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Abstract

Objectives: The aim of this study was to examine the two-factor model of romantic relationships and to evaluate the relation of four attachment derivatives (secure, dismissive, preoccupied and fearful) to marital satisfaction and sociodemographic factors. Method: A total of 201 Lebanese married adults rated their attachment styles to a favorite cross-sibling on the Arabic Relationship Questionnaire (Arabic RQ) and their marital satisfaction on the Arabic Quality Marriage Index (QMI). The factor structure of the Arabic RQ and the intercorrelations of the four attachment styles were examined, as were their relation to marital satisfaction and the demographic factors of age, sex, education, and religion. Results: Overall marital satisfaction was positively related to secure attachment (r = .18, p<.02) and negatively correlated with fearful attachment (r = -.22, p<.003). Sex, education and religion were not related to cross-sibling attachment styles, but age was significantly correlated with dismissing attachment, older Lebanese reporting higher dismissing attachment than younger Lebanese adults. Conclusion: While secure and fearful attachment styles are associated with marital satisfaction, the Western-grounded two-factor model of romantic relationships requires rethinking in the Lebanese context.
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Introduction

Adult attachment styles are individual differences in the regulation of emotion and behavior in social relationships. As cognitive-emotional attitudes or internal working models of self and other, adult attachment styles are rooted in early childhood emotional experiences with attachment figures and are closely connected to adults’ feelings toward themselves and their relationships with significant others. Responsive and warm attachment figures in childhood tend to engender secure bonding between children and parents and invoke positive internal working models of self and other whereas insensitive or hostile attachment figures engender insecure attachments and give rise to negative internal working models of self and/or other.

Adult attachment styles have been related to romantic love and sexual relationships. Bartholomew and Horowitz have described a two-factor model of romantic attachment in which the internal working models of self and other are assumed to be independent and that in combination invoke four styles of adult romantic attachment. Individuals who have a secure attachment style in romantic relationships maintain positive models of both self (they see themselves as worthy of love) and other (they highly value others); individuals who have a preoccupied attachment style maintain a negative view of self and a positive view of other; those who have a dismissing attachment style maintain a positive view of self but a negative view of other; and finally people who have a fearful attachment style maintain negative models of both self and other.

Based on their two-factor model, Bartholomew and Horowitz have developed a short measure, the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ), to assess the four attachment styles and their relationship to interpersonal and marital satisfaction. Overall, RQ based secure
attachment scores positively correlate with marital satisfaction whereas the remaining attachment styles negatively correlate with marital satisfaction.\(^7\)

In the present study, an Arabic translation of the Relationship Questionnaire was used to examine the underlying assumptions of the two-factor model of romantic relationships in Lebanon, a non-western context, and to evaluate cross-sibling attachment styles in relation to marital satisfaction and socio-demographic factors. We were motivated by three factors for undertaking the study. First, the two-factor model of the RQ is embedded in the Western view of the autonomous self, and as such it assumes the independence of the working model of the self and the universality of the two-factor working model across cultures.\(^7\) The underlying assumption of the universality of the independence of the working models of self and other posited by the two-factor model of romantic attachment can be contested theoretically and empirically in that the self in non-Western collectivist cultures is construed as interdependent, raising the possibility that the working models of self and other in such contexts may be blurred rather than distinct as in individualist cultures.\(^7\) In the present study, we expected the RQ to show a one-factor solution rather than a two-factor solution as predicted by the two-factor model and as empirically supported in Western European and North American samples because of the interdependence of self and other in the case of Lebanese. Considering the Lebanese view of the self as an extension of the other, we also expected working models of self and other to correlate with each other rather than show an orthogonal relationship as postulated by the two-factor-theory. While we expected secure and fearful attachments which are set in diametrically opposite positions vis-a-vis self and other by the two-dimensional model to relate negatively as in Western European and North American samples,\(^7\) we hypothesized a positive rather than a negative relationship between preoccupied attachment (negative view of self and positive view of other) and dismissing attachment (positive view of self and negative view of other) because of the interdependence of self and other in the Lebanese context.

The second reason for undertaking the present study is that the effects of sibling attachments on marital relationships have taken a back seat to attachment theory and research. While the life-span perspective to attachment styles has been focused on parent-child or mother child bonding, the importance of siblings as attachment figures, and cross-sibling relationships as prototypes for later romantic relationships, have been implicit postulates of attachment theory.\(^8\) Adult attachment theory posits that adults show patterns of attachment to their romantic partners similar to the patterns of attachment that children have with their parents. It is also conceivable that adults show patterns of attachment to their romantic partners similar to the patterns of attachment that children have with their cross-siblings. Research has confirmed that siblings form attachment bonds and serve as attachment figures for each other\(^11,12,13\). Sibling relations have been also been found to meet "the strict criteria used to define full-blown attachments", and in some cases siblings represented the primary attachment figures.\(^14\) "In later childhood, adolescence, and adulthood, a wider variety of relationship partners can serve as attachment figures including siblings, other relatives, familiar coworkers, teachers or coaches, close friends, and romantic partners" (Bowlby, 1969,1982, cited by\(^15\), p18). In psychoanalytic literature, it is suggested that adult siblings serve as models for each other; more specifically, along with the mother-child relationship, Kohut (1971), claims (cited by\(^16\), p89) that experiences with siblings "can be a major co-organizer" of the child’s psychic experiences. Sibling relationships give rise to intrapsychic representations that result in adaptive or defensive attachment and behaviors.\(^17\). Therefore, individuals come to anticipate interpersonal outcomes, through the internalized views of
the self in relation to significant others, which in and of itself governs their emotions and behaviors. Similarly, Mones explains:

**Processes of power, gender identity, competition, cooperation, affection, proximity-distance, communication, and empathy are regularly negotiated between and among brothers and sisters. These same skills and competencies are those that are critical in our marital interactions. The degree to which these processes are negotiated between partners often determines the fate of a marriage.**

Mones goes as far as calling the sibling experiences as the learning laboratory for marital interactions. Accordingly, “the development of identity, the deepening of the capacity to endure frustration and fluctuation in intimate relationships, the growth of the ability to love and empathize, to be faithful and trusting, all stem” from one’s internalized experiences with those upon whom one depends, including siblings (p30). In psychoanalytic literature, attending to sibling transference within the settings of couples therapy or individual therapy for people with adult relationship issues has been pushed forth but remains greatly lacking in research and practice.

In the present study, it was postulated that attachment styles that are similar to attachment patterns adults have with their cross-siblings contribute to marital satisfaction, in a manner similar to the contribution of attachment styles that follow parent-child attachment patterns. As such, the relation of cross-sibling attachment styles to marital satisfaction was examined in the Lebanese context. It was hypothesized that secure cross-sibling attachment will correlate positively with marital satisfaction whereas the three insecure attachment styles will correlate negatively with marital satisfaction. Past research on sibling relationships in Lebanon and the Arab Middle East has been almost nonexistent, with a few exceptions such as Joseph and El-Shamy’s work. For example, Joseph, using an ethnographic approach, has described sibling roles, expectations, and brother-sister bonding. According to Joseph, the brother-sister relationship in the Lebanese context is distinguished from any other dyad in the family. The author found that cross-siblings in Lebanon shape each other’s masculinity and femininity, idealize and romanticize each other, and set standards for judging potential spouses for one another. She argues that men and women expect their spouses to live up to their cross-siblings’ idealized images.

A third reason for undertaking the present study was the paucity of research on attachment styles in the Arab Middle East, in contrast to the abundant Western literature on the topic in the past three decades. Our literature search on the topic revealed two studies on the RQ in the Arab Middle East. Al Tamimi et al. used a modified Arabic translation of the RQ in Saudi Arabia in that RQ items were 5-point ratings of husband/wives. Schmitt et al., on the other hand, used the original English version of the RQ in a sample of Lebanese college students and an Arabic version of the RQ in a sample of Jordanian college students. Even though Schmitt et al. did not report the specific factor analysis results of the RQ for their Lebanese and Jordanian samples, they showed negative correlations between secure and fearful attachment for both Lebanese and Jordanian samples, findings which were expected, and insignificant correlations between preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles, findings which were inconsistent with predictions from the two-factor model of romantic attachment.

In the present study, a Lebanese Arabic translation of the RQ was used with married Lebanese in which the original 7-point rating scale was maintained. The psychometric properties of the Arabic RQ in the form of factor structure and relation to marital satisfaction were examined, as were the relations of the four attachment styles to the sociodemographic factors of age, sex, education, and religion.
Adult attachment of Lebanese

Method
Participants:
A convenient sample comprising a total of 201 married adults in an urban community in Lebanon participated in the study. Participants were 50.5% male (n=96) and 49.5% female (n=100) with a mean age of 37.5 years (n=170, SD=11.69, range 18-75). Participants were 44.8% college/university educated, 43.2% high school educated, and 12% below high school educated. In terms of religion (n=183), the majority of the participants were Christian (38.4%), followed by Sunni (34.1%), Shite (21.4%) and other (3.2%).
In view of the sensitivity of the Lebanese to religion, a significant number did not respond to this item causing the total to fall short of 100%.

Instrumentation
The Relationship Questionnaire4 (RQ) and the Quality Marriage Index5 (QMI) were translated into Arabic using translation/back-translation methodology. The two questionnaires were first translated by two separate translators from English to Arabic and then back-translated from Arabic back to English to ensure equivalence among the English and Arabic versions. Both scales were pilot-tested before final use.
The Arabic Relationship Questionnaire6 (Arabic RQ) “Appendix A”. The Arabic RQ is a 4-item measure of four attachment styles: secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful. Participants were instructed to rate their attachment with the different-sex sibling to whom they felt closest. Items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1=Not at all like me, 7=Very much like me), higher scores indicating higher endorsement of each of the attachment prototypes. In addition to the four attachment styles, an overall Model of Self scale and an overall Model of Other scale were created as suggested by Schmitt et al.7 Overall Model of Self scores were calculated by adding together participants' secure and dismissing scores and then subtracting the combination of preoccupied and fearful scores. Similarly, overall Model of Other scores were calculated by adding together the secure and preoccupied scores and then subtracting the combination of the dismissing and fearful scores. While the two-factor model8 considers the Model of Self and Model of Other orthogonal constructs that independently underlie the secure and insecure forms of romantic attachment and predicts a non-significant correlation between the two models, we expected a significant correlation in the Lebanese context. This prediction was made building on Markus and Kitayama’s description of the self in non-Western cultures as “interdependent with the surrounding context, and [that] it is the “other” or the “self-in-relation-to-other” that is focal in individual experience” (p.225).
Arabic Quality Marriage Index5 (Arabic QMI) “Appendix B”. The QMI is a 6-item measure of marital satisfaction. Items are rated on a 7-point scale and summed for a total score ranging from 6 to 42, higher scores indicating higher marital satisfaction.

Procedure
Participants completed a test battery that included the Arabic RQ and the Arabic Quality Marriage Index. Self-report measures were administered in a counterbalanced order to minimize potential order effects. Also, no participants were targeted from the same couple or sibling group to ensure independence of responses. All participants signed informed consent forms for participation.

Results
Descriptive Statistics
Means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis for the Arabic RQ items are presented in Table 1. Standard deviations of the Arabic RQ items ranged from 1.83 to 2.03, indicating variability in the item responses. Similarly, both skewness and kurtosis for Arabic RQ items were within the recommended cutoff values of
3.00 and 8.00, respectively, indicating adequate univariate normality.  
The mean of Secure Attachment (M=5.39, SD=1.83), was above the midpoint of 4, indicating that on average, participants were moderately high on this variable.  
The mean of the remaining patterns of attachment to the cross-sibling were lower than the midpoint, suggesting that on average participants were low on the three insecure attachment styles.

**Arabic RQ Factor Structure**

Using SPSS Version 18, the 4 items of the Arabic RQ were subjected to principal component analysis with Varimax rotation, a procedure followed by Schmitt et al2.  
The Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) value of .65 for the sample exceeded the required value of .6, suggesting sampling adequacy and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance (p<.0001), supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix for the sample29.  
Factor analysis resulted in one-factor solution with an eigenvalue of 2.01, explaining 50.3% of the variance.  
The component matrix factor loadings for the Arabic RQ are provided in Table 1. As can be seen all factor loadings were above .50.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Content</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic RQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Secure Attachment</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fearful Attachment</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preoccupied Attachment</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dismissive Attachment</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic QMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Good marriage</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stable relationship</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strong marriage</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationship makes me happy</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feeling part of a team in marriage.</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Overall happiness in marriage.</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Total</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages represent the number of scores above the midpoint out of the total number of scores.

**Appendix A**

(بوزيمي، 1916):

يَحَلُّ هذا الإستبان عن ملاحظات بالشقيق (لا الشقيقة) التي تشيرين لتي لابد إلي الرجاء إلى كل من البيانات التالية عبر الإشارة إلى أي رغبة يعبر هذا البيان صحيحاً بالنسبة لملاحظات بديعة.

| من السهل بالنسبة لي أن أقرب من شقيقتي في أقدام بالاعتماد عليه وهو يعتمد عليه أيضاً. لا ألقى من عدم قنله في. |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 7       | 6       | 5       | 4       | 3       | 2       | 1       |

لا ينطبق على أبداً

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ينطبق على كثيراً</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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## إستبيان العلاقة (بيترزومي ودهور nhập، 1991)

يُخبر هذا الاستبيان بعلاقتك بالشقيق (لا الشقيق) التي تشعر بها الأقرب إليها. فيما يلي أربع أمثلة عن علاقة من العلاقات التي يجري عنها النشاط في ملء استبيانات.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا يبطّلع على أباً</td>
<td>ماجيد</td>
<td>ماجيد</td>
<td>ماجيد</td>
<td>ماجيد</td>
<td>لا يبطّلع على أباً</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
<td>لا تشعر بالأرتاح حول القرب من شقيقتك</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Arabic QMI Factor Structure
Principal component analysis of the Arabic QMI supported a one factor solution accounting for 83.4% of the variance and all factor loadings were .85 and above (see table 1 for details). The internal consistency of the Arabic QMI in the present study was $\alpha = .96$, a finding comparable to $\alpha = .94$ reported for the English version of the scale[30].

Arabic RQ Inter correlations
Adult attachment of Lebanese

Arabic RQ-derived Model of Self scores and Model of Other scores correlated significantly with each other (n=198, r=.24, p<.001) rather than insignificantly as predicted by the two-factor model of romantic attachment. Similarly, and contrary to the two-factor theory of romantic attachment, preoccupied attachment scores which were expected to correlate negatively with dismissing attachment scores, correlated positively in the present study (n=199, r=.29, p<.0001). On the other hand, and consistent with the two-factor theory of romantic attachment, secure cross-sibling attachment scores correlated negatively with fearful attachment scores (n=199, r=-.29, p<.0001). Contrary to Bartholomew and Horowitz's findings (1991), secure cross-sibling attachment scores also correlated negatively with preoccupied attachment scores (n=198, r=-.19, p<.009), and dismissing scores (n=200, r=-.29, p<.0001).

Arabic RQ and Demographic Comparisons

Scores on the four cross-sibling attachment styles of the Arabic RQ were comparable across sex, religion, and education. On the other hand, age correlated significantly with Arabic RQ dismissing attachment scores (n=170, r=.20, p<.009), but not with the scores of the remaining attachment styles, suggesting higher dismissing attachment scores with age.

Arabic RQ and Arabic QMI

Means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis for the Arabic QMI items and QMI total score are presented in Table 1. Standard deviations of the Arabic QMI items ranged from 1.69 to 1.84, indicating variability in the item responses. Similarly, both skewness and kurtosis were within the recommended cutoff values of 3.00 and 8.00, respectively, indicating adequate univariate normality. The mean of marital satisfaction (M=5.68, SD=1.72) was above the midpoint, indicating that on average, participants were moderately high on marital satisfaction.

Marital satisfaction scores as measured by the Arabic QMI correlated r=.18 (p<.05) with Arabic RQ secure attachment scores and r=-.22 (p<.05) with fearful attachment scores but not preoccupied attachment scores (r=-.14, ns) or dismissing attachment scores (r=-.14, ns). These results suggest that higher secure attachment scores are associated with higher overall marital satisfaction whereas higher fearful attachment scores to the sibling are associated with lower overall marital satisfaction.

Discussion

In the present study, factor analysis of the Arabic RQ resulted in a one factor solution rather than a two-factor solution as predicted by the two-factor model of romantic attachment. In addition, and contrary to expectations from the two-factor model of romantic attachment, Model of Self scores and Model of Other scores correlated significantly, suggesting that the self and other dimensions are not orthogonal constructs as postulated by the two-factor model of romantic relationships. Thirdly, the pattern of intercorrelations with marital satisfaction was such that only secure attachment scores and fearful attachment scores were correlated with marriage quality. Taken together, these findings challenge the two-factor model assumption of the orthogonality or independence of the dimensions of self and other that underlie the various forms of secure and insecure romantic attachment. The findings suggest that the romantic attachment psychology represented by the two-factor model of romantic relationships may be culture bound in its relevance to Western European and North American countries in which the self is construed as independent and needs rethinking in the collectivist Lebanese context in which the self is construed as interdependent. The four attachment styles derived from the RQ are based on independent construals of self and other. However, the idea of self and other as separate or orthogonal entities seems more relevant to Western European and North American cultural contexts than
non-Western cultures in which "the self is viewed as interdependent" (p.225). As such, it is possible that "the self-in-relation-to-other" or the blurred boundaries between the Lebanese self and other could be the underlying common variance to the three insecure attachment styles. While the lack of support of the two-factor model in the case of Lebanon may be due to the modification of the RQ and its grounding in cross-sibling relationships, it is also possible that Lebanese attachment styles are more parsimonious in their focus on the secure and insecure prototypes of attachment. Further studies are required to examine these alternate possibilities.

In the present study, sex, education and religion were not related to cross-sibling attachment styles while age was weakly correlated with dismissing attachment. While these findings also require replication, taken together, they suggest that attachment styles are invariant across sex, education and religion.

In relation to marital satisfaction, the Arabic version of the Quality Marital Index showed a one-factor solution as expected and high reliability, supporting its cultural relevance in the Lebanese context. To our knowledge, this is the first successful application of an Arabic version of the Quality Marital Index. In the present Lebanese sample, the majority of the married Lebanese reported satisfaction with their marriage. In the absence of published normative data on marital satisfaction in Lebanon, it is difficult to ascertain whether our finding on marital satisfaction is an underestimate or an overestimate.

Secure cross-sibling attachment in the present study correlated positively with marital satisfaction whereas fearful cross-sibling attachment correlated negatively. These results are consistent with the relation between marital satisfaction and adult romantic attachments, and as such extend the findings to cross-sibling relationships. In a related study, Rauer and Volling (1984) proposed a model that depicts differential treatment and sibling jealousy as predictors of romantic relationship attachment in young adulthood. Both maternal and paternal differential affection were strongly correlated with sibling jealousy, which was strongly correlated with one's cognitive and affective models. Equal parental affection was associated with equal sibling jealousy, positive internal models, and better romantic relationship outcomes. Being on the receiving end of perceived parental favoritism was associated with higher self-esteem and fearful or dismissing attachment styles, while being less favored was correlated with higher sibling jealousy, lower self-esteem, and preoccupied attachment styles. Of course, the insecure attachment styles were related to young adult's romantic relationship distress.

Clearly, this study does not directly explore the child's attachment style to the parents, but the variables that influence the quality of the parent-child relationship, which in turn influence the attachment style. This study sheds light on the importance of the attachment style in the formation of the attachment style.

Building on the results of the current study and previous research, it is possible that attachment styles in marital relationships that are similar to attachment patterns adults have with their cross-siblings contribute to marital satisfaction, in a manner similar to the contribution of attachment styles that follow parent-child attachment patterns. While the results suggest that cross-sibling attachment styles may contribute to marital satisfaction as prototypes for marital relationships, the findings require future replication. Research has shown that both partners and siblings can act as adult attachment figures. However, it is not clear if it is the attachment to the parents that is reenacted in sibling and marital relations, or if the attachment to the sibling -colored by parental attachment- is an influential factor in its own right on one's marital attachment.

In summary, the present study provides preliminary support to the value of the Arabic RQ as a measure of attachment styles in the Lebanese context but not necessarily the conceptual framework on which the scale is grounded. Also, the present study is limited by its focus on urban Lebanese in the city of Beirut, and its
consideration of cross-sibling attachment to the exclusion of other attachment prototypes. More diverse samples of Lebanese and measures complementary to self-report assessments of attachment styles need to be considered in the future to further evaluate the correlates of marital satisfaction in the case of Lebanon and other Arab countries. On a practical level, the traditional application of attachment theory has been preoccupied with programs that aim at the improvement of parent-child relationships. Our findings, while tentative, suggest that interventions that focus on improvement in cross-sibling relationships may also be important in healthy conjugal relationships in adulthood.
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