized view that attachment relationships in Western cultures and non-Western cultures never cross over.

Gaskins et al. (2017) also urged a mix method of qualitative and quantitative approaches to understand attachment phenomena, a suggestion with which we wholeheartedly agree. This is precisely the reason we are compiling the current case study report; to illustrate the value of qualitative attachment research. In addition, Gaskins et al. presented an extensive list of information that may help researchers better understand “culturally informed” attachment

phenomena. Interestingly, however, some items listed under the category of parental ethnotheories or parental beliefs have already been examined by attachment researchers concerned about how they may impact the quality of attachment relationships. For example, Mein, Fernyhough, Fradley, and Tuckey (2001) developed the *mind-mindedness* measure to examine a mother's understanding and readiness to treat her infant as having a mind or unique characteristics of his/her own rather than a helpless, needy creature; and Fonagy, Steele, Moral, Steele, & Higgitt (1991) developed the concept of *reflective functioning* to examine mothers' insightfulness about their own children as in their thoughts, feelings, and motivations, using the Parent Development Interview (PDI: Aber, Slade, Bresgi, & Kaplan, 1985). These measures have been implemented with the SSP and/or AAI to explore the link to attachment security measured by these traditional attachment measures. Separately but relatedly, Dozier and colleagues (Bates & Dozier, 1997) developed the *This Is My Baby Interview* targeting foster parents to examine their level of commitment to their foster children to predict the child's sense of security. Furthermore, one question toward the end of the AAI asks interviewees about their three wishes for their children 20 years into the future. The responses to this particular question were compared between American mothers and Japanese mothers and many overlapping wishes but some culture-specific wishes were identified (Behrens & Umemura, 2017). Therefore, the attempt has already been made among some attachment researchers to understand the qualitative aspect of the family relationship above and beyond reporting the quantitative aspects of most commonly utilized attachment measures.

Taken together, these cultural psychologists' claims are understandable, given that cross-cultural attachment studies are still very limited. Here, our case studies compare samples from the US and Japan to show similarities that may inform the study of the intergenerational transmission of attachment security, matching AAI speech and SSP behavior, while also exploring potential cultural differences, particularly for mismatched cases.

Case Studies

The goal of the case studies is threefold. First, we show descriptively how the cross-modal intergenerational transmission of attachment can be seen in the manner in which mothers discussed their childhood attachment experiences during the AAI and how their children behaved toward them during the SSP (Hesse, 2016). Second, we present matched and mismatched cases, comparing data from the US and Japan to descriptively show that similar attachment phenomena are observed in diverse cultures. Third, we explore possible underlying reasons why transmission did not occur as expected, remaining mindful of possible cultural explanations. This paper proceeds as follows: a) a narrative presentation of the US data, showing four matched AAI-SSP cases (one for each attachment category) and one mismatched AAI-SSP case with a brief summary to discuss the proposed means of transmission process in matched cases, or to present possible explanations for the mismatched case; b) a narrative presentation of the Japan data, showing four matched AAI-SSP cases (one for each attachment category) and one mismatched AAI-SSP case with a brief summary to discuss the transmission process in matched cases and possible explanations for the mismatched case. Cultural differences are considered in all

discussions. In addition to a narrative presentation of each case, we reproduce an actual verbatim response to one of the AAI questions as an example, depicting the characteristics of each of the main AAI classifications (*Secure*, *Dismissing*, and *Preoccupied*) for both samples.

Cases from the US were drawn from a community sample of middle-class families, participating in a larger study (Behrens et al., 2016). Cases from Japan were drawn from a community sample of middle-class families, participating in a larger, longitudinal study (Kondo-Ikemura et al., 2018). As stated earlier, the socioeconomic status of both samples was matched enhancing the likelihood that notable differences between the two samples could be attributable to culture (see Tables 1 and 2 for demographic information). Furthermore, when we discuss the transmission process, we assume that the transmission did occur when the classifications match, even though we are fully aware that the actual transmission process *cannot* be physically observed given that the transmission is a *process* rather than a set of behaviors that are observable in a lab setting.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics by Groups

| | US (N = 72) | | Japan (N = 45) | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|----------------|--------|
| | M | (SD) | M | (SD) |
| Mother age in years | 29.4 | (4.9) | 31.2 | (4.6) |
| Mother ethnicity (N) | White (60), Hispanic (9), Other (3) | | Japanese (45) | |
| Child age in months | 12.5 | (0.8) | 13.0 | (<.10) |
| Child gender (%) | Boys (59) | | Boys (46) | |
| Education in years | 15.6 | (1.2) | 14.6 | (2.2) |

Table 2
Demographic Characteristics by Cases

| Country | US | Japan | US | Japan | US | Japan | US | Japan | US | Japan |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Att Quality | <i>F/B</i> | <i>F/B</i> | <i>Ds/A</i> | <i>Ds/A</i> | <i>E/C</i> | <i>E/C</i> | <i>U/D</i> | <i>U/D</i> | <i>Ds/B</i> | <i>Ds/B</i> |
| Mother age | 35 | 35 | 23 | 32 | 36 | 28 | 29 | 39 | 34 | 31 |
| Ethnicity | W | J | H | J | W | J | W | J | W | J |
| Child age (in months) | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 |
| Child gender | f | f | m | f | f | f | m | m | m | m |
| Education (in years) | 18 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 18 | 16 | 18 | 14 | 16 | 16 |

Notes: Att quality – Attachment Quality of mother and child: F/B – Secure/Secure; Ds/A – Dismissing/Avoidant; E/C – Preoccupied/Ambivalent, U/D – Unresolved/Disorganized; Ds/B – Dismissing/Secure. For mother’s ethnicity: W = White, H = Hispanic, J = Japanese. Child gender: f – female, m – male.

AAI-SSP Sample from US

Case 1: Matched Secure case (Secure (F) mother and Secure (B) child).

AAI: Secure (F). This mother reported highly positive relationships with her parents (on the *loving* scale, her mother was rated 8 and her father was rated 7 out of 9). The adjectives chosen by this mother to describe her relationship with her own mother as a child were positive but not overly so, and she was able to support these adjectives. For example, to support the adjective *comfortable*, she stated “She always rocked me at night, and that was always a cozy, comfortable place” and further added “...she’d always, even when I got older, she’d always rock me and scratch my back...” For the adjective “loving,” she stated “She’s always good about telling me she loved me...” and added “... anytime we were walking to the store, we’d sing a song” that went “Mother and daughter holding hands walking together because they love each other.”

The adjectives chosen for her father were mixed positive and neutral, and again largely supported. For example, for the adjective *covering*, she stated “...he was always like an umbrella over his family...when we’d have storms, he would put us in the car...we’d drive around and look at storms. And it was a safe place to be in a car with him watching storms... he would just make us feel safe.” This mother was highly collaborative throughout the interview, taking time to answer each question carefully (e.g., 5 to 10 seconds to come up with each adjective), often re-confirming the interviewer’s meaning and truthfully stating “this interview is hard.” Toward the end, in answering what she felt she had learned above all from her childhood experiences, she stated “That I knew I was loved, and I’ll ...make sure they know they are loved...” showing that she values the relationships she had with her parents. Overall, this mother was coherent, open, collaborative, thoughtful, and exhibited statements valuing attachment, warranting placement in the *Secure* (F) state of mind category. The following verbatim response to one of the AAI questions by this mother demonstrates *valuing attachment*, a characteristic of a *Secure* state of mind:

Interviewer: How do you think your overall experiences with your parents have affected your adult personality?

I think they gave me a lot of confidence.... {{4 sec}}. They did, they – I wish they would have taught me to make more decisions on my own because when I did leave, it was kind of hard. I’d always call them, ‘What do I do? What do I do? So, just mainly just learning how to make decisions and so on. But overall, the way my parents affected their training on me or parenting on me growing up was they gave me a lot of confidence. They set me up for success, and did everything I could to be successful – everything they could ... {{3 sec}}, which gave me confidence, so.

SSP: Secure (B). During Episodes 1, 2, & 3, this child (C) actively, happily explored the toys. C showed no fear toward the stranger (S), accepting toys from S. During the first separation (Episode 4), C did not show apparent distress when mother (M) left the room. C was frequently babbling and did search for M, approaching the door, but was distracted by S. During the first

reunion (Episode 5), C approached M, clearly signaling to M that C wished to be picked up. After M picked up C, she quickly settled and resumed active playing, occasionally subtly touching M. During the second separation (Episode 6), C immediately became distressed and expressed negative vocalizations while crawling toward the door. At the door, C looked around and kept trying to open the door by sticking a finger between the door and the doorframe. Upon realizing that s/he could not open the door, C looked at the toys and crawled back to explore them, occasionally emitting negative vocalizations. Soon, C crawled back to the door with more negative vocalizations until S entered the room (Episode 7). C remained by the door and S picked C up to position C near the center of the room. C fussed a little, with low key negative vocalizations, but resumed playing with the toys S showed C. Soon, C moved about the room and crawled toward the door with low key negative vocalizations, at one point placing his/her face on the floor. C explored some more, and then listened keenly when a noise/voice outside the door was heard. When C recognized it was M's voice calling C from outside the door C intently looked at the door, and soon charged toward the door as it opened (Episode 8) making a full approach and signaling M to pick her up. Even though C was not too distressed, M kissed C's head, comforting C. C immediately settled and resumed play on M's lap, but when M took a seat too soon, C protested for more contact, turning toward M. M picked C up again and sat on the floor with C on her lap, gently scratching/stroking C's back just like this mother had said her own mother did when she was a child. For the remainder of the episode, C remained on M's lap, while trying to reach for toys, sometimes stretching quite far. C scored high on both *proximity seeking* and *contact maintenance* (for the second reunion) with no scores on *contact resistance* or *proximity avoidance*, clearly showing *Secure* behaviors toward the mother.

Transmission. For the mother who recalls feeling “comfortable” being rocked by her mother as a child, it is likely that she would also engage in such physically affectionate interactions with her child, as observed in her gently scratching her child's back as her mother did. For this dyad, it appears that the child knows or is confident that the distress signals or cues will be accurately communicated to the mother. Thus, mother's willingness and ability to act as a safe haven and/or secure base when needed appears to have been communicated to her child so that the child could explore this “strange” environment, confident that the mother would respond and satisfy the child's attachment needs.

Case 2: Matched Insecure (Dismissing (Ds) mother and Avoidant (A) child)

AAI: Dismissing (Ds). This mother reported highly *neglecting* behaviors for her parents (scoring 6 for her mother and 8 for her father). She described how her mother told her to get out of the kitchen when she asked if she could help. This mother endorsed her mother's behavior, explaining that her mother was too busy to stop and show her things. Adjectives for her mother were mixed, but positive adjectives such as *loving* were not supported; mother simply stated that “I never felt like I wasn't loved... I always knew she loved us...” This speaker gratuitously praised her mother excessively throughout the interview. Overall, this mother received a moderate to high *idealization* score for her state of mind regarding her childhood relationship with her mother. On the other hand, this mother scored high on the *derogation* scale for her father. Adjectives for her father

were mixed negative and included “*dead beat*”. The mother also stated “I don’t really remember... caring about what my dad thought,” suggesting that her father was beneath her consideration. She also added “Not that I wished he would have been there or anything...” showing contemptuous dismissal. The overall features of this AAI are more likely to represent the *Dismissing* category than others, specifically separately showing *idealization* for mother and *derogation* for father. The following verbatim response to one of the AAI questions by this mother demonstrates *idealization* (by endorsing rather unloving parent’s behavior), a characteristic of a *Dismissing* state of mind:

Interviewer: Does an incident or memory stand out with regard to that [descriptor chosen – time consuming]?

Not a certain incident but I remember often when she would be in the kitchen she would be like trying to cook and stuff for us and I’d say, ‘Can I help?’ And then she would say, ‘You can help by getting out of the way.’ That was, that’s like one thing that she always did a lot, because you know, she’d rather just us not have been there because it would have been too much more (Uh-huh), you know, it would have taken more of her time to stop and show us than to just get it done.

SSP: Avoidant (A). During Episodes 1, 2, & 3, C quietly explored. Following the initial brief interaction when C showed and offered a toy to M, the dyad engaged in no further interaction, C occasionally glancing at M. Upon entry of S, C stared at S for a while but returned to play, although later S and C played together. When M left for the first separation (Episode 4), C appeared not to notice, showed no apparent distress, and continued to explore the toys. Upon M’s return (Episode 5), C turned when M called, but gave no greeting. C ignored M’s overtures but vocalized some and continued to play. C heard a knock, signaling M to leave (Episode 6). C turned to watch M leave, showing neither distress nor any reaction. C looked toward the door, but continued to play actively for the remainder of this episode. C’s active play continued upon S’s entry (Episode 7). Upon M’s return (Episode 8), C looked at M and gave a brief vocalization. As M approached C she asked “what’ve you been doing?” C turned completely around with his/her back facing M. M, trying to communicate or engage in some interaction, continued to talk, offering a toy to C. C finally accepted the toy and resumed playing, but without making eye contact with M. C made no approach and had no physical contact with M, showing classic *Avoidant* behaviors toward M.

Transmission. Because a child’s separation from the caregiver is an evolutionarily-based threat (Bowlby, 1969/1982), the child is assumed to experience distress upon mother’s leave-taking. The fact that this child *showed no distress* (although physiological data such as heartrate *may* show otherwise) during the separations presents a likely strategy that this child came to learn. The child’s failure to greet the mother upon her arrival, ignoring the mother’s overtures, and physically turning around so that the child’s back faced the mother, illustrates purposeful behavior and suggests a strategy designed to enhance the possibility of maintaining proximity and protection by avoiding M who likely regularly ignores or rebuffs the child’s bid for comfort or reassurance. Mother’s *Dismissing* state of mind, convincing herself that she was loved by her

neglecting mother, or that her neglecting father was not worth considering, has been transmitted to the child who developed an avoidant strategy by *pretending* that he is not distressed or that the mother is not needed, to minimize the risk of the child's bids for attention being rejected or rebuffed. The child's contemptuous dismissal of his mother upon reunion seems to echo how the mother described her relationship with her father.

Case 3: Matched Insecure (Preoccupied (E) mother and Ambivalent (C) child)

AAI: Preoccupied (E). This mother's father was judged extremely unloving (scoring -1 on the *loving* scale, 7.5 on *rejecting*, and 8 on *pressured to achieve*). Her father was often intoxicated, and was abusive and violent toward her mother. The speaker apparently lived under constant fear of her father. One of the many unloving acts this father committed occurred when this mother was only 5 or 6 years of age; the mother was taken to a drive-in movie which showed a horror movie in which a man's head was chopped off. She was very scared and frightened, and he thought it was "great fun to tease [her]," continuing to scare her by playing a joke on her using a head of lettuce as a severed head. When the same movie came on the television days later, he would turn the volume all the way up so she could hear, while she was screaming and running around the house in terror. One adjective she chose for her father was *very performance-oriented*, for which she gave an episode of how he got mad when she placed second in the school spelling bee. In terms of achieving certain results, this mother stated that it was, "...pretty clear cut that, 'If you do this, I love you. If you don't do it, I don't.'" While this mother had a good memory for events happening as young as age 5, she appeared to have traumatic memory loss, stating that she was conscious of "blocking off" memories and that there was something "there" that she just couldn't recall related to her father's abusive behaviors. Another adjective chosen for her father was *very fearful relationship* and she repeatedly said she was frustrated with herself for not being able to recall. This mother was otherwise thoughtful and displayed a habitual metacognitive thinking process. Nevertheless, even though it is rare in non-clinical samples, this mother appears to be overwhelmed by and most probably *Preoccupied* with traumatic events and fear, which warranted placement in the *Preoccupied* (E) category. The following verbatim, fairly long response to one of the AAI questions by this mother demonstrates *preoccupation* (with fear for this mother), a characteristic of a *Preoccupied* state of mind:

Interviewer: Did you ever feel frightened or worried as a child?

Uh, yes, and, oh, I'm just so embarrassed. Not embarrassed, but I just hate having to tell you all this. Um, when I, when we first moved to CITY4, I guess, it was probably, I was probably 5 or 6 years old, but, mu, we went to the drive-in and saw a movie. I don't know what in the world my parents were thinking, but it was a horror movie (Um-hmm) that we saw, and it just scared the death out of me, (Um-hmm), and, um, there was a part in this movie where this man got his head chopped off, (Um-hmm) and that was the part that I just went hysterical over, and um, my dad thought it was fun to tease me about that, (Um-hmm) and to play jokes on me, like um, I just remember specifically with a head of lettuce, you know, (Um-hmm) um, like that was a severed head, (Um-hmm) but I, I can remember, I remember two other instances with that movie. I remember one day, we

had HBO, (Um-hmm) you know, which was the new thing back then (Right). I don't know, you may not even remember. This is like, you know, '77, '78. So, but HBO was a new thing, but, um, so I can remember playing in the living room, and the commercial for this movie came on, and it just, again, scared the daylights out of me, and I remember just running, screaming to my mom, and she was taking a nap at that time, and just waking her up and just being hysterical (Um-hmm) over the whole thing, but then I can remember, too, um my dad would watch that movie, and he would turn the volume on the TV up all the way, I mean just full blast, and my room was upstairs, and um, I couldn't hear specifics, but I knew what he was watching, and I just could feel the floor vibrating, you know, could hear the muffled sounds (Um-hmm), and just being scared to death in my room (Um-hmm) of, of that (Um-hmm). So, (Um-hmm) um, I can remember another time of, my parents were in the kitchen talking, they were discussing my brother's academics at school (Um-hmm), and, um, and I basically just kind of snuck up on 'em to listen to what they were saying, and my dad saw me, and um, and I was just scared to death of what he was gonna do. I don't remember any repercussions from that (Okay). I don't remember him doing anything (Um-hmm) so, but there was definitely that fear of that, you know, (Okay) I was in trouble (Um-hmm, um-hmm) so.

SSP: Ambivalent (C). During Episodes 1, 2, & 3, C did not explore and simply clung to M. Although C did not appear distressed, when M took a seat C immediately crawled to M and tried to clamber up, patting M's knee, constantly touching M. Upon S's entry, C stared at S. When S offered a toy, C did not accept, and did not explore independently. In fact, C never left M's side, standing by her, as if frightened of *something*. When signaled to leave, M put C down on the floor and left (Episode 4). As soon as M left, C became distressed, seeking comfort and physical contact with S. C cried the entire episode, although the cry was relatively low key. Upon M's return (Episode 5), C approached M. Although C did not give a signal for pickup, M picked C up. C quickly settled and stopped crying. M kissed C and comforted C. When seated M put C down on the floor. As soon as M put C down C became distressed, emitting intermittent cries. C was clingy with M and did not explore. When M tried to show C a toy, C looked at the toy, but did not engage in play. After receiving another signal to leave, M abruptly left (Episode 6). C became immediately distressed and cried passively on the same spot without moving until S entered (Episode 7). C continued to emit a low key cry while in S's arms and did not explore. Upon M's return (Episode 8), C did not approach (perhaps too distressed) and M picked C up. C continued to fuss weakly, clinging onto M, as though frightened with no apparent reason. At one point, M interacted with C face to face, placing C on her knee. C appeared to settle down somewhat, but as soon as M tried to put C down on the floor to play, C fussed. This child was extremely passive, timid, and clearly preoccupied with M, which warranted an ambivalent (C) classification.

Transmission. This mother's preoccupation with her childhood experiences was reflected by the fear she expressed of her violent father. Moreover, the fact that she evidently has traumatic memory loss confirms that *something* frightening and associated with the father happened to her during childhood. This mother's *Preoccupied* state of mind has transmitted to her child, who was

unable to explore simply because s/he was in an unfamiliar environment which made the child extremely anxious. Accordingly, this child exhibited an attachment strategy consisting of maintaining constant contact with the mother and monitoring the mother's whereabouts. The child was also notably timid and passive. Further evidence of the transmission of the mother's state of mind with a component of fear was seen in the child's behaviors that showed some inexplicable fear but without a clear target.

Case 4: Matched Insecure (Unresolved (U) mother and Disorganized (D) child)

AAI: Unresolved (U). This mother experienced a few losses of her family members, one during high school and two more recently. Her first reported loss was of her maternal great-grandfather. The mother said she was close to her maternal great-grandfather as she saw him once or twice a week. She was closer, however, to her paternal grandparents. She showed some *disorientation with respect to time*, as earlier she said she didn't experience any loss of a family member "until real recently, like in the last couple of years." Yet her great-grandfather died when she was in high school more than several years ago (note that the question initially asked whether she experienced a loss as a young child; she was correct to say "no" because she was in high school at that time). She also said she wasn't too close to him. Thus, this particular slip would not qualify for a high U score. While discussing the loss of her paternal grandmother, she showed several *dead/not-dead* indices. For example, while discussing the adjective "still loving" to describe the relationship with her father, she said "...his family *is* just weird, they *are* selfish, and ...they *don't* have healthy relationships..." showing usage of present tense. Since this particular context also includes living members, these passages did not qualify for high U scores (her unresolved state of mind toward one individual is not entirely clear). She also used the present tense in response to the question about the effect of the loss of her great-grandfather on her approach to her own child declaring that "...if [the loss was of] my grandparents on my dad's side, it'd still be kind of the same detached, sad that they're gone...." Given that the paternal grandmother died months earlier, this comment was the clearest indication that this mother speaks as if this deceased paternal grandmother was still alive. Thus, this is a stronger slip (as her grandmother is still alive in her mind) and was sufficient to place this mother in the U category. It should be noted, however, that this loss did occur within the last year. Main et al. (2003), nevertheless, recommends considering U placement for a speaker with a recent loss when clear indices are present because this state of mind is likely to immediately affect the mother's interactive behaviors toward the child.

SSP: Disorganized (D). During Episodes 1, 2 & 3, C would stand and walk, and examine toys. At one point, C lost his/her balance but settled down on the floor and continued to explore. C stared at S as she entered the room, and stood by S while checking back with M. S approached C and C appeared happy, showed no distress and interacted well with S. Soon after M left (Episode 4), C showed distress and went to the door. S tried to entice C with toys, but C rejected both the toys and S's pickup. Directly upon M's return (Episode 5), C showed *rapid changes of affect and demonstrated hurried hand to mouth movements* (Category 7: Direct indices of disorganization or disorientation). C then approached M and offered her a toy, displaying an obvious desire for contact. M did not respond to C's overtures for contact and instead teased C.

C then lost his/her balance and fell down. M helped C up but C was still upset. M continued to tease C. M then showed C a telephone toy but C rejected it. M finally picked C up briefly, but soon put her/him down, with no protest from C. C continued to approach M, seeking contact. Immediately after M left (Episode 6), C became highly distressed. When S entered (Episode 7), C turned around and eventually accepted S's pickup but could not be comforted by S. Upon M's entry, C simply *collapsed* (Category 3: Undirected, incomplete, and interrupted movements and expressions). S tried to help C before C completely fell down and laid upon the floor. M tried to soothe and pick C up. C looked up at the ceiling. C got up and signaled for pickup. M picked C up and C looked up the ceiling. C quickly settled and was put down for the remainder of the episode, interacting with M with toys.

Transmission. This mother's grandmother died within the last year, for which she was judged *Unresolved* due to her disbelief that the deceased grandmother was dead. Her disbelief was reflected by her comment "if this grandmother were to die," when clearly, she did die 10 months ago. Although this mother said she wasn't close to this paternal grandmother who was not pleasant to be around, perhaps she was, in part, trying to blame her grandmother for how her own father turned out by saying "his parents were as loving as they knew how to be and it was not very loving and supportive...." She openly discussed how her father left her family when she was young, was an alcoholic, and married a number of times. Yet, she still apparently longed for a relationship with him. It is possible her *Unresolved* state could be resolved in future years but this mother's Unresolved state of mind did appear to transmit to her child who exhibited unambiguous disorganized behaviors upon reunion with the mother. Note that the *Unresolved* state is believed to manifest itself in what are called Frightened/Frightening (FR) behaviors. FR behaviors are thought to promote disorganization in children. Discussion of FR behaviors is beyond the scope of this paper (see Abrams, Rifkin, & Hesse, 2006; Hesse & Main, 2006; Jacobvitz, Leon, & Hazan, 2006; Schuengel, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van IJzendoorn, 1999).

Case 5: Mismatched Insecure (Dismissing) mother and Secure (B) child

AAI: Dismissing (Ds). This mother's parents divorced when she was three. When she was seven, her mother married her step-father. Although she maintained regular contact with her father and established a meaningful relationship with her step-father, her mother was the attachment figure to whom she was closest during childhood. From the very beginning, she described the relationship with her mother as being *very, very* close and continued to describe the relationship with her that way throughout the interview. Her adjectives describing the relationship with her mother were mostly very positive, but this speaker could provide no specific examples for *any* adjectives, giving only general statements. For example, M's answers would include phrases such as "my whole life," "always been a constant...", and "wasn't one particular..." for the descriptor "*very close*." This speaker also repeatedly stated that she couldn't remember any specifics and had no memory regarding particular events or memories throughout the interview. Lack of memory is a typical characteristic of *Dismissing* speakers, scoring high on *idealization* and also *lack of recall* for not being able to substantiate the positive relationship she claimed she had with her mother. This mother was also clearly somewhat excessively grateful to

her mother for making her feel “loved,” being able to always “count on her,” although again she offered no specific memories to support such statements other than *canned speech* statements such as “being hugged and kissed.” Thus, the high *idealization* score that placed this speaker in the *Dismissing* category was not based on overt contradictions of what the mother tried to portray and evidence that showed otherwise, but rather her inability to provide any instances or memories to support her positive descriptors, as well as her striking lack of memory throughout the interview. While showing this undeniable evidence of *Dismissing* characteristics, this mother was nevertheless pleasant and collaborative, often taking time to come up with a response for each question, even though she ultimately could not provide specifics, saying instead “this is hard.”

SSP: Secure (B). During Episodes 1, 2, & 3, C happily played with the toys. At one point, C went around M, seemingly wanting a sippy-cup from M’s purse which she took away. C briefly cried but soon returned to play. C was also able to play well with S after she entered the room. During the first separation (Episode 4), C was immediately distressed when M left. S picked him/her up, and though C was sometimes distracted by toys, C continued to be distressed, pointing to door. Upon M’s entry (Episode 5), C showed a marked, happy smile, but no approach. Soon, C wanted contact, but M did not pick him/her up and provide contact, so C continued to demand contact. When M left the room (Episode 6) C immediately became distressed and completely stopped exploring. C became distracted a bit when S entered the room (Episode 7) but continued to cry at M’s chair. Although C played with S a little, C continued to cry while pointing to M’s bag, possibly wanting a drink. Upon M’s return (Episode 8) C’s extreme distress prevented an approach to M although C showed a clear desire for contact. This time, M picked him/her up, and C completely relaxed immediately and put his/her head on M’s shoulder. C maintained contact for a while and finally settled. C made a little fuss when M wiped his/her nose and stayed on M’s lap for the remainder of the episode. Even though C did not approach M upon reunion (possibly because of distress), his/her clear desire for contact and instant settling down upon being picked up are clear indications of a *Secure* classification.

Transmission. This mother experienced her parents’ divorce when she was only three years of age. Experiencing the divorce of parents at such a young age was likely confusing and could be potentially traumatic. Prior to remarrying, her mother was a single mother raising two children although her father did visit frequently. It is thus understandable that she was a bit excessively grateful to her mother for simply being there even though the relationship might have been a rather superficial one as, other than a customary hug and kiss, no specific examples depicting affective interactions were described. It is thus possible that a significant event such as parental divorce during the mother’s early years could have meaningfully affected her discourse and coherence of mind to an extent the current AAI classification system would not be able to capture.

Interestingly, this mother did provide a couple of instances of clear memories relating to her early separations, the first one being when her mother remarried and was leaving for a honeymoon. The mother described how she was clinging to her mother’s leg and crying, and how her mother gave her a hug and a kiss and said she had to go. Although she was seven at that time, old enough to understand the situation, she could have felt rejected because her mother left her. Another memory pertaining to separation was when this mother became ill at her

grandparents' house where she and her sister stayed overnight while her mother was out with a friend in another city. She openly described being sick, how she cried, and how she wanted her mother. Thus, this mother did show vulnerability and acknowledged her need to depend on others (i.e. attachment figures), indicative of valuing attachment. These are characteristics of a *Secure* rather than a *Dismissing* classification. Ultimately, however, this mother did fit a *Dismissing* classification best because of her clear and consistent idealizing stance. Nevertheless, this mother's clear indication of valuing attachment, and her collaboration throughout the interview, could have substantially affected her parenting or interactive behaviors with her child (shown in her high sensitivity score⁴) and thus been transmitted to her child. Therefore, in this dyad, this mother's sensitivity was sufficient to allow her child to develop a secure attachment toward her above and beyond the mother's attachment state of mind according to the coding manual.

Japan - AAI-SSP Sample

Case 1: Matched Secure case (Secure (F) mother and Secure (B) child).

AAI: Secure (F). One of the characteristics of this mother's discourse and her state of mind was her ability to be open and at ease throughout the interview. When the mother talked about her early memories of her parents, she candidly stated that her memory was based on photo albums showing frequent family trips. Most of her adjectives for both parents were neutral and not relational, thus no overt contradiction could be demonstrated. She had a rather unusual upbringing; because her father's job required that the family move overseas, this mother was born, raised and educated in a foreign country. She was aware that her parents' own upbringing, as well as their Christian faith, might have affected their parenting practices. Today, only one percent of the Japanese population identify themselves as Christians. Thus, if her mother's parenting was influenced by her Christian faith, this mother's childhood may have been unusual for a Japanese child. At least in the past few decades, however, it has been commonly observed that Japanese people tend to *romanticize* Christian traditions. For example, some Japanese may celebrate Christmas, although it is not a national holiday in Japan; young non-Christian couples may opt for a church wedding; and some may wear a cross pendant or earrings as a fashion statement. Therefore, upon her return to Japan, this mother may have felt privileged to have been exposed to Christianity early in life. However, she openly acknowledged that her mother was not around much and was quite active in religious activities or her own hobbies. While she never indicated that her parents engaged in any deliberately unloving behaviors, she also never mentioned any loving parental behaviors. Instead, it appears she avoided the discussion of the relationship in emotional terms, while nonetheless being open at times for unpleasant experiences when she got hurt or was sick in a foreign country. She frequently showed gratitude for her parents perhaps because she was exposed to the unique childhood experiences discussed above. She also clearly showed that she valued attachment. During the discussion of losses, she showed compassion and thoughtfulness toward those who suffered from these losses. Thus, overall, this mother's openness, truthfulness, and valuing of relationships warranted a *Secure (F)*

⁴ For this sample, sensitivity was assessed for each participating mother.

classification. The following (translated) verbatim response to one of the AAI questions by this mother demonstrates *valuing attachment*, a characteristic of a *Secure* state of mind:

Interviewer: How do you think your overall experiences with your parents have affected your adult personality?

Um, well, for my family, um, because we had an opportunity to live overseas, uhm, I would say, first of all, family bonding, you know? Um, if I stayed in Japan, around the age of junior high or so, I'd think that [the family bonding] would become less strong, but because we went to [PLACE B] for the second time, and uhm, we valued each other, and um, spent a lot of time together, talking about the way of living, our future, and such relationship to this day is still continuing, you know?

SSP: Secure (B). During Episodes 1, 2, & 3, C, a bit passively, but happily played with the toys. M often introduced toys to C who was responsive to M's overtures and mimicked what M did with the toys. C frequently looked at M, and both smiled at each other. When S entered the room, C did not show fear toward S although C did stare at S often, and looked at M. During the first separation (Episode 4), C did not see M leave but soon noticed her absence. As soon as S took a seat, C started to whine, and cried looking at S and around the room. S approached and showed some toys, but C continued to cry, even when S picked C up. C momentarily stopped crying but would then cry harder. C was put down on the floor to prepare for the reunion, and continued to cry. Upon M's entry (Episode 5), C immediately stretched out her left arm. M approached C, stretching out her arm, and picked up C. After M rubbed her forehead against C's, and asked "what's wrong," C seemed to be ready to explore. M continued to hold C who settled in by putting C's hand onto M's shoulder. Within several seconds, however, C signaled to be put down with a small protest vocalization. M put C down on the floor and C immediately started to play with the toys. C even engaged in some social play, swinging a bell, swaying the body slightly right and left, and looking at M at a distance. C noticed as soon as M stood up and watched M leave (Episode 6). C did not move and started to cry. As S entered the room (Episode 7), C continued to cry and could not be comforted even when S picked her up. C was put down on the floor to prepare for the reunion. Upon M's entry (Episode 8), C cried even harder (*directed cry*), shaking her/his arms up and down while remaining in a seated position. As M approached, C stretched out her arms and hands, signaling for pickup. As soon as M picked C up, C stopped crying and emitted some vocalizations. Placing hands on M's shoulder, C's body soon stretched toward the toys. When put down, C looked around for the toys. C fully resumed exploration even after M took a seat, vocalizing at M. For the remainder of the episode, C interacted with M at a distance. Although C vocalized often, s/he did not move. Even though C did not get a score on *proximity seeking* or *contact maintenance* due to C's limited mobility, C's ability to recover quickly from distress once comforted and return to exploration places C in the *Secure* classification.

Transmission. This mother's speech and state of mind are characterized by openness, relative straightforwardness, and valuing of attachment relationships. Given that both of her parents were rather neglecting (in the sense that they were busy with their work or activities that they devoted

most of their time to), this mother's attempt to view her parents in a somewhat positive light with some *idealization* by focusing more on non-relational terms is understandable. M's own lack of experience with affectionate interactions with her parents and accepting these experiences may not have encouraged child's physical contact much. Mother's coherent state of mind has transmitted to her child, who openly expresses distress but quickly settles down without much need for physical contact to maintain a healthy, *Secure* relationship.

Case 2: Matched Insecure (*Dismissing (Ds)* mother and Avoidant (A) child)

AAI: Dismissing (Ds). This mother was an only child and claimed to have been close to both parents. Although she spent much more time with her mother, she said she was closer to her father. For her mother, she gave some positive adjectives, but those were not extremely positive and were reasonably supported. However, adjectives for her father, most of which were very positive, were not well supported, showing clear *idealization* toward her father. In fact, one of her chosen adjectives was "ideal person." This mother lost her father approximately one year earlier and it is possible that she wanted to view and consider/remember her father in the most positive light. Still, her first adjective describing him was "someone who understood me the most EVER" simply because he allowed her to take piano lessons after he *really* listened to her seems a bit excessively grateful. To support another adjective "extremely loving," she explained that she used to suffer from childhood asthma and frequently went to the emergency room. One night this mother had an asthma attack and her father was the one who drove her to the hospital. This mother insisted that her father made a huge sacrifice driving her to the hospital because he needed to wait to drink until she was treated and released to go back home. Thus, her attempt to convince herself and the interviewer that what would normally be considered an obligatory act of parenting like taking a sick child to the hospital, and disrupting his drinking routine, was "extremely loving" is clearly *idealizing*. Keep in mind, however, that in Japan (especially during the mother's childhood days) it is not unusual for an adult, particularly a father-figure, to consume alcohol nightly as long as he does not become violent upon drinking. In fact, there is a term *banshaku*, that specifically refers to an evening sake usually prepared by his wife (or older daughter). This is the time for breadwinners of the house to wind down and relax after a day of hard work, which understandably this mother's father was looking forward to. Also, in Japan, drunk driving laws are extremely strict and drivers can be stopped at any point and checked for alcohol consumption. Drivers may have their driver's license suspended or face jail time for drinking as little as one beer. Thus, most people take this seriously and do not drink and drive. Thus, it may be understandable that this mother felt grateful to her father for giving up his favorite time to take her to the hospital. Still, for any parent, attending to a sick child should take priority over anything. Thus, this mother's praise of her father's act is overrated and does not support her father being extremely loving. Therefore, this speaker's *Dismissing* state was not based on overt contradictions but rather on her failure to support extremely positive views of the relationship with her attachment figure. The following (translated) verbatim response to one of the AAI questions by this mother demonstrates *idealization or excessive praise of parent's behavior* of what would be considered otherwise normal parental responsibility, characteristics of a *Dismissing* state of mind:

Interviewer: Does an incident or memory stand out with regard to that [descriptor chosen— extremely loving]?

For loving, um, I have asthma, and it was pretty bad when I was young, often ended up in the ER, and missed the Sports Day and stuff like that, and when that happened, yeah, and if it was at night, taking me to the ER meant, my father had to drive me there, so even though he loved drinking, he didn't drink a drop of sake until my asthma settled down, yeah (I see).

SSP: Avoidant (A). During Episodes 1, 2, & 3, C began to explore as M took seat. C was sitting with C's back to M, but turned around and looked at M as C explored. C appeared uncertain about what to do with one toy, and began to bang some random toys with sticks. C then alternated between banging and licking or mouthing toys. C slowly moved closer to S and M, and showed no fear of S as she approached C. C watched M leave (Episode 4) but showed no change in affect and was not responsive to S's overtures. C continued to explore on C's own but didn't use the toys as intended, emitting some negative vocalizations when apparently frustrated with the toys (low quality of play in general). Upon M's entry (Episode 5), C, who happened to be sitting facing the door, looked up. M asked "What have you been doing?" As soon as C saw M, C looked away to search for the toys, started banging again, and continued on with exploration with no apparent change in C's affect. When C saw S leaving, C tried to follow and walked toward the door, but once the door shut, C looked around and sat. M tried to pick C up but C moved away from M and moved toward the toys. M tried to line up the toys. C began banging the drum, looked at M, and continued to bang or mouth other toys. Then, with C's back facing M, C began throwing blocks over his/her shoulder. M approached C and said "wait a little, okay?" patting C's head. C watched M leave (Episode 6), continued to shake toys and looked around emitting some vocalizations. Nearly 3 minutes later, C abruptly stopped playing, moved toward the door, and stood up making loud vocalizations. C did not cry, but appeared angry. C continued to shout, but did not call for M. Upon S's entry (Episode 7), C remained by the door, but became responsive to S, and followed S to explore toys. C happily accepted the toy from S and started to shake it. S then took a seat. C laid on his/her stomach, and then on his/her back, and sat up again, occasionally looking at S. When the door opened (Episode 8), C looked up. M said "I'm back." C turned around and continued to act as if nothing happened. Occasionally, C looked at M. C threw a block and put another block in his/her mouth. C continued to touch toys, banging the drum, and vocalizing toward M until the end of the episode.

Transmission. Similar to children in the US sample, this child showed no distress during the separations which is not a natural response of a young child to separations from the parent in an unfamiliar environment. This child's gaze aversion from mother, pretending to look for toys, or rejection of mother's attempt to pick up the child by moving away from her appear to be deliberate attempts to minimize demands on the mother for comfort, possibly to protect the child from experiencing the rejection s/he encountered in the past. This mother's *Dismissing* state of mind has apparently transmitted to her child who developed an avoidant strategy to minimize the risk of being rejected or ridiculed.

Case 3: Matched Insecure (Preoccupied (E) mother and Ambivalent (C) child)

AAI: Preoccupied (E). This mother clearly showed preoccupied anger toward her mother for constant nagging and punishing her for mostly minor things during her entire childhood. She also experienced her mother's blunt favoritism toward her brothers, especially the youngest brother. Mother reported that she was required to do all the household chores while her brothers were excused because she was "a girl." Mothers' favoritism toward a boy or a son, or the youngest, is perhaps not uncommon in many cultures. For example, a close mother-son relationship in Italy is evidently called *mammone* which translates to mama's boy. But an extremely close mother-son relationship has been often depicted in Japan through popular dramas, creating the term *mazakon*, which likely derives from *mother complex* or mother-son relationships characterized by an unhealthy level of closeness. There are no similar terms used to describe the mother-daughter relationship. But the behavior of this mother's mother appeared to be quite hysteric and chaotic while her father was rather quiet, passive, and neglectful. This mother remembers how her parents often got into vicious fights. Her mother, however, was the dominant one who tried to kick her father out of the house, yelling, screaming, and throwing his suitcase outside. As a child this mother heard these incidents frequently and tried to intervene, begging her father not to leave and clinging to his legs. After experiencing such a chaotic environment, it is no surprise that this mother showed a number of angry passages toward her mother. In one particular passage, she became notably involved and her tone and usage of words shifted/changed, as if she were talking directly to her parents, leading to a high *anger* score. Later in the interview, however, this mother also showed an impressive ability to reflect and implicitly forgive her parents, understanding the circumstances under which they were trying to raise a family. She also clearly recognized the effects of her childhood, which included being a rather negative person, and even stating that she would sometimes catch herself, doing/saying similar things that she hated hearing as a child. She was also concerned that she might subject her own child to the same type of experiences, showing glimmers of a thoughtful secure state of mind. Nevertheless, even now when her mother has become much more mellow and supportive, as soon as this mother began talking about her childhood, she became vividly annoyed about how she could not wait to move out of the home and how unlucky she felt for being born into a family like this. Thus, her *involving anger* still characterizes current state of mind. The following (translated) verbatim response to one of the AAI questions by this mother demonstrates *preoccupation* with currently involving anger (i.e., speaking in the present tense, speaking directly to the parent), a characteristic of a *Preoccupied* state of mind:

Interviewer: When you were upset as a child, what would you do?

Ah, about me, right? Uhm, what would I do (Yes). Upset, probably cry. (How so?) Like when my mom said mean things to me or. But when my dad and my mom fight, it's sad and upsetting, you know? I mean, my dad and my mom, as a kid, I want them to get along, you know what I mean? But like, yelling, telling him to get out, and him actually trying to leave, like a divorce, as a kid, immediately think they're gonna get divorced, you know? Not just a fight, now my dad and my mom gonna get separated, so I get so upset,

crying, try to stop, try to make him stay, please stay, don't want you to get divorced (Oh, I see).

SSP: Ambivalent (C). During Episodes 1, 2, & 3, C spent most of the time in physical contact with M early on. When C was put down on the floor and shown the drum, C became frightened and climbed back onto M's lap. C simply watched, leaning against M with one hand on M's lap, as M showed C a number of toys. C was extremely unwilling to engage in any exploration. Even when C was handed sticks and encouraged to play, C stayed motionless. M repositioned C, and offered more toys, subtly backing away from C. M said "go ahead and play" and took a seat, saying "Mommy is here" and began reading. C watched M moving away, and picked up a stick and beat the drum. M responded, "good." C watched M, picked up the picture book and offered to M, but M didn't respond, so C started to bang the other toys. Upon S's entry, C froze, and started to cry, but M failed to respond. As M and S greeted each other, C watched M and S back and forth, with intermittent crying. C cried harder as S approached and after a while, suddenly and quickly approached M. C was clinging to M's knee when M heard the signal to leave. M pulled C away and left. After M left (Episode 4), S could not comfort C who cried even louder, apparently afraid of S. C was crying so hard that s/he did not notice M's entry (Episode 5). When M picked C up, however, C stopped crying and watched S leave. C grabbed M's sleeve and clung onto M. C and M then started to read the picture book together during which C smiled and enjoyed the interaction. When M put C down, C began to cry, but when M picked C up, C cried even harder. M then rubbed C's back leaning closely to M. As C began to settle down a bit, M repositioned C who cried hard again. Upon hearing the second signal to leave, M said "play with this" and left. When M left (Episode 6), C crawled toward the door, stopped in the middle, and began to cry hard. S entered (Episode 7) and tried to pick C up and show him/her toys, but nothing worked to calm C. When M entered (Episode 8) C approached but showed no signal to M for pickup. When C was picked up, C stopped crying and firmly clung to M. When M tried to reposition C, C started to cry, but soon stopped once M started engaging C in reading the picture book together. C settled but as soon as M put C down, C began to cry hard, and continued until C firmly grabbed onto M.

Transmission. This mother's story about how, as a child, she would intervene during frequent fights between her mother and father by clinging to father's leg, begging him not to leave, has eerie similarities to her child's frequent clinging behaviors to this mother. The child also showed the need for constant maintenance of physical contact, compromising exploration. At one point, the mother, who was happily engaged in joint reading with her child, abruptly left when signaled to leave. Mother was perhaps simply trying to follow instructions, but the child, who was clinging to the mother's knee, was forcefully pulled apart from her before she hurriedly left the room. Inconsistent parenting is associated with the Ambivalent classification in children (Ainsworth et al. 1971). Accordingly, this child could have been experiencing inconsistent responses to her signals for comfort or protection. Mother's *Preoccupied* state of mind has appeared to be transmitted to her child who failed to explore ostensibly because the child was consumed with monitoring the mother's whereabouts. The child appears to have adopted a strategy designed to

ensure that his/her attachment needs were met by clinging and touching because the child was not confident enough to assume the child's needs would be met when needed.

Case 4: Matched Insecure (Unresolved (U) mother and Disorganized (D) child)

AAI: Unresolved (U). This mother showed many different qualities and strategies in her transcript. Her major underlying states of mind included her apparent anger toward her mother for her weak, chaotic, and rather immature characteristics. Her speech was not excessively long, but rather included a number of small complaints about, or annoyance with, her mother, revealing undeniable involving anger. On the other hand, this mother showed excessive gratitude for her father, including the way her father had given her work to do as a part of the family business throughout her childhood. But this mother also showed impressive, habitual meta-cognition by deeply analyzing what she thought, how she understood the relationship or the characteristics of her parents as children, as if to recognize herself that she tended to idealize her father while being always critical of her mother, a view that eventually changed. This mother clearly showed forgiveness and compassion toward her own mother, indicating characteristics of a *Secure* state of mind. The most surprising aspect of this mother's speech and state of mind became apparent when she described the death of her aunt, her first experience of loss which occurred when the mother was a young child. The mother described this loss as traumatic. At first glance, her fear of death or physically approaching the deceased appears normal for a young child. In fact, although it is ultimately the individual families' decision, some parts of the funeral ceremony in Japan are often considered too traumatic for young children to witness, and thus children will not be permitted to attend. This is especially true when the coffin is sent off for cremation, followed by a ritual in which male family members select bones of the deceased to be placed in special boxes. It is unclear what this mother actually experienced at her aunt's funeral. But it is clear this experience was traumatic for her. A careful examination of her speech reveals a vivid memory of her aunt *being* in "that space" (the mother is unable to name the coffin, a symbol of death), suggesting that her aunt was there temporarily and could come out of "that space," an indicia of *Unresolved* loss. This mother also showed an irrational fear of the temple (probably because the Buddhist temple is associated with funerals symbolizing death) which has had affected her over many years. For example, this mother described being frightened when walking by "there" [the temple] after dark; this irrational fear seems to have a "haunted" quality. She indeed emphasized that she never, ever thought she would become affiliated with a temple since she could never live in "the space." Despite such a strong aversion to temples, this mother apparently married into a temple family (a Buddhist priest). Therefore, such traumatic, irrational fears may indeed affect her parenting behaviors, and her overarching state of mind was *Unresolved (U)*.

SSP: Disorganized (D). During Episodes 1, 2, & 3, C took an interest in a doll, touching the head/face and poking the eyes with his/her fingers. M encouraged C to play with other toys, saying "there are a lot of toys here," bringing C the drum with sticks. C pushed the doll away and took the sticks. C also looked at the music box and picture book M showed him. C began beating the drum, while M introduced more toys. C continued to beat the drum and M praised C. C then started to bang all the other toys, poking the doll's eyes with the stick and vocalizing toward M. C

started to move toward M but when M called C, C turned around and sat down (a behavior which fits under the criteria of Category 3 listed above, a clear indication of *Disorganization*). M approached C, trying to show how to set up the drum and use the sticks, but C ignored her, and continued to bang everything. C showed no fear of S upon her entry. As they began to talk, C stared at S. C and M continued to play with the ball and bowling pins, but when C approached M, C turned around with no reason and moved away from M. S approached C and C pushed away the toys and moved away from S. S placed the drum in front of C and C started to hit the drum with sticks. With his/her back to S, C threw a tantrum and scattered toys around while continuing to bang toys. When signaled to leave, M stood up, but turned around at the door, looking at C one more time. As M was leaving (Episode 4), C looked toward the door, dazed. S offered some toys and C accepted one. S took a seat, and C began hitting the wall with a toy and then hitting the door. C started to look around aimlessly, and tried to climb the wall or touch the camera lens. Upon M's entry (Episode 5), C turned around and greeted M with a smile, but soon turned around and, with a happy vocalization, started to follow S who was leaving; these behaviors are consistent with *undirected* movement (Category 3). C then again turned around and approached M with an odd laughing-like, *anomalous* vocalization (Category 2). C then passed M, turned around by the wall and walked back to M standing by her for a few seconds and then looked down. Suddenly, C buried his/her face in M's lap, and rather than signaling for pickup, lifted M's shirt for her breast. M rejected C's demand and moved to show C other toys. C followed M to see the toy. M took a seat, and C poked the doll's face with the stick, or poked the doll's eyes with his finger or the sticks. C then started to throw or kick other toys but continued to interact with M who tried to entice C to use the drum for beating with the sticks. Upon hearing a signal to leave, M said "wait here, okay?" several times, and C looked at M. A few minutes after M left (Episode 6), C began to cry hard, moving to the corner, and to the door. S entered (Episode 7) and C approached S, but when S tried to pick C up, C ran away toward the door. C stopped crying when S succeeded in picking him/her up and pointed at the ceiling. Once put down, C leaned against S, but soon began crying, and resisted being held by S. C repeated this sequence of crying, stopping, being picked up and put down, pointing at the ceiling and the door, and so forth. Upon M's entry (Episode 8), C clung to M's legs and stopped crying, looking at S on the chair. Once picked up, C pointed up at the ceiling, but C's body was looking away. M sat down and showed C the picture book. C began crying again. As M tried to show C toys, C didn't respond but clung to M and continued to cry. At one moment, M picked up the doll and said "hellooo, NAME" in a sudden *haunted voice*. After that, M used child-directed speech as if the doll were talking to C, saying "let's play, NAME." M showed C more animal toys, and C threw them off. M also threw random things, copying C. C mouthed various toys, and started to beat the drum. C beat the drum harder once M praised C.

Transmission. This mother's aunt died when she was a young child for which she was judged as *Unresolved*. The loss of her aunt was evidently traumatic and terrifying. She could never acknowledge that her aunt was dead, instead describing how her aunt was in "the space" which this mother was too terrified to approach. This terror was evidently extended to anything that symbolized or was associated with death or an afterlife, such as a temple. The mother also remembered how frightened she was to walk down the path leading to the temple even as teenager. During the last reunion, this mother exhibited one of the FR behaviors, known as

haunted voice (Main & Hesse, 1992-2006). Research has shown associations between *Unresolved* and FR, and FR and *Disorganization* (Abrams et al., 2006; Jacobvitz et al., 2006; Schuengel et al., 1999). Thus, this child's various disorganized behaviors from Category 3 (e.g., *undirected movement*) appear to indicate the child's reactions to distress caused by separations from mother. This mother must also occasionally exhibit FR behaviors some of which were observed during the SSP (i.e., *the haunted voice*). Mother's *Unresolved* state of mind did appear to have been transmitted to the child, most likely via her FR behaviors, which could have been exhibited when this mother was passing by the temple with the child or needed to attend family business-related events in the temple. FR behaviors may have placed the child in what is thought of as an irresolvable paradox; the parent, who is the child's main source of protection and comfort, is also a source of fear through their behaviors resulting in disorganization. To our knowledge, this is the first evidence of the FR behaviors in a non-Western sample. This case suggests that fearful experiences may impact children in a remarkably similar manner across diverse cultures.

Case 5: *Mismatched Insecure (Dismissing) mother and Secure (B) child*

AAI: Dismissing (Ds). This mother was superficially collaborative in the sense that she was polite and did not reject or attempt to block any interview questions. She also showed some habitual monitoring behaviors, which is typically indicative of a *Secure* state of mind, by often referring to what she had just said or recognizing some differences in the way she thought as a young child versus when she got older. Her adjectives for both parents were mixed or neutral and thus did not lead to high *idealization* scores which often appear in *Dismissing* transcripts. None of her adjectives, however, described her relationship with her mother in emotional terms. The most interesting or unusual feature of this discourse was that, overall, this mother was speaking in a manner that devalued the relationship with her parents, particularly with her mother. For the first adjective, *mitchaku* (enmeshed), this mother described how her mother was always asking about every little detail of what had happened at school and so forth. She was open in stating that by age 9 or 10, it had gotten rather irritating to be asked so many questions although she never ignored her mother. She then added that her mother did that because she was *just* a full-time housewife/home maker and was *hima* or had all the time in the world. Similarly, for the second adjective, *tezukuri* or home-made/hand-made, she described how her mother always made snacks or clothes although she added, honestly her mother wasn't good at it. The mother recognized, however, that her mother made these items with love, and thus she did accept them. But at that time, she told herself, when she became a mother herself, she would have her child choose snacks or clothes from stores. She did admit that she didn't think like that when she was in elementary school, demonstrating her thoughtfulness or metacognitive-like skills. This speaker often stated how her mother was *hima* or having all the free time (implies, nothing better to do) as a stay-at-home mother, which in itself is not highly derogatory. Nevertheless, it appeared that the speaker did not have a great deal of respect for her mother. Even at the present time, her relationship with her mother is satisfying or better because she can maintain some physical distance although again she recognizes her mother might be missing her.

Overall, this mother's transcript was given a *Dismissing* classification primarily because of the mother's devaluing of her relationship with her mother. Recall that valuing attachment is one

of the most basic criteria for a *Secure* state of mind. However, *derogation*, according to the classification manual, is scored high for relatively brief statements about an individual being beneath consideration and this mother's attempt to portray her mother as somewhat lower in terms of status/social recognition, or talents/skills, throughout the interview is unusual. This may indeed reflect a specific cultural value embraced in Japan which traditionally values modesty and devalues boastfulness. In fact, there are specific words and phrases that exist to describe oneself and one's family members at a lower level and to heighten the level of other people and their families (in this context, the interviewer) (e.g., *gusai* for stupid wife, *gutei* for stupid or foolish brother; see Kondo-Ikemura et al., 2018). Note that the mother also frequently minimized hurt or showed personal strength when she was emotionally upset or got hurt or ill as nothing special to discuss, which further fits to a *Dismissing* state of mind.

SSP: Secure (B). During Episodes 1, 2, & 3, C happily played with the toys, while occasionally vocalizing and moving closer to M. When M introduced toys, C stared at them for a moment and soon tried them out. As soon as M took a seat, C moved toward her and at one point tried to grab a book from M. M responded by sitting down on the floor to join C for play. Upon S's entry into the room, C didn't notice her for a while because music box was playing. When S approached C and M took a seat, C did not show fear toward S but subtly pushed the music box toward M. S then wound up the music box while C watched with interest. C did not notice M leaving the room (Episode 4) because S was introducing toys. C started to beat the drum, and S also beat the drum. When S took a seat, C looked at S and showed no apparent distress about M's absence. C only vocalized when C wanted S to wind up the music box or join the drum beating, but showed no distress from separation. Upon M's entry (Episode 5), C stared at M with drum sticks in hands, but as M approached C, C also stood up and tried to approach, signaling for pickup, but tripped on the music box. M picked C up and C snuggled in with one hand on M, one hand stretching out, vocalizing softly to M's affectionate speech, and turned toward toys. After M wiped C's nose, C was ready to be put down and C immediately started to beat the drum. M showed more toys and C took interest in them as well and actively explored. After a little while, C looked at M and tried to approach but fell down. C cried, looking over at M. As M approached C, C stopped crying. Once picked up, C was soon ready to be put down and explore. C vocalized, wanting M to join in play, and continued to beat the drum. Once M took a seat, C vocalized and quickly moved toward M. When M stood up to respond to C, M was given a signal to leave (Episode 6). Although C heard M saying "Will be back, just wait, okay?" C appeared to be distracted by the toys. As soon as the door was shut, C went to the door and cried. When S entered the room (Episode 7), C continued to cry. When S picked up C, C resisted and wanted to be put down, but cried harder once put down. C ignored S's attempt to distract C and moved to the door. Upon M's entry (Episode 8), C made a direct approach to M and M quickly picked up C. C's crying was immediately reduced but C continued to emit a low key cry. When M tried to wipe C's tears, C swiped her hand, a bit angrily. When M took seat, C began crying again, clinging to M. M tried to comfort C, slightly swaying right to the left, but C didn't stop crying. M turned the music box on, C looked at it and stopped crying. C had no desire to be put down, firmly grabbing onto M. When the music stopped, C whined. When M beat the drum, C took interest and came down from M's lap, but soon clambered back up onto M's lap. When the music box started to play again, C came down again to look. But when

S entered the room to announce the end of the procedure, C grabbed onto M again. For this dyad, the second reunion episode showed this C's strong desire to maintain contact with some resistance while also indicating C's ability to balance a desire for contact with a desire to explore. These behaviors suggest a *Secure* classification.

Transmission. This mother did not insist on an inability to recall childhood experiences or idealize the relationship with her parents. Instead, she described her relationship with her mother with a cool devaluation and even ridiculed her mother for being "just" a stay-at-home mother with lots of free time and for being unskilled in cooking or dressmaking. Because the devaluing of attachment was a consistent theme throughout the interview this mother's transcript was assigned a *Dismissing* classification. A *Dismissing* classification was also supported by the mother's efforts to minimize distress or show personal strength when she was emotionally upset, hurt, or ill. For example, in response to the question regarding the effects of her childhood experiences on the formation of her personality, she argued that personality is something one is born with rather than being formed, showing independent or confident thinking while again not valuing relationships. At the same time, this mother often showed habitual monitoring of her speech, frequently referring to what she just said or what she had said earlier. Her speech was often fresh reflecting something she just thought of. These are characteristics of a *Secure* rather than a *Dismissing* classification. Moreover, this mother's cool devaluing attitude can be seen as reflecting the traditional cultural values of embracing modesty and speaking lower of herself and her immediate family members. This conclusion is supported by the mother's recognition of her mother's love which she did think was important. Thus, her attentiveness to the current task (AAI) through habitual monitoring of her speech and her actual recognition of the importance of the relationship could have been transmitted to her child, affecting her interactive behaviors with her child, and promoting a *Secure* attachment. Therefore, while this speaker technically fits best to *Dismissing*, this rather unusual cultural practice evidenced in this discourse may need to be re-evaluated as an exceptional case, deviating from the coding principle in the current coding manual, leading to mismatched classifications of mother and child.

Discussion

The first goal of this paper was to present attachment phenomena through qualitative case studies, a research approach rarely seen in recent published attachment studies. The second goal was to form hypotheses about the intergenerational transmission of attachment via these case studies. As stated earlier, both Bowlby's first published attachment study in England (Bowlby, 1944) and Ainsworth's first observation study of attachment in Uganda (Ainsworth, 1969), presented case studies of the children they observed. Bowlby, while working with children who demonstrated behavioral problems, described how these children experienced extended separation from their mothers early on, reconfirming his assumption of the importance of an uninterrupted mother-child relationship. Ainsworth, during a year-long observation of 26 families, described each baby's interactive behaviors at different time points, leading her to identify roughly three distinct interactive behavioral patterns with the mother, later identified as attachment

categories. In our view, these classic attachment studies, through their description of the child's behaviors in the attachment context, helped us visualize each child's attachment experience across time and place. Today, the level of sophistication that attachment researchers have achieved in terms of methodologies, measurements, data syntheses, data analyses, and data interpretation is unprecedented (e.g., Verhage et al., 2016; Verhage et al., 2018). Yet, behind the impressive, massive quantitative data, the marvelous variations in the characteristics of each child's behavior, each parent's perceptions of childhood experiences, and an assessment of each parent-child attachment relationship, which contribute collectively to the data, may be at risk of becoming *invisible*.

We believe that by presenting case studies of attachment phenomena, the reader might simply enjoy reading *stories* being told through variations in child behavioral responses to exactly the same procedures, and mother's narrative responses to exactly the same questions. The reader might also gain a renewed appreciation for the instruments that powerfully or subtly 1) reveal the manner in which adults talk about their childhood experiences that may reflect their state of mind with respect to attachment, and 2) effectively capture children's behaviors that are indicative of the quality of the relationship. More importantly, via case studies, we hope that the reader might gain some insights as to how such cross-modal attachment phenomena would connect and transmit from one generation to the next. Therefore, in this report we presented matched cases for each of the four main attachment categories, describing how the mother discussed her childhood attachment experiences during the AAI, how the child behaved during the SSP upon reunion with the mother, and how the transmission of attachment security might likely have occurred. As referenced earlier, Hesse (2016) described how Main initially "became intrigued by a particular interview in which the speaker's responses to the AAI queries appeared to her to be surprisingly reminiscent of the behavior of B4 infants" (pp. 554-554). Thus, the AAI was not initially developed as a tool to predict the child's attachment quality. Rather, this link was discovered unintentionally via Main's insights to connect the two attachment paradigms by listening to the interview and watching the child's behavior with extraordinary care, equivalent to a form of case study. The powerful AAI-SSP link was then empirically validated by the first meta-analysis of its kind only a decade later (van IJzendoorn, 1995).

In addition, we felt it would be important to discuss cases where attachment strategies were *not* transmitted from the parent to the child as expected, referred to as crossover transmission, or simply mismatches by attachment researchers. We presented one mismatched case for each cultural group by exploring circumstantial or environmental reasons why the *expected* transmission did not occur. We specifically chose cases of mothers with insecure states of mind and children with secure attachments because ultimately a positive/secure developmental outcome is the goal of attachment-based interventions. Learning how to promote attachment security in a child of a parent with an insecure state of mind could be helpful. In the particular US case presented, the mother, judged as *Dismissing*, was understandably extremely grateful to her mother who took care of the speaker and her sister single-handedly for a number of years following a divorce. Strictly following the AAI classification manual, this was a classic *Dismissing* case due to her inability to produce any specific examples for adjectives with her mother which were mostly very positive. However, unlike most *Dismissing* speakers, this mother was also collaborative, taking a long time to respond to each question, clearly struggling to search for an

answer, and also revealing her vulnerable characteristics, discussing an incident of clinging to her mother, and begging her not to leave on the way to her honeymoon. Thus, *something* was not captured by the current classification system because overall this mother's collaborativeness and her openness to the interview process is consistent with a *Secure* classification and yet her high idealization score, indicative of a *Dismissing* state of mind, necessarily placed her in an insecure classification. Perhaps contextual considerations can be added when assessing *idealization* scores; for example, in cases when speakers' excessive gratitude toward the parent can be somewhat justified. Overall, however, we were able to present attachment phenomena, specifically the intergenerational transmission of attachment qualitatively via case studies, meeting the first and second goals of this study.

The third goal was to explore similarities and differences of attachment phenomena between two diverse cultures by presenting case studies from a non-Western culture, namely Japan, because cultural psychologists rightly demand and remind us of the need to be culturally sensitive when we collect and interpret data, and that considering culture-specific views regarding family relationships is critical. As with the US case studies, we presented Japanese case studies of each matched case for all four categories summarized in Table 3. Behavioral similarities under each attachment category between the US and Japan samples are apparent.

For describing what the Japanese mothers said or how they responded to AAI queries, we necessarily presented the translated version of the discourse. Nonetheless, the estimated transmission process of the mother's state of mind to her child showed no distinct or systematic differences from the US cases despite the fact some uniquely cultural factors were considered to help the reader better understand the speaker's childhood experiences or general background (Behrens et al., 2007; Kondo-Ikemura et al., 2018). Interestingly, however, one mismatched case revealed a discourse style that would be considered uniquely Japanese, representing cultural values not seen in the US sample. As with the US case, we again chose a *Dismissing* mother with a *Secure* child. Unlike the US case, however, this Japanese mother was judged as *Dismissing* not because of a lack of recall or an inability to come up with any specific examples, but rather because of her consistent devaluing of the relationship with her mother either in childhood or in the present. Also of some interest, the *Dismissing* classification was assigned because of a consistent derogating theme rather than the brief, sharp derogating remarks described in the AAI classification manual. As with the US mismatched case, this mother also showed some characteristics of a secure state of mind because even when she was ridiculing her mother's poor skills in cooking or making dresses, she voluntarily stated that she understood that her mother did these things for her children out of love, thus not totally dismissing the value of the relationship. Overall, as we discussed above, such consistent devaluation might reflect the traditional Japanese cultural value of devaluing oneself and/or one's immediate family members to show modesty and humbleness. Such practices are perhaps being observed less frequently in contemporary Japan, but it is still important to take a more careful look at considering unique cultural practices because the current version of the AAI classification manual is not equipped to capture such differences in cultural values which might affect determining a final classification. Caution is also required when assessing the *Unresolved* classification due to unique cultural/religious beliefs (e.g., speaking to the dead at the altar in the present tense to show the

Table 3

Case Studies: US-Japan Comparison of Attachment Transmission

| F/ | B | Ds/ | A | E/ | C | U/ | D | Ds/ | B |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| US | Japan | US | Japan | US | Japan | US | Japan | US | Japan |
| AAI Positive relationships with parents were supported by recalling, e.g. being rocked by M, holding hands, singing together when going shopping etc. via collaborative, thoughtful interview. | AAI Openness and coherence characterized this M by disclosing, e.g., her early memory was from her photos or her M wasn't around much but still valued attachment and showed compassion. | AAI: Idealized M by endorsing M's rejection as being too busy and no support for positive adjective e.g. "never felt like I wasn't loved" while derogating F calling him <i>dead beat</i> devaluing relationship. | AAI Highly idealized F by giving an episode of F taking her to hospital at night for her asthma attack by sacrificing his drinking until later because he needed to drive her to support <i>extremely loving</i> | AAI Abusive, violent, drunk F often frightened her who appears to have traumatic memory loss regarding some abuse being 'blocked off.' Overall, this speaker was overwhelmed and preoccupied with fear. | AAI Clear anger toward M for blunt favoritism toward brother and constant fights with F for which she often tried to intervene as a child. At one point, her discourse style shifted as if talking directly to M. | AAI Lost FGM within a year and clearly not accepting her death evidenced in her multiple usages of present tense and at one point, even hypothetically described if this GM were to die. | AAI: Loss of her aunt as a young child was traumatic, developed an irrational fear for the temple, associated with death, unable to walk by or enter the 'space' when referring to where her aunt is. | AAI No support for very positive adjectives to describe the relationship with her M with excessive praise warrants Ds. But also, did show some F-like collaborative-ness and value of attachment. | AAI Her discourse style was clearly devaluing her M or looking down on her as, e.g., "just a stay-at-home with lots of time in her hands" but she was reflective and monitoring, and values attachment. |
| SSP Actively, explored, no fear for S, no strong distress upon 1 st separation but upon reunion, approach, signal for pickup. Immediate distress upon 2 nd separation, no comfort by S, and full approach, signal for pick up, quickly settled. | SSP Happily explored, no fear for S. Some distress upon 1 st separation and clear signal for pick up upon reunion and quickly settled. Immediate distress upon 2 nd separation but quickly settled after pick up and ready to play. | SSP Explored, no fear for S, no distress upon 1 st separation. Upon reunion, no greeting, ignored M's overtures. When M approached C on 2 nd reunion, C turned around, C's back facing M. Accepted toy but no approach, no contact. | SSP Explored but low-quality play. No fear for S, no distress upon M's leaving. Upon M's entry, C looked up but looked away. M tried to pick C up but C moved away. Upon M's entry for the 2 nd reunion, C looked up but turned around to play. | SSP From the beginning, C did not explore, clinging to M as if being frightened by something. On separations, C clearly got distressed and M could comfort C with continued low key cry, clinging to M passively. | SSP Passive, no exploration. Froze upon S's entry. Clung to M. Immediate distress at M's leaving but stopped crying once picked up. Full cry at M's 2 nd leaving, once picked up, stopped full cry but low key cry on/off, clinging | SSP Explored, no fear for S. Upon 1 st reunion, C showed rapid changes of affect, hand-to-mouth behaviors as direct indices of D, and on 2 nd reunion, C simply collapsed, again as clear indices of disorganization. | SSP Explored. Contradictory, odd behaviors (approach-move away), tantrum, some anger, hitting toy against wall and door. Upon M's entry, C greeted. On 2 nd reunion, M picked C up, began to cry, M then emitted <i>haunted voice</i> . | SSP Happily explored. Distress upon 1 st separation but distracted by toys. Marked greeting upon M's entry, and immediate distress on 2 nd separation, and quickly settled on M's pickup on and back to explore. | SSP Happily explored. No fear for S, no distress on M's absence. Upon 1 st reunion, M and C both approach and C picked up, snuggled in. Immediate distress for 2 nd separation, upon M's return, full approach, picked up and settled. |

Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 6, Subunit 1, Chapter 9

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| <p><u>Transmission</u> M's memory of affectionate relationship being comforting transmitted to C, who can explore and seek physical contact in distress.</p> | <p><u>Transmission</u> Despite limited emotional experiences as child, M's open, coherent state of mind transmitted to C who can signal for pickup and explore.</p> | <p><u>Transmission</u> M's dismissing state of mind, considering M's neglect as loving transmitted C who avoided M who likely neglected or rebuffed C.</p> | <p><u>Transmission</u> M's disconnect by considering F's taking sick C to hospital as extremely loving transmitted C who avoided M who likely rebuffed C.</p> | <p><u>Transmission</u> M's trauma/preoccupation with fear relating to F transmitted to C who could not explore, being fearful with no clear target, clinging to M.</p> | <p><u>Transmission</u> Similarities of M's clinging to F's legs, begging not to leave and C's clinging to M. Preoccupation transmitted to C, consumed in monitoring M.</p> | <p><u>Transmission</u> U on the recent loss of the GM can be resolved later, but her U status clearly transmitted to C who showed multiple clear D behaviors</p> | <p><u>Transmission</u> M's first loss experience was terrifying, leading her to engage in FR behaviors, which led C to develop disorganization</p> | <p><u>Transmission</u> Because of divorce this M experienced as a child M perhaps simply wished to appreciate her M excessively, but not affecting her parenting.</p> | <p><u>Transmission</u> This M's Ds was not based on idealizing or inability to recall but her devaluing of attachment which could indicate cultural practice.</p> |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|

respect) in Japanese samples, as previously discussed (Behrens et al., 2007, Kondo-Ikemura et al., 2018). It is possible that as the AAI is administered more widely to cultures with differing religions, more details about the specifics regarding religious beliefs surrounding death need to be acknowledged in *Unresolved* or *U* coding. Altogether, we demonstrated similarities in the estimated transmission process but also shared some cultural-specific background information which might have contributed to the transmission process, thus meeting the third goal.

One major limitation of this study is the small sample size. Moreover, these cases were summarized extremely briefly because of space considerations. As stated above, we also compared attachment systems of speakers from two diverse cultures but with similar socioeconomic status (Table 1 A&B). While we discussed the reason earlier, it would be illuminating if we compared Japanese and US rural samples. Although unlike other developing countries, at least on the surface, Japan as a whole is more or less homogenous in terms of ethnicity and socioeconomic status. Nevertheless, people in some small farming or fishing villages in the rural part of Japan, for example, may experience different parenting practices and childhood experiences within the family or in the community. Thus, it will be an interesting endeavor to investigate those who are not often chosen as participants in the academic research. If such study were to be designed, the AAI can be given in a private room at home, at a school classroom, or town hall, but the SSP may not be a feasible measure. Instead, home observation, using the Attachment Q-sort, as Gaskins et al. (2017) suggest, will be a viable option to observe the parent-child relationships.

Another important limitation is that, like the majority of attachment transmission studies, no father attachment information was available for either the US or Japan samples. Inclusion of fathers' AAI or the child's SSP with the father is urgently needed in attachment studies world-wide. Moreover, cross-cultural studies clearly need to include examination of attachment relationships with grandparents or other alternative parent-figures. Note that even in Western countries significant numbers of children are being raised by grandparents, other family members, or close friends.

Moreover, while the SSP and the AAI represent a narrow but important picture of attachment, other measures of attachment that assess relationships throughout the lifespan should be considered. For example, during the childhood, AQS, a dimensional measure, which Gaskins et al. (2017) also consider promising, can be applied to a wider age range of young children, from one to five years of age with an excellent validity when assessed by trained observers rather than mothers (van IJzendoorn, Vereijken, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & Riksen-Walraven, 2004). Other behavioral measures beyond infancy include: the Preschool Attachment Classification System (PACS: Cassidy, Marvin, & MacArthur, 1992); and the Main-Cassidy Sixth-Year Reunion (Main & Cassidy, 1988). Symbolic representation measures include: the Separation Anxiety Test (SAT: Kaplan, 1987; Slough & Greenberg, 1990); the Attachment Story Completion Task (ASCT: Bretherton, I., Ridgeway, D., & Cassidy, J., 1990); the Manchester Child Attachment Story Task (MCAST; Goldwyn, Stanley, Smith, & Green, 2000); and the Family Drawing (Kaplan & Main, 1986). Some studies utilizing these measures above were conducted in non-Western cultures (e.g., Behrens et al., 2007; Behrens & Kaplan, 2011). Some other attachment measures that use narrative interviews for older children include the Child Attachment Interview (CAI: Shmueli-Goetz, Target, Fonagy, & Datta, 2008) and the Friends and Family Interview (FFI: Kriss,

Steele, & Steele, 2012). Furthermore, in addition to the established, validated attachment measures devised in Western cultures, other forms of measuring parent-child relationship perhaps unique to a particular culture of investigation should be considered whether applicable to other cultures or not. For example, as previously discussed (e.g., Behrens, 2004; Behrens, 2010), developing a new culture-specific measure such as *Amae* Q-sort can bring about new insights in learning how exactly *amae* relationships are similar or different from attachment relationship in Japan measured by the validated attachment measures stated above. *Amae* Q-sort can also be applied to Western samples to test whether such phenomena do exist in other cultures even though it is not called *amae* as previously discussed (e.g. Behrens, 2004; Behrens, 2010).

Finally, the AAI coding manual has not been revised since 2003. Accordingly, we suggest that the AAI is due for another round of overall updates. We suggest that specific changes take into account cultural context and possible idiosyncrasies before reaching a final classification. The current version of the AAI classification manual already includes extremely detailed and helpful examples for identifying indices for certain scales or classifications. Perhaps under each major category, a special section of cultural considerations should be added with an expectation that the list will grow as more AAI studies are being conducted around the world. Such suggestions could not have been made without evaluating the cases via case studies as presented in the current report. As stated earlier, the SSP had been conducted in a number of non-Western cultures with substantial modifications to the procedure (e.g., Grossmann et al., 2005.; True et al., 2001). It is also important to pay attention to the cultural contexts where multiple caregivers are commonly observed. As Gaskins et al. (2017) recommended, in such a context, it is crucial to determine who will be the caregiver to participate in the SSP or how many of them should participate albeit at differing times.

In sum, while it is possible to examine various ecological factors that may explain crossover transmission of attachment quantitatively as was done to better understand the transmission gap (e.g., Verhage et al., 2018), potential explanations for crossover transmission or mismatches due to cultural differences can only be meaningfully shown qualitatively or in case studies. It is our hope that this paper may encourage attachment researchers to incorporate some qualitative aspects of their data to add individual characterizations to quantitative attachment data. Furthermore, as Behrens (2016) suggested “attachment researchers could focus on individual differences and etiology and cross-cultural psychologists could identify and cherish cultural differences. Should we not merge?” (p. 30). We believe collaboration between experts in highly quantitative analyses and experts in qualitative research can be extremely productive because each brings a different skillset to an area of research that is enormous and complex.

References

- Abrams, K., Rifkin, A., & Hesse, E. (2006). Examining the role of parental frightened/frightening subtypes in predicting disorganized attachment within a brief observational procedure. *Development and Psychopathology*, 18, 344-362. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579406060184>

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1967). *Infancy in Uganda: Infant care and the growth of love*. The Johns-Hopkins Press.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Erlbaum. <http://doi.org/10.1037/t28248-000>
- Archer, M., Steel, M., Lan, J., Jin, X., Herreros, F., & Steel, H. (2015). Attachment between infants and mothers in China: Strange Situation procedure findings to date and a new sample. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 39, 485-491. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0165025415575765>
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2009). The first 10,000 Adult Attachment Interviews: distributions of adult attachment representations in clinical and non-clinical groups. *Attachment & Human Development*, 11, 223-263. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14616730902814762>
- Behrens, K. Y. (2004). A multifaceted view of the concept of *amae*: Reconsidering the indigenous Japanese concept of relatedness. *Human Development*, 47, 1-27. <http://doi.org/10.1159/000075366>
- Behrens, K. Y., Haltigan, J. D., & Gribneau Bahm, N. I. (2016). Infant attachment, adult attachment, and maternal sensitivity: Revisiting the intergenerational transmission gap. *Attachment and Human Development*, 18, 337-353. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2016.1167095>
- Behrens, K. Y., Hesse, E., & Main, M. (2007). Mothers' attachment status as determined by the Adult Attachment Interview predicts their 6-year-olds' reunion responses: A study conducted in Japan. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 1553-1567. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.6.1553>
- Benoit, D., & Parker, K. C. H. (1994). Stability and transmission of attachment across three generations. *Child Development*, 65, 1444-1456. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00828.x>
- Bernier, A., Matte-Gagne, C., Belanger, M-E., & Whipple, N. (2014). Taking stock of two decades of attachment transmission gap: Broadening the assessment of maternal behavior. *Child Development*, 85, 1852-1865. <http://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12236>
- Bornstein, M. H., Azuma, H., Tamis-LeMonda, C., & Ogino, M. (1990). Mother and infant activity and interaction in Japan and in the United States: I. A comparative macroanalysis of naturalistic exchanges. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 13, 267-287. <http://doi.org/10.1177/016502549001300302>
- Bornstein, M. H., Toda, S., Azuma, H., Tamis-Lemonda, C., & Ogino, M. (1990). Mother and infant activity and interaction in Japan and in the United States: II. A comparative microanalysis of naturalistic exchanges focused on the organisation of infant attention. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 13, 289-308. <http://doi.org/10.1177/016502549001300303>
- Bowlby, J. (1944). Forty-four juvenile thieves. Their characters and home life. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 25, 19-52, 107-127.
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. I. Attachment*. Basic Books.
- Cassidy, K., Marvin, R. S., with the MacArthur Attachment Working Group. (1992). *Attachment organization in preschool children: Coding guidelines (4th ed.)*. (Unpublished manuscript) University of Virginia.

- Chao, R. (2001). Comment: Integrating culture and attachment. *American Psychologist*, 56, 822-823. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.822>
- George, C., Kaplan, N., Main, M. (1996). *Adult Attachment Interview*. Unpublished protocol, University of California.
- Gjerde, P. F. (2001). Comment: Attachment, culture, and *amae*. *American Psychologist*, 56, 826-827. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.826>
- Gojman, S., Millan, S., Carlson, E., Sanchez, G., Rodarte, A., Gonzalez, P., & Hernandez, G. (2012). Intergenerational relation of attachment: A research synthesis of urban/rural Mexican samples. *Attachment and Human Development*, 14, 553-566. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2012.727255>
- Goldwyn, R. Stanley, C., Smith, V., & Green, J. (2000). The Manchester Child Attachment Story Task: Relationship with the parental AAI, SAT, and child behavior. *Attachment and Human Development*, 2, 71-84. <http://doi.org/10.1080/146167300361327>
- Gottlieb, A. (2014). Is it time to detach from attachment theory? Perspectives from the West African rain forest. In H. Otto & H. Keller (Eds.), *Different faces of attachment: Cultural variations on a universal human need* (pp. 187-214). Cambridge University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139226684.011>
- Grossmann, K. E., Grossmann, K., & Keppler, A. (2005). Universal and culture-specific aspects of human behavior: The case of attachment. In W. Friedlmeier, P. Chkkarth, & B. Schwarz (Eds.), *Culture and Human Development: The importance of cross-cultural research for the social sciences* (pp. 75-97). Psychology Press.
- Fogel A., Toda, S., & Kawai, M. (1988). Mother-infant face-to-face interaction in Japan and the United States: A laboratory comparison using 3-month-old infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 24, 398-406. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.24.3.398>
- Fonagy, P., Steele, H., & Steel, M. (1991). Maternal representations of attachment during pregnancy predict the organization of infant-mother attachment at one year of age. *Child Development*, 62, 891-905. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1131141>
- Hesse, E. (2016). The adult attachment interview: Protocol, method of analysis, and selected empirical studies: 1985-2015. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications* (pp. 553-597). The Guilford Press.
- Hesse, E., & Main, M. (2000). Disorganization in infant and adult attachment: Description, correlates, and implications for developmental psychopathology. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 48, 1097-1127. <http://doi.org/10.1177/00030651000480041101>
- Hesse, E., & Main, M. (2006). Frightened, threatening, and dissociative parental behavior in low-risk samples: Description, discussion, and interpretations. *Development and Psychopathology*, 18, 309-343. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579406060172>
- Hind, R. A. (2005). Ethology and attachment theory. In K. Grossmann, K., Grossmann, & E. Watters (Eds.), *Attachment from infancy to adulthood: The major longitudinal studies*. (pp. 1-12). The Guildford Press.
- Jacobvitz, D., Leon, K., & Hazen, N. (2006). Does expectant mothers' unresolved trauma predict frightening/frightened maternal behavior?: Risk and protective factors. *Development and Psychopathology*, 18, 363-379. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579406060196>

- Kaplan, N. (1987). *Individual differences in six-year-olds' thoughts about separation: Predicted from attachment to mother at one year of age*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) University of California.
- Kaplan, N., & Main, M. (1986). *Instructions for the classification of children's family drawings in terms of representation of attachment*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California.
- Keller, H. (2003). Socialization for competence: Cultural models of infancy. *Human Development*, 46, 288-311. <http://doi.org/10.1159/000071937>
- Keller, H., & Otto (2014). Epilogue: The future of attachment. In H. Otto & H. Keller (Eds.), *Different faces of attachment: Cultural variations on a universal human need* (pp. 307-312). Cambridge University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139226684.018>
- Kondo-Ikemura, K. (2001). Comment: Insufficient evidence. *American Psychologist*, 56, 825-826. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.825>
- Kondo-Ikemura, K., Behrens, K. Y., Umemura, T., & Nakano, S. (2018). Japanese mothers' prebirth Adult Attachment Interview predicts their infants' response to the Strange Situation procedure: The Strange Situation in Japan revisited three decades later. *Developmental Psychology*, 54, 2007-2015. <http://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000577>
- Kriss, A., Steele, H., & Steele, M. (2012). Measuring attachment and reflective functioning in early adolescence: An introduction to the Friends and Family Interview. *Research in Psychotherapy: Psychopathology, Process and Outcome*, 15, 87-95. <http://doi.org/10.4081/ripppo.2012.106>
- Main, M. (1981). *Avoidance in the service of attachment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Main, M., & Cassidy, J. (1988). Categories of response to reunion with the parent at age 6: Predictable from infant attachment classifications and stable over a 1-month period. *Developmental Psychology*, 24, 415-426. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.24.3.415>
- Main, M., Goldwyn, R., & Hesse, E. (2003). *Adult attachment scoring and classification system*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California.
- Main, M., & Hesse, E. (1992–2006). Frightened, threatening, dissociative, timid-deferential, sexualized, and disorganized parental behavior: A coding system for frightened/frightening (FR) parent-infant interactions (Unpublished manuscript). University of California, Berkeley.
- Main, M., Hesse, E., Kaplan, N. (2005). Predictability of attachment behavior and representational processes at 1, 6, and 19 years of age: The Berkeley longitudinal study. In K. Grossmann, K., Grossmann, & E. Watters (Eds.), *Attachment from infancy to adulthood: The major longitudinal studies*. (pp. 245-304). The Guilford Press.
- Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points of attachment theory and research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50(1-2, Serial No.209), 66-104. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3333827>
- Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1990). Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth strange situation. In M. T. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti, & E. M. Cummings (Eds.), *Attachment in the preschool years* (pp. 121-160). University of Chicago Press.
- Mesman J., van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Sagi-Schwartz, A. (2016). Cross-cultural patterns of attachment: Universal and contextual dimensions. In J. Cassidy & P.R. Shaver (Eds.),

Handbook of attachment: Theory, Research, and clinical applications (pp. 853-877). The Guildford Press.

- Morelli, G. (2015). The evolution of attachment theory and cultures of human attachment in infancy and early childhood. In L. A. Jensen (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Human Development and Culture: An interdisciplinary perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Otaki, M., Durrett, M. E., Richards, P., Nyquist, L., & Pennebaker, J. W. (1986). Maternal and infant behavior in Japan and America. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 17*, 251-268. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022002186017003001>
- Otto, H. (2014). Don't show your emotions! Emotion regulation and attachment in the Cameroonian Nso. In H. Otto & H. Keller (Eds.), *Different faces of attachment: Cultural variations on a universal human need* (pp. 215-229). Cambridge University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139226684.012>
- Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Miyake, K., & Morelli, G. (2000). Attachment and culture: Security in the United States and Japan. *American Psychologist, 55*, 1093-1104. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.10.1093>
- Schooler, J. (2011). Unpublished results hide the decline effect. *Nature, 470*, 473. <http://dx.org/10.1038/470437a>
- Schuengel, C., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M., & van IJzendoorn, M. (1999). Frightening maternal behavior linking unresolved loss and disorganized infant attachment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*, 54-63. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.67.1.54>
- Shmueli-Goetz, Y., Target, M., Fonagy, P., & Datta, A. (2008). The Child Attachment Interview: A psychometric study of reliability and discriminant validity. *Developmental Psychology, 44*, 939-956. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.4.939>
- Tarabulsky, G. M., Bernier, A., Provost, M. A., Maranda, J., Larose, S., Moss, E., et al. (2005). Another look inside the gap: Ecological contributions to the transmission of attachment in a sample of adolescent mother-infant dyads. *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 212-224. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.41.1.212>
- Toda, S., Fogel, A., & Kawai, M. (1990). Maternal speech to three-month-old infants in the United States and Japan. *Child Language, 27*, 279-294. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900013775>
- True, M. M., Pisani, L., & Oumar, E. (2001). Infant-mother attachment among the Dogon of Mali. *Child Development, 72*, 1451-1466. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00359>
- van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1995). Adult attachment representations, parental responsiveness, and infant attachment: A meta-analysis on the predictive validity of the Adult Attachment Interview. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 387-403. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.387>
- van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Kroonenberg, P. M. (1988). Cross-cultural patterns of attachment: A meta-analysis of the strange situation. *Child Development, 59*, 147-156. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1130396>
- van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Sagi-Schwartz, A. (2001). Comment: Cultural blindness or selective inattention? *American Psychologist, 56*, 824-825. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.824>
- van IJzendoorn, M. H., Vereijken, C. M. J. L., Bakernas-Kranenburg, M. J., & Riksen-Walraven, J. M. (2004). Assessing attachment security with the attachment Q-sort: Meta-analytic

evidence for the validity of the observer AQS. *Child Development*, 75, 1188-1213. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00733.x>

- Verhage, M. L., Fearon, P. R. M., Schuengel, C., van IJzendoorn, M. H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., Madigan, S., Roisman, G. I., Oosterman, M., Behrens, K. Y., Wong, M. S., Mangelsdorf, S., Lynn E. Priddis, L., E., Brisch, K-H. (2018). Examining ecological constraints on the intergenerational transmission of attachment via individual participant data meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 89, 2023-2037. <http://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13085>
- Verhage, M. L., Schuengel, C., Madigan, S., Fearon, R. M. P., Oosterman, M., Cassibba, 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, 337-366. <http://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000038> .

Discussion Questions

- (1) Articulate differences between quantitative and qualitative studies.
- (2) Are all qualitative studies case studies?
- (3) What are the advantages of using case studies when conducting cross-cultural research?
- (4) How can the quality of father-child attachment relationship differ from, or be similar to, the mother-child attachment relationship? Why would differences or similarities exist?
- (5) How might a child's fear of stranger act as an advantage or disadvantage in different cultures?
- (6) Under what circumstances could a secure child look insecure?
- (7) In some cultures, the father is involved very little in child rearing practices. Could a child still develop a secure attachment toward the father?
- (8) Can a child develop secure attachment with one parent and insecure attachment with another parent? How so?

About the Authors

Kazuko Y. Behrens holds a M.A. in Asian studies from Cornell University, a M.A. in developmental psychology from San Francisco State University, and a Ph.D. in human development from University of California, Berkeley. She is currently an associate professor of psychology at the State University of New York Polytechnic Institute and has published numerous scientific journal articles. Her primary research interests are intergenerational transmission of attachment, attachment and culture, attachment and neuroscience, and attachment-based intervention. Her previous work involving Japan has been featured recently in two BBC articles (<https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20191212-japans-deep-connection-to-childish-relationships> : <https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20200114-why-japan-is-so-successful-at-returning-lost->

property). Behrens has been collaborating with researchers in Japan, the Netherlands, and England and currently serving a role as a guest editor for the special issue of *Attachment & Human Development* journal.

Karen Jones-Mason holds undergraduate degrees in history, political science and development economics from the University of California, Berkeley. She also has a law degree from Georgetown University, and a MSW and a PhD in human development and social welfare from the University of California, Berkeley. She is currently a research scientist in the Center for Health and Community at the University of California, San Francisco. Her primary research interests focus on the impact of trauma and adversity on child developmental trajectories, and how parenting may act as a protective or risk factor. Accordingly, she has published in areas examining parental influence over autonomic nervous system, cortisol, genetic and epigenetic function in infants, adolescents and young adults.