

Attachment to God and Perceived Childhood Attachment in an Iranian Sample: An Investigation of Granqvist's "Correspondence" and "Compensation" Hypotheses

Shahriar Shahidi, PhD*
Department of Psychology
Shahid Beheshti University

Fatemeh Shahabizadeh
Department of Psychology
Shahid Beheshti University

Mohammad Ali Mazaheri, PhD
Department of Psychology
Shahid Beheshti University

The present study investigated parents' religiosity, perceived childhood attachment to parents in Muslim Iranian adult subjects and the reported attachment to God. The relationship between "sudden religious conversion" and attachment style to parents was also investigated. The sample consisted of 405 university students. Results showed that subjects who had a history of secure attachment style to parents also reported a secure attachment style to God and those whose attachment style to parents was insecure reported an insecure attachment to God. However, this relationship was found to be true only when parents' religiosity was reported to be high. This indicates a higher congruence between parents' religiosity and respondents' attachment to God in the secure groups and thus providing support for the correspondence hypothesis. When parents' religiosity was low, a opposite effect was observed. Subjects whose attachment style to parents was insecure reported secure attachment to God and those whose attachment style to parents was secure, reported insecure attachment to God. Results of the present study also showed that subjects who had experienced sudden change in religious beliefs, reported ambivalent and avoidant attachment styles to parents. However, this relationship was found to be true only when parents' religiosity was reported to be low.

Keywords: attachment to god, childhood attachment, correspondence, compensation

Attachment theory as developed by Bowlby (1969, 1980) focuses on the

* Email: shahriarshahidi@hotmail.com

development of the bond between infant and caregiver and the ways in which the functioning of this relationship influences subsequent psychological development. Based on subsequent research, Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wally (1978) proposed three patterns of infant-caregiver attachment. First, the secure pattern is characterized by infants' use of caregivers as a secure base during play, exploration, and proximity seeking to caregivers when reunited. Second, infants in the insecure avoidant pattern generally neglect caregivers during play, appear to be indifferent during separation, and avoid caregivers when reunited. These infants seem to deny the need of the caregivers. Third, the insecure ambivalent pattern is characterized by infants clinging to caregivers, showing little exploration of the environment, external distress during separation, and ambivalence when reunited.

Bowlby claimed that the attachment system might operate throughout an individual's life span (Ainsworth, 1985). Therefore, some authors (e.g., Hazan and Shaver, 1987; Shaver, Hazan & Bradshaw, 1988) have extended the theory to adult romantic relationships. It has been demonstrated that individual differences in adult attachment styles appear to parallel individual differences in childhood and correlate in theoretically expectable ways with a host of other personality, attitudinal, and emotion measures in adulthood. See Hazan and Shaver (1994) for a review of the literature.

Kirkpatrick and Shaver (1992, 2005) believed that, like romantic love relationships, many aspects of religious belief and experience may be fruitfully conceptualized from the perspective of attachment theory. The attachment model seems to fit theistic religion even more neatly than it does romantic love. Adult love relationships differ from infant mother relationships in at least two important respects: Adult love relationships tend to be more symmetrical than infant mother relationships and also typically involve a sexual component. That is, the dynamics of the attachment system are confounded with the care giving and sexual behavior system (Shaver et al. 1988). Kirkpatrick and Shaver (1992) argued the worshiper God relationship, in contrast, is generally uncontaminated by these processes and may thus represent a much purer example of an adult attachment relationship. To many people, God is the

quintessential "stronger, wiser other" as Bowlby has often characterized the prototypical attachment figure. Kaufman (1981) emphasized that God represents an ideal attachment figure, while human attachment figures are, even at their best, fallible and hence not perfectly trustworthy.

Ainsworth (1985) has pointed to certain defining characteristics that distinguish attachment relationships from other types of close relationships. Kirkpatrick (1999) argues that these defining characteristics are interpretable in worshipper–God relationship. First, the attached person seeks proximity to the caregiver, particularly when frightened or alarmed. Although God can not be literally approached in a physical sense, other religious behaviors (e.g., prayer) resemble more proximity attachment behaviors. Prayer provides perhaps the clearest example of attachment behavior commonly directed towards God. In many ways prayer seems analogous to "social referencing" in young children, an intermittent checking back to make sure that the attachment figure is still attentive and potentially available (Kirkpatrick, 1999). Secondly, the attachment figure is seen as a haven of safety. People are most likely to turn to God in times of trouble and crisis and use prayer and religion more directly (Argyle and Beit – Hallahmi, 1975; Argyle, 2000; Rowatt and Kirkpatrick, 2002). Thirdly, the attachment figure is seen as a secure base. God can be viewed as a protective parent who is always reliable and always available to his children when they are in need (Granqvist, 1998). Therefore, religion provides a sense of security and confidence that allows people to function effectively in everyday life (Kirkpatrick, 1994). Fourthly, the threat of separation and loss of the attachment figure may cause anxiety in the attached person. Wright (1987) maintains that defectors from cults commonly experience psychological symptoms, including "separation anxiety", similar to those associated with marital separation and divorce. Therefore such relationships with God can be construed meaningfully as attachment relationship and God as an attachment figure. Kirkpatrick (2005) argued that attachment theory offers a powerful framework for understanding many aspects of religious belief and behavior.

In the present study, we have used the attachment theory to derive and empirically test hypotheses of the influence of attachment quality on

attachment relationships with God. In the pioneering study in this domain, Kirkpatrick and Shaver (1990) outlined two opposing hypotheses derived from attachment theory. First, on the basis of Bowlby's (1969, 1980) notion of relatively stable working models being responsible for relationship continuity, the original correspondence hypothesis assumes that early relationships provide the foundation upon which future relationships, including that with God are built. Thus, adults' religiosity is expected to correspond directly to their childhood relationships so that securely attached children as adults would be able to establish a higher degree of religiosity than adults with insecure attachment histories. This hypothesis may be analogous to Erikson's (1950) notion of basic trust as the basis for later religiosity.

Second, based on Ainsworth's (1985) discussion of insecurely attached individual's need for a surrogate attachment figure, the compensation hypothesis assumes that people with an insecure attachment history are more likely to be religious and to believe in and experience a relationship with a personal God than securely attached individuals.

In support of the correspondence hypothesis, several classic studies have demonstrated correlations between subjects' image of God and of their parents (e.g., Potvin, 1977). Potvin (1977) showed that perceived parental affection and parental control were related significantly to images of a loving God and a punishing God, respectively. Kirkpatrick and Shaver's (1990) results mainly supported the compensation hypothesis. Avoidant respondents in the maternal relationship have been found to be more than four times as likely to have experienced a sudden religious conversion as compared to their secure or ambivalent counterparts. In addition, we found an interactive effect between attachment quality in the maternal relationship and maternal religiosity. When maternal religiosity is high, no significant difference in religiosity is found between the members of the three attachment types. However, when maternal religiosity is low, avoidant respondents score significantly higher than their non-avoidant counterparts do on belief in a personal God and perceived personal relationships with God. Thus, we argue that religion may play a compensatory role for insecurely attached individuals. In other words, God

may serve as a substitute attachment figure. Kirkpatrick and Shaver (1992) found that respondents who were classified in the secure adult attachment category were more likely to experience a secure attachment to God and to have a higher degree of religious commitment than insecure respondents were. In light of these seemingly contradictory findings, Kirkpatrick (1999) suggests an integration of the correspondence and compensation hypotheses and tentatively argues that each could be seen as consistent with different aspects of the attachment theory. The correspondence hypothesis is true contemporaneously whereas the compensation hypothesis taps the longitudinal dynamics of attachment. Granqvist (1998) has also tested the two opposing hypotheses. The results of his study showed that when paternal religiosity is high securely attached individuals tend to be more religious (e.g., to believe in a personal God and experience a personal relationship with God) than their insecure counterparts. Based on these considerations, and because correspondence hypothesis seemingly fails to explain the relationship between attachment quality and parental religiosity in adult subjects, Granqvist & Hagekull (1999) and Granqvist (1998) outline the revised version of the correspondence hypothesis. The revised theory suggests that the religiosity of securely attached individuals corresponds to their attachment figure's religiosity rather than to the security of the relationship per se. Kagan (1984) has also argued that one important function of secure attachment is to make the child receptive to adopt parental standards. It has also been repeatedly demonstrated that the religiosity of the parent and the quality and closeness of the parent-child relationship are all linked to the child's acceptance of his or her parents' religion in a manner that is consistent with the revised correspondence hypothesis (e.g. Hood, Spilka, Hunsberger, and Gorsuch, 1996). These studies show that security of attachment is positively associated with religiosity stemming from socialization of the attachment figure's religious standards (Granqvist & Hagekull, 1999. Granqvist, 2002). Granqvist's (1998) results showed that insecure individuals in the maternal relationship were almost three times as likely to have experienced a significant increase in the importance of their religious beliefs in adulthood as compared to secure individuals. Granqvist (1998); Granqvist & Hagekull (1999) and

Granqvist (2002) stated that Kirkpatrick's longitudinal compensation hypothesis fails to account for both the cross-sectional associations between attachment insecurity and some aspects of religiosity and for the results linking insecure attachment history with mother and anxious romantic attachment to decreased religiosity. Thus, he outlined emotional compensation hypothesis. This hypothesis states that religiosity reflects an affective regulation strategy to obtain/ maintain a sense of felt security. This is likely to fluctuate (increase and decrease) over time and that God is utilized as a compensatory attachment- link figure in this regard.

Granqvist (2002) believed that the extent of religiosity of insecure individuals in the emotional compensation profile is independent of the religiosity of their parents although it has been shown that when parental religiosity was perceived as low, insecure respondents had a significantly higher level of religiosity than their secure counterparts (Granqvist, 1998; Granqvist & Hagekull, 1999). Granqvist and Hagekul's (1999) study showed that avoidant responses were positively related to emotionally based religiosity, and particularly so at low parental religious activity. Thus, emotional compensation hypothesis does not explain the role of parental religiosity in predicting the influence of insecure childhood attachment on adult's religiosity.

Therefore, in the light of these seemingly contradictory findings, the present study attempts to test empirically both the correspondence and the compensation hypotheses in Muslim subjects in Iran.

Method

Participants and procedure

500 students at Shahid Beheshti University in Tehran, Iran were asked individually to fill out the research questionnaires ninety-five participants either declined to do so or provided incomplete information. Thus, data for 405 students were included in the final analyses. This sample included 204 Female and 201 male subjects, with a mean age of 21.3 years (range = 18–26). The authors assured participants that taking part in the study was voluntary and that their responses would be treated as anonymous. Researchers asked the participants to fill in the questionnaires (described

below) in groups of 20 – 30 students in various classes in the university. The sample included students studying a wide variety of academic subjects ranging from human sciences to arts to basic sciences. All questionnaires were translated from English to Persian and then were back translated. The back translation was then checked and compared with the original by a native English speaking person. Necessary changes, corrections and alterations were then made to the Persian version.

Measurements

1) Measure of parental religiousness (Granqvist, 1998).

Each parent's level of religiousness (as perceived by the respondents) during the respondent's childhood was assessed by asking participants to indicate on a 9 point scale (1= strongly disagree and 9 = strongly agree) the extent to which they agreed with the following two statements: "My mother was religiously active during my childhood" and "My father was religiously active during my childhood". Those who disagree (score of 1-3), were considered to have indicated low maternal or paternal religious activity and those who agreed (score of 4-6) were considered to have indicated high maternal or paternal religious activity. Internal consistency of the scales were measured in the present study in 50 undergraduate students in Shahid Beheshti University (mean age = 21.57, age range = 19 to 25) and were high (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.89 and 0.94 for maternal and paternal religiosity, respectively.) Furthermore, test retest reliability conducted on the same sample was found to be high after a period of three weeks ($r = 0.90$ and 0.85 for maternal and paternal religiosity).

2) Measure of perceived childhood attachment:

This measure consisted of three paragraphs, originally proposed by Hazan and Shaver (1986) to tap the characteristic features of the attachment categories, as described by Ainsworth et al. (1978). We asked the respondents to mark one of the paragraphs that were most descriptive of their childhood relationship with their mother and father.

To achieve higher measurement precision and increase statistical power, respondents were asked to indicate on a 9-step scale (where 1 = SD, 9 =

SA) the extent to which each of the paragraphs was descriptive of their memory of their childhood relationship with mother and father, respectively.

3) Measure of attachment to God:

This measure consisted of nine items each describing the person's relationship with God based on his or her experiences and feelings. The questionnaire was developed by Rowatt and Kirkpatrick (2002) based on scales previously devised (e.g., Kirkpatrick and Shaver, 1992) but with the aim of reducing methodological and administrative shortcomings which existed. Participants have to indicate on a seven point Likert scale the extent to which they agree or disagree with each of the nine statements. The scale measures secure, avoidant and ambivalent attachments to God. Rowatt and Shaver (2002) have reported very high internal consistency for the three dimensions of attachment, ranging from 0.80 to 0.92 using Chronbach's Alpha. In the present research Alpha values of 0.74, 0.84 and 0.68 were found for secure, avoidant and ambivalent attachment, respectively. Although Rowatt and Kirkpatrick's scale was developed as a result of extensive psychometric examination, including factor analysis, the scale has not been used previously in Iran and no data based on factor analysis is available.

4) Religious change and sudden religious conversion (Granqvist and Hagekull, 1999):

Subjects were required to indicate on a six point rating scale, the extent to which the following statement applied to them: "I have experienced a change which meant that religious beliefs became more important to me during a period of my life." Those who agreed with this statement (scored 4, 5 or 6 on the rating scale), were labeled as having experienced religious change. These subjects were then asked to indicate the intensity of the change and the extent to which religious change was sudden or gradual by choosing one of the following alternatives: 1 = a slow, gradual change over a long period of time; 2 = a slow, gradual change with one or more relatively intense experiences; 3 = An intense and sudden personal experience (Granqvist, 1999). Those scoring 6 on the first statement and 3 on the second were considered to have had a sudden religious conversion.

Subjects who had not experienced a sudden change but had indicated that gradual and important changes had occurred in their lives were labeled as having experienced change. Those who failed these criteria were labeled as "non-converts." Those who had experienced change were asked to indicate the age at which change had occurred and also to indicate on a six point rating scale the extent to which they agreed with each of eight themes, five of which were compensation themes and three were correspondence themes.

Results

Table 1
Means (and standard deviations) for attachment scores towards parents and God.

	Mean (SD)	N
Secure Maternal Attachment	6.71 (2.43)	268
Insecure Maternal Attachment	2.87 (2.37)	117
Secure Paternal Attachment	5.98 (2.88)	225
Insecure Paternal Attachment	2.97 (2.50)	140
Secure Attachment To God	5.49 (1.39)	210
Insecure Attachment To God	2.46 (1.63)	175

Since only 12 (6.0%) and 13 (6.5%) respondents were classified as avoidant in the maternal and paternal relationships, respectively, the two insecure groups were aggregated, yielding one insecure and one secure attachment group for each of the parental relationships.

In order to test the effects of parental attachment during childhood and parents' religiosity on attachment to God, two-way analyses of variance were conducted on the data. There was a significant effect of paternal religiosity ($F = 6.78$, $df = 1, 362$, $P = 0.01$). Also, there was a significant interaction between paternal religiosity and paternal attachment on secure attachment to God ($F = 22.27$, $df = 1, 362$, $P = 0.001$). Only maternal religiosity had a significant main effects ($F = 12.74$, $df = 1, 383$, $P = 0.001$). Interaction of paternal attachment and paternal religiosity was statistically significant for avoidant and ambivalent attachment to God ($F = 23.05$ and

8.05, respectively, $df = 1, 362, P = 0.001$). Furthermore, the effect of maternal attachment was significant for avoidant attachment to God ($F = 4.44, df = 1, 380, P = 0.03$).

Scores for paternal and maternal religiosity were split so that those scoring above the mean were labelled as high religiosity and those below the mean were labelled as low religiosity. We performed a series of t-tests to clarify whether the secure and insecure groups differed significantly at low and high parental religiosity. Tables 2 and 3 present data for high and low parental religiosity

Table 2
Means (and standard deviations) for Parental attachment and high parental religiosity

Attachment to God	Secure Paternal Attachment	Insecure Paternal Attachment	t	Secure Maternal Attachment	Insecure Maternal Attachment	t
Secure	5.91 (0.97)	5.12 (1.51)	5.25**	5.73 (1.17)	5.37 (1.49)	2.32 *
Avoidant	1.95 (1.32)	2.71 (1.75)	-3.98**	2.11 (1.51)	2.54 (1.70)	-2.21 *
Ambivalent	2.75 (1.56)	3.24 (1.68)	-2.36*	2.77 (1.56)	3.20 (1.64)	-2.26 *

** p<0.01 * p<0.05

Table 3
Means (and standard deviations) for Parental attachment and low parental religiosity

Attachment to God	Secure Paternal Attachment	Insecure Paternal Attachment	t	Secure Maternal Attachment	Insecure Maternal Attachment	t
Secure	4.74 (1.84)	5.46 (1.35)	-2.13*	4.88 (1.74)	4.83 (1.85)	ns
Avoidant	3.21 (2.10)	2.11 (1.54)	2.89**	2.36 (1.84)	2.70 (1.87)	ns
Ambivalent	3.29 (1.86)	2.64 (1.50)	ns	2.75 (1.82)	2.93 (1.82)	ns

** p<0.01 * p<0.05

As can be seen from Table 2, when parental religiosity was perceived as high, respondents with a secure paternal/maternal relationship had significantly higher scores on secure attachment to God than their insecure

counterparts and insecure respondents had significantly higher scores on avoidant and ambivalent attachment to God than secure respondents. Table 3 shows that when paternal religiosity was low, insecure respondents to father, as compared to secure respondents, had significantly higher scores on secure attachment to God, and also secure respondents had significantly higher scores on avoidant attachment to God. There were no significant effects for the corresponding maternal variables. We performed all the analyses separately for males and females to assess the possible sex differences. We found no significant sex differences.

Table 4
Means (and standard deviations) for parental attachment in participants reporting sudden, gradual and no religious change

	Sudden Conversion	Gradual Conversion	No Change
High Maternal Religiosity	N = 13	N = 108	N = 57
Secure	6.40 (2.56)	7.10 (2.13)	7.00 (2.32)
Avoidant	2.19 (2.05)	2.10 (1.84)	1.89 (1.81)
Ambivalent	4.09 (3.12)	3.64 (2.72)	2.88 (2.59)
High Paternal Religiosity	N = 14	N = 93	N = 41
Secure	6.15 (3.02)	6.34 (2.54)	5.84 (2.90)
Avoidant	2.48 (2.63)	2.18 (1.75)	2.13 (2.01)
Ambivalent	3.73 (3.05)	3.69 (2.61)	4.02 (2.96)
Low Maternal Religiosity	N = 13	N = 127	N = 68
Secure	5.38 (2.84)	6.98 (2.17)	6.65 (2.49)
Avoidant	3.08 (2.78)	2.28 (1.97)	2.02 (1.93)
Ambivalent	4.62 (2.99)	3.84 (2.74)	3.26 (2.77)
Low Paternal Religiosity	N = 14	N = 125	N = 68
Secure	6.00 (2.88)	5.98 (2.70)	5.84 (2.90)
Avoidant	3.00 (2.39)	2.37 (1.97)	2.13 (2.01)
Ambivalent	4.29 (2.67)	3.82 (2.71)	4.02 (2.96)

Table 4 shows means and standard deviations for parental attachment in participants reporting sudden, gradual and no religious change. As can be seen, in the low maternal religiosity group, those who had reported a

sudden conversion also reported significantly less security than those reporting gradual change in religious perspectives ($t = -2.45$, $df = 119$, $P = 0.016$). Comparing low and high parental religiosity, the low maternal religiosity group who had reported a sudden conversion, were significantly less secure towards parents than participants in the high maternal religiosity group who had reported a gradual change or no change at all ($t = -2.66$, $df = 119$, $P = 0.009$ and $t = -2.17$, $df = 68$, $P = 0.03$ respectively). Also, the low maternal religiosity group reporting sudden conversion, were significantly more ambivalent as compared to the high maternal religiosity, no change group ($t = 2.13$, $df = 68$, $P = 0.03$). There were no effects for paternal religiosity.

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to examine the applicability of attachment theory to attachment relationships with God. Overall results seem to mirror previous questionnaire based findings investigating attachment styles to God (Kirkpatrick and Rowatt, 2002). In agreement with previous studies (Granqvist, 1998 and Granqvist & Hagekull, 1999), the socialization correspondence hypothesis is strongly supported. Results show that when parental religiosity is high, secure respondents have significantly higher scores on secure attachment to God as compared to their insecure counterparts. When paternal religiosity is low, secure respondents to father have significantly higher scores on avoidant and ambivalent attachment to God than their insecure counterparts. Thus, the present study supports findings of Granqvist (1998, 2002) and Granqvist & Hagekull's (1999). Secure attachment quality to parents seems to have a significant effect on the links between parental religiosity and attachment relationships with God in adulthood. We may argue that the religiosity of secure individuals seems to originate from social learning and partial adoption of parental religious standards, aggravated by a secure attachment history. In other words, secure respondents' attachment relationship with God Corresponds to parental religiosity rather than to secure childhood attachment per se. However, this argument does not imply that attachment relationship with God in secure individuals cannot serve other functions or

be related to other factors such as cognitive factors and personality traits.

Granqvist and Hagekull (1999) argue that intergenerational similarity in relationship between attachment quality with God and parental religiosity is likely to be higher in secure than in insecure individuals and that this might reflect a difference in susceptibility of adopting important standards held by the primary attachment figures in childhood. In the present study, the assumptions made by the Compensation Hypotheses were supported and results showed that when paternal religiosity is low, respondents who report insecurity towards their father had significantly higher scores on secure attachment to God as compared to their insecure counterparts. This finding corresponds to Granqvist (1998, 2002), Kirkpatrick and Shaver's (1990) studies. Thus, based on the Compensation Hypothesis, it is argued that insecure individuals may use the concept of God as "a substitution attachment figure" so that they can obtain and maintain feelings of security. But, this hypothesis does not explain why at low parental religiosity, insecure respondents were more religious. The hypothesis seems to neglect the role of parental religiosity in predicting the relationship between insecure attachment and attachment to God. The results of the present study showed that at high parental religiosity, insecure respondents had significantly higher scores on insecure attachment to God than their secure counterparts. Thus, a tentative conclusion may be as follows: When parental religiosity is high, insecure respondents' quality to God does not correspond to parental religiosity and insecure individuals do not accept parental religious values and standards becoming more avoidant and ambivalent towards God during adulthood. However, these results may stem more from existing cultural and religious differences between Western and Iranian subjects.

Results of previous studies (Granqvist, 1998; Ullman, 1982, & Kirkpatrick and Shaver, 1990) suggest that sudden religious converts may show more perceived insecure attachment histories than non-converts. But the present study suggests that parental religiosity may have a significant effect in predicting the relationship between attachment quality and experience of religious change. Respondents whose parental religiosity was low and who reported having experienced sudden religious change had

significantly higher scores on insecure attachment to parents than respondents having experienced gradual change or had not experienced change at all. Interestingly, these effects were observed only in maternal and not paternal religiosity, although some statistics reached near significance. It may be possible to explore the intricate relationships between paternal religiosity and attachment patterns to parents and God in a larger sample and with more sensitive measurement tools.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1985). Attachment across the life span. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Medicine*, 61, 792 – 812.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waiters, E., & Wally, S. (1978). *Patterns of Attachment: A Psychological Study of the Strange Situation*. Erlbraum Ass., NJ.
- Argyle, M., & Beit–Hallahmi, B. (1975). *The Social Psychology of Religion*. Rutledge and Kegan, Ltd, London.
- Argyle, M. (2000). *Psychology and Religion: An Introduction*. Routledge, London
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss, Vol. I: Attachment*. Basic Books, NY.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and Loss, Vol. III: Loss*. Basic Books, NY.
- Erikson, E. (1950). *Childhood and Society*. Norton, NY.
- Granqvist, P. (1998). Religiousness and perceived childhood attachment: On the question of compensation or correspondence. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37, 350 – 367.
- Granqvist, P. (2002). *Attachment and Religion: An Integrative Developmental Framework*. Uppsala, Sweden.
- Granqvist, P., & Hagekull, B. (1999). Religiousness and perceived childhood attachment: Profiling socialized correspondence and emotional compensation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 38, 254 – 273.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 52, 511 – 524.
- Hazan, C. and Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational

- framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Enquiry*, 5, 1 – 22.
- Hood, R. W., Spilka, B., Humberger, B., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1996). *The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Approach (2nd Ed)*. Guilford, NY.
- Kagan, J. (1984). *The Nature of the Child*. Basic Books, NY.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1994). The role of attachment in religious belief and behavior. *Advances in Personal relationships*, 5, 239 – 256.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1999). *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research and Clinical Application*. Guilford Press, NY.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2005). *Attachment, Evolution and Psychology of Religion*. Guilford Press, NY.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1990). Attachment theory and religion: Childhood attachments, religious beliefs and conversion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 315 – 334.
- Kirkpatrick, LA and Shaver, PR (1992) An attachment theoretical approach to romantic love and religious belief. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 266 – 275.
- Potvin, R. H. (1977). Adolescent God images. *Review of Religious Research*, 19, 43 – 53.
- Rowatt, W. C., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2002). Two dimensions of attachment to God and their relation to affect and personality constructs. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41, 637 – 651.
- Shaver, P. R., Hazan, C. & Bradshaw, S. (1988). A biased overview of the study of love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 473 – 501.
- Ullman, C. (1982). Change of mind, change of heart: Some cognitive and emotional antecedents of religious conversion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 183 – 192.

Received: 20/ 2/ 2010

Revised : 1 / 1 2 / 2 0 1 0

Accepted: 16/ 1/ 2011