

Exploring the influence of family status, birth order and romantic experience of 3rd year Nursing Students on their State Adult Attachment

Frederick Edward T. Fabella ^{1,*} and Myla D. Plan ²

¹ FEU Roosevelt, Cainta, Rizal, Philippines.

² Our Lady of Fatima University, Antipolo City, Philippines.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 31(01), 1164–1188

Publication history: Received on 14 June 2026; revised on 18 July 2026; accepted on 21 July 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.31.1.1949>

Abstract

This study focused on the state adult attachment in its 3 domains of anxiety, avoidance and security. Previous studies have satisfactorily demonstrated how attachment affects the well-being and overall functioning of the human person. The objective of this study was to investigate whether family status, birth order and romantic experience influences attachment. Since one of the very critical professions in the Philippines is nursing, this study focused on 3rd year nursing students as its respondents. Using the State Adult Attachment Measure (SAAM), the respondents' anxiety, avoidance and security scores were measured and compared with respect to the 3 aforementioned factors. Although limited samples were obtained that satisfied the inclusion criteria, the results indicated that there were no significant differences among the 3 SAAM domain scores of the respondents who have different family status. However, significant differences were discovered between the anxiety scores of middle child and youngest child respondents. Furthermore, a statistically significant difference was also found in the anxiety scores and avoidance scores between respondents with and without romantic experience.

Keywords: State adult attachment; Anxiety; Avoidance; Security; Birth order; Intact family; Broken family; Romantic relationship

1. Introduction

It is believed that attachment styles represent people's cognitive-affective "working models," or mental images of self and other, as well as the ensuing behavioral orientations toward intimate partners in a relationship. Insecurity about one's own value and skills, an intense need for intimacy, love, and support from others, and a persistent fear of rejection or abandonment are the hallmarks of attachment anxiety. Reluctance to trust others, a focus on independence and self-sufficiency, a low threshold for interpersonal intimacy and interdependence, and a propensity to suppress one's own emotions are all signs of attachment avoidance. Lastly, attachment security is associated with a belief in one's own value and the responsiveness of attachment figures (Gillath et al, 2009).

A person's development and future relationships are greatly influenced by their sibling relationships. Based on sibling constellations, a study of 136 young adults from India was carried out to ascertain the impact of sibling relationships on young adults' romantic attachment styles. The results showed that romantic attachment styles and sibling relationships did not significantly correlate. Sibling relationships showed gender differences, but romantic attachment styles did not. Variations in anxious attachment styles were observed across different numbers of siblings, but no significant differences were found in sibling relationships based on the number of siblings or birth order. Significant variations in sibling relationships were also noted according to the length of time spent with siblings and the status of

* Corresponding author: Frederick Edward T. Fabella

living with siblings, underscoring the complex influence of these factors on sibling dynamics (Sinchana & Thomas, 2024).

In one study, 126 pairs of siblings who were genetically unrelated participated. The participants were 39 years old on average. Sibling age differences and gender concordance did not correlate with attachment concordance rates. By highlighting the shared environment as a significant factor in sibling similarities on structured patterns of attachment in adulthood, these findings go beyond earlier research (Caspers et al, 2007).

Children's attachment styles may be impacted by disruptions in family dynamics brought on by separations, which may then have an effect on their capacity to establish and sustain stable relationships as adults. The impact of family structure disruptions, such as divorce or the separation of parental figures, on children's attachment styles and relationship functioning was examined in a systematic review of 20 articles. As a child grows into adulthood, attachment-related issues may cause communication, relationship building, and maintenance issues. According to other research, children of divorced parents are more likely to develop insecure attachment styles like avoidant or anxious. Additionally, research indicates that children with avoidant or insecure attachment styles may struggle later in life with commitment, trust, and emotional control (Carleton, 2025).

One study looked at how attachment bonds form in romantic relationships between adults. According to the findings, attachment traits and functions appear in a particular order that starts with proximity-seeking, moves on to safe haven, and ends with secure base. Additionally, longer-term partners were found to be more likely to use their partners for attachment functions (Heffernan et al, 2012).

In a cross-sectional study, 260 Turkish adults between the ages of 18 and 65 participated. Participants filled out the Three-Dimensional Attachment Styles Scale, the ACE Scale, and a Personal Information Form. ACE scores were found to be positively correlated with anxious-ambivalent attachment, while avoidant or secure attachment showed no significant correlation. After adjusting for sociodemographic factors, ACE scores were a significant predictor of anxious-ambivalent attachment. Men, married participants, and those with jobs had higher avoidant attachment scores. Participants with lower incomes had higher levels of anxious attachment and ACE. The association between ACE and anxious-ambivalent attachment was not moderated by the length of psychotherapy. The results also show that, negative childhood experiences are mainly linked to insecure attachment styles in adulthood, especially anxious-ambivalent attachment (Tonguç, 2025).

In another study, findings revealed a link between high attachment anxiety and unstable self-esteem that is independent of self-esteem level. Attachment avoidance, conversely, was unrelated to self-esteem stability. These results are consistent with the developmental and social-cognitive characteristics of attachment anxiety. They also are consistent with recent research showing that anxious attachment moderates the effect of social feedback on self-evaluations (Foster et al, 2007).

Higher levels of attachment anxiety and avoidance were found to be negatively correlated with positive affect (such as life satisfaction and self-esteem) and positively correlated with negative affect (such as depression, anxiety, and loneliness) in a meta-analysis of 224 studies. More precisely, attachment avoidance and poor mental health were moderately correlated. Additionally, there were only weak correlations between attachment anxiety and both good and bad mental health. Additionally, a number of factors (such as age and gender) moderated the relationship between the attachment dimensions and mental health outcomes. In general, attachment avoidance was less associated with mental health than attachment anxiety (Zhang et al, 2022).

A framework for comprehending the connections between stress, health, and interpersonal relationships is provided by attachment theory. Additionally, a significant predictor of mental health is adult attachment (Zhang et al, 2022).

According to one review of literature, people who are more anxiously and avoidantly attached have worse mental (like depression) and physical (like immune system functioning) health as well as increased psychological (like distress) and physiological reactions to stressful situations. Additionally, research indicates that the mental health of people who are more avoidantly and anxiously attached may benefit from perceived social support processes (Stanton & Campbell, 2014).

One study looked at how individual differences in adult attachment influence relationship behaviors and regulatory strategies, which in turn affect responses, behaviors, and outcomes related to health. The connections between attachment and health behavior (e.g., substance use, diet), physiological reactions to stress (e.g., hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis responses, cardiovascular responses, immune responses), and subsequent health and disease

outcomes were examined. According to recent research, dysregulated physiological reactions to stress, risky health behaviors, vulnerability to physical illness, and worse disease outcomes are all linked to attachment insecurity (attachment anxiety and/or attachment avoidance). The relationship context, which includes the other partner's attachment style and behavior, influences these associations. Adult attachment insecurity has been associated with worse physical health (Pietromonaco & Beck, 2019).

High trait avoidance was linked to lower baseline state anxiety, according to one study. This implies that people who exhibit high levels of trait avoidance typically suppress their attachment system's (hyper)activation in day-to-day interactions. It emphasizes the ability of motivation to prevent the psychological suffering brought on by needing love and care while expecting rejection. This suggests that the trait attachment results support the idea that a strong sense of security depends on a high degree of stability in state security (Tammilehto et al, 2025).

Although the exact nature of this relationship is unknown, recent research indicates a connection between attachment and mindfulness. In one study, the impact of experimentally raising state mindfulness on state attachment security was examined. Although state mindfulness was successfully increased, state attachment security remained unchanged. The impact of experimentally increasing state attachment security on state mindfulness was examined in a second study. Although state attachment security was successfully increased, state mindfulness remained unchanged (Pepping et al, 2015).

The reliability of the Experiences in Close Relationships scale (ECR) and the State Adult Attachment Measure (SAAM) (Gillath et al., 2009) in measuring attachment change was investigated in two longitudinal studies. Both scales' within-person and between-person reliabilities were estimated using generalizability theory analyses. The SAAM had a higher reliability of change than the ECR, even with fewer items. When it came to assessing attachment changes, the SAAM outperformed the ECR. The SAAM should be taken into consideration by researchers who wish to evaluate changes in attachment. Reliability should be evaluated in change studies using suitable psychometric techniques (Xu and Shrout, 2013).

This study takes a look at nursing students as the respondent sample. As frontline leaders in community engagement, health promotion, and policy implementation, public health nurses in the Philippines are essential to the advancement of primary and universal health care (De Los Angeles-Anonuevo, 2025). An already understaffed Philippine healthcare system is seriously threatened by burnout among Filipino nurses, which can result in resignations, career changes, and migration to other nations, worsening the nursing shortage in the country (Alibudbud, 2023). Since the role of attachment in one's well-being and functioning has been established in the preceding literature, this study investigates state adult attachment and the potential factors that may influence the same among 3rd year nursing students who will one day become health professionals that will form the backbone of the nation's healthcare system.

1.1. Research Questions

What are the *anxiety*, *avoidance* and *security* state adult attachment scores of the respondents when categorized according to

- Birth order;
- Intact or broken family; and
- With or without romantic experience?

Is there a significant difference in the *anxiety*, *avoidance* and *security* state adult attachment scores between the respondents belonging to intact and broken families?

Is there a significant difference in the *anxiety*, *avoidance* and *security* state adult attachment scores between the respondents having different birth orders?

Is there a significant difference in the *anxiety*, *avoidance* and *security* state adult attachment scores between the respondents with or without romantic experience?

1.2. Null Hypotheses

There is no significant difference in the state adult attachment scores between the respondents when grouped according to whether they come from intact or broken families.

There is no significant difference in the state adult attachment scores between the respondents when grouped according to birth order.

There is no significant difference in the state adult attachment scores between the respondents when grouped according to with or without romantic experience.

1.3. Operational Definitions used in this Study

- *Intact Family* refers to one in which the biological father and biological mother are living with their children in the same domicile.
- *Broken Family* refers to one in which the biological father **or** biological mother are not living with their children in the same domicile.
- *Family status* refers to whether the respondent comes from an intact family or a broken family.
- *Birth Order* means the respondent is either an *eldest child*, a *middle child* or a *youngest child*.
- *Eldest child* means the first-born offspring of the biological parents in a family where there are 2 or more children.
- *Middle child* means a child who is not the first nor the last offspring of the biological parents in a family where there are 3 or more children.
- *Youngest child* means the last born offspring of the biological parents in a family where there are at least 2 or more children.
- *Romantic Experience* means the respondent is *with romantic experience* or *without romantic experience*.
- *With romantic experience* means the respondent has been in an exclusive romantic relationship.
- *Without romantic experience* means the respondent has never been in an exclusive romantic relationship.

2. Methodology

The research environment chosen was a private college in Antipolo City, Philippines. The target population were 3rd year students taking up B.S. Nursing. The research instrument utilized was the State Adult Attachment Measure (SAAM) (Gillath et al., 2009). The SAAM has 21 items which uses a 7-point Likert scale. The SAAM measures 3 attachment domains namely, anxiety, avoidance and security. Items 1, 5, 8, 12, 14, 17 and 18 measure anxiety. Items 2, 3, 9, 10, 15, 21 measure avoidance. Lastly, items 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 18 and 20 measure security. There are no reverse-scored items.

With respect to the research question about family status, purposive sampling was used to identify 10 respondents from intact families and 10 respondents from broken families. The sample totaled 20 and their average age was 20.90. For purposes of this study, a family refers only to a nuclear family which includes the spouses and their biological children. Families who have adopted or stepchildren were excluded.

In order to address the research question concerning birth order, through purposive sampling, 9 eldest, 9 middle and 9 youngest were identified and asked to answer the SAAM. The sample totaled 27 and their average age was 21.04.

In regard to the research question concerning romantic experience, purposive sampling was used to identify 18 respondents who have romantic experience and 18 respondents who are without romantic experience. The sample totaled 36 and their average age was 21.

The above respondent samples were obtained independently of each other. Significant differences were tested using independent t-test.

2.1. Scope and Limitations

To maintain homogeneity of the respondents, only the 3rd year B.S. Nursing students of a particular school were included in the sampling. The limited population of the latter allowed only the sample sizes indicated with respect to the inclusion criteria. It is for this reason that the results cannot be generalized and applies only to the samples obtained.

3. Results

The following tables present the data obtained concerning the respondents' profile as well as the weighted means for the items of the SAAM for each specific sample of respondents. The independent t-test calculations are also presented in tabular form.

Table 1 The Interpretation Scale used for the State Adult Attachment Measure (SAAM)

Range	Verbal Interpretation
1.000-1.857	Strongly disagree
1.858-2.715	Moderately disagree
2.716-3.573	Slightly disagree
3.574-4.431	Neutral
4.432-5.289	Slightly agree
5.290-6.147	Moderately agree
6.148-7.000	Strongly agree

Table 1 presents the scale of interpretation for the ranges of scores yielded by the State Adult Attachment Measure (SAAM). The SAAM uses a 7-point Likert scale. 1.000-1.857 corresponds to strongly disagree, 1.858-2.715 corresponds to moderately disagree, 2.716-3.573 corresponds to slightly disagree, 3.574-4.431 corresponds to neutral, 4.432-5.289 corresponds to slightly agree, 5.290-6.147 corresponds to moderately agree and 6.148-7.000 corresponds to strongly agree.

Table 2 Profile of the Respondents in terms of sex(Family Status Sample)

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	1	5%
Female	19	95%
Total	20	100%

Table 2 shows the distribution of the family status sample respondents. There are 20 respondents in this sample and 5% are male while 95% are female.

Table 3 Anxiety Item Weighted Means Intact family (n=10)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. I wish someone would tell me they really love me	6.2	Strongly agree
5. I wish someone close could see me now	5.1	Slightly agree
8. I feel a strong need to be unconditionally loved right now	3.8	Neutral
12. I really need to feel loved right now	3.2	Neutral
14. I want to share my feelings with someone	4.8	Slightly agree
17. I want to talk with someone who cares for me about things that are worrying me	5.5	Moderately agree
19. I really need someone's emotional support	4.8	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	4.77	Slightly agree

Table 3 presents the item weighted means of the *anxiety* scores of the *intact family* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I wish someone would tell me they really love me,*” with 6.2 which has a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I really need to feel loved right now,*” with 3.2 which has a verbal interpretation of *neutral*. It can also be seen that the grand mean of the *anxiety* scores of respondents belonging to *intact family* is 4.77 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*.

Table 4 Anxiety Item Weighted Means Broken family (n=10)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. I wish someone would tell me they really love me	6.2	Strongly agree
5. I wish someone close could see me now	5.6	Moderately agree
8. I feel a strong need to be unconditionally loved right now	4.7	Slightly agree
12. I really need to feel loved right now	4.6	Slightly agree
14. I want to share my feelings with someone	5.6	Moderately agree
17. I want to talk with someone who cares for me about things that are worrying me	6.2	Strongly agree
19. I really need someone's emotional support	5.9	Moderately agree
Grand Mean	5.54	Moderately agree

Table 4 shows the item weighted means of the *anxiety* scores of the *broken family* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I wish someone would tell me they really love me,*” with 6.2 which has a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I really need to feel loved right now,*” with 4.6 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *anxiety* scores of those belonging to *broken family* is 5.54, which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*.

Table 5 Independent T-test calculation of anxiety scores between intact family and broken family

Anxiety	
Intact family	Broken family
N = 10 Mean = 4.77 SS = 22.05 Sample Variance = 2.45	N = 10 Mean = 5.54 SS = 10.07 Sample Variance = 1.12
<u>T-Test Results</u> Pooled Variance = 1.78 Standard Error = 0.60 $t = -1.2913$ df = 18	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.106$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

The independent t-test calculation of the anxiety scores of the *intact family* and *broken family* respondents in Table 5 yielded a t-value of -1.2913. And with a p-value of 0.106, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 6 Avoidance Item Weighted Means Intact family (n=10)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2. I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me	2.9	Slightly disagree
3. I feel alone and yet don't feel like getting close to others	3.7	Neutral
9. I am afraid someone will want to get too close to me	3.9	Neutral
10. If someone tried to get close to me, I would try to keep my distance	4.1	Neutral
15. I feel like I am loved by others but I really don't care	3.9	Neutral
16. The idea of being emotionally close to someone makes me nervous	5.0	Slightly agree
21. I have mixed feelings about being close to other people	5.7	Moderately agree
Grand Mean	4.17	Neutral

Table 6 presents the item weighted means of the *avoidance* scores of the *intact family* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “I have mixed feelings about being close to other people,” with is 5.7 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me,” with 2.9 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly disagree*. It can also be seen that the grand mean of the *avoidance* scores of respondents belonging to *intact family* is 4.17 which has a verbal interpretation of *neutral*.

Table 7 Avoidance Item Weighted Means Broken family (n=10)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2. I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me	2.8	Slightly disagree
3. I feel alone and yet don't feel like getting close to others	3.8	Neutral
9. I am afraid someone will want to get too close to me	3.7	Neutral
10. If someone tried to get close to me, I would try to keep my distance	4.0	Neutral
15. I feel like I am loved by others but I really don't care	3.8	Neutral
16. The idea of being emotionally close to someone makes me nervous	5.1	Slightly agree
21. I have mixed feelings about being close to other people	5.6	Moderately agree
Grand Mean	4.11	Neutral

Table 7 shows the item weighted means of the *avoidance* scores of the *broken family* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “I have mixed feelings about being close to other people,” with is 5.6 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me,” with 2.8 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly disagree*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *avoidance* scores of those belonging to *broken family* is 4.11, which has a verbal interpretation of *neutral*.

Table 8 Independent T-test calculation of *avoidance* scores between intact family and broken family

Avoidance	
Intact family	Broken family
N = 10 Mean = 4.17 SS = 9.46 Sample Variance = 1.05	N = 10 Mean = 4.11 SS = 18.28 Sample Variance = 2.03
<u>T-Test Results</u> Pooled Variance = 1.54 Standard Error = 0.56 $t = 0.1029$ df = 18	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.460$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

As shown in Table 8, the independent t-test calculation of the *avoidance* scores of the *intact family* and *broken family* respondents produced a t-value of 0.1029. And with a p-value of 0.460, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 9 Security Item Weighted Means Intact family (n=10)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
4. I feel loved	6.4	Strongly agree
6. If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone	4.4	Neutral
7. I feel like others care about me	6.0	Moderately agree
11. I feel relaxed knowing that close others are there for me right now	5.5	Moderately agree
13. I feel like I have someone to rely on	5.1	Slightly agree
18. I feel secure and close to other people	5.4	Moderately agree
20. I feel I can trust the people who are close to me	4.9	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	5.39	Moderately agree

Table 9 presents the item weighted means of the *security* scores of the *intact family* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “I feel loved,” with is 6.4 which has a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone,” with 4.4 which has a verbal interpretation of *neutral*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *security* scores of respondents from the *intact family* is 5.39 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*.

Table 10 Security Item Weighted Means Broken family (n=10)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
4. I feel loved	6.0	Moderately agree
6. If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone	5.1	Slightly agree
7. I feel like others care about me	6.2	Strongly agree
11. I feel relaxed knowing that close others are there for me right now	6.0	Moderately agree
13. I feel like I have someone to rely on	5.9	Moderately agree
18. I feel secure and close to other people	5.5	Moderately agree
20. I feel I can trust the people who are close to me	5.0	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	5.67	Moderately agree

Table 10 shows the item weighted means of the *security* scores of the *broken family* respondents. The statements with the highest weighted mean are “I feel loved,” and with “I feel relaxed knowing that close others are there for me right now,” which is 6.0 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “I feel I can trust the people who are close to me,” with 5.0 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*. It can also be seen that the grand mean of the *security* scores the *broken family* sample is 5.67, which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*.

Table 11 Independent T-test calculation of *security* scores between intact family and broken family

Intact family	Broken family
N = 10 Mean = 5.39 SS = 18.41 Sample Variance = 2.05	N = 10 Mean = 5.67 SS = 5.14 Sample Variance = 0.57
<u>T-Test Results</u> Pooled Variance = 1.31 Standard Error = 0.51 $t = -0.5585$ df = 18	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.292$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

As indicated in Table 11, the independent t-test calculation of the *security* scores of the *intact* family and *broken* family respondents produced a t-value of -0.5585. And with a p-value of 0.292, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 12 Profile of the Respondents in terms of sex (Birth Order Sample)

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	4	14.81%
Female	23	85.19%
Total	27	100%

Table 12 shows the distribution of the *birth order* sample respondents. There are 27 respondents in this sample and 14.81% are male while 85.19% are female.

Table 13 Anxiety Item Weighted Means Eldest child (n=9)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. I wish someone would tell me they really love me	6.00	Moderately agree
5. I wish someone close could see me now	4.89	Slightly agree
8. I feel a strong need to be unconditionally loved right now	5.00	Slightly agree
12. I really need to feel loved right now	4.22	Neutral
14. I want to share my feelings with someone	5.67	Moderately agree
17. I want to talk with someone who cares for me about things that are worrying me	5.78	Moderately agree
19. I really need someone's emotional support	5.22	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	5.25	Slightly agree

Table 13 presents the item weighted means of the *anxiety* scores of the *eldest child* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I wish someone would tell me they really love me,*” with 6.0 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I really need to feel loved right now,*” with 4.22 which has a verbal interpretation of *neutral*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *anxiety* scores of the *eldest child* respondents is 5.25 with a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*.

Table 14 Anxiety Item Weighted Means Middle child (n=9)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. I wish someone would tell me they really love me	5.22	Slightly agree
5. I wish someone close could see me now	5.00	Slightly agree
8. I feel a strong need to be unconditionally loved right now	3.44	Slightly disagree
12. I really need to feel loved right now	3.44	Slightly disagree
14. I want to share my feelings with someone	4.44	Slightly agree
17. I want to talk with someone who cares for me about things that are worrying me	5.56	Moderately agree
19. I really need someone's emotional support	4.33	Neutral
Grand Mean	4.49	Slightly agree

Table 14 shows the item weighted means of the *anxiety* scores of the *middle child* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I want to talk with someone who cares for me about things that are worrying me,*” with is 5.56 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statements with the lowest weighted means are “. I feel a strong need to be unconditionally loved right now,” and “*I really need to feel loved right now,*” with 3.44 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly disagree*. It can also be seen that the grand mean of the *anxiety* scores of *middle child* respondents is 4.49 with a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*.

Table 15 Anxiety Item Weighted Means Youngest child (n=9)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. I wish someone would tell me they really love me	6.44	Strongly agree
5. I wish someone close could see me now	6.00	Moderately agree
8. I feel a strong need to be unconditionally loved right now	5.67	Moderately agree
12. I really need to feel loved right now	5.11	Slightly agree
14. I want to share my feelings with someone	5.56	Moderately agree
17. I want to talk with someone who cares for me about things that are worrying me	6.00	Moderately agree
19. I really need someone's emotional support	6.11	Moderately agree
Grand Mean	5.84	Moderately agree

Table 15 presents the item weighted means of the *anxiety* scores of the *youngest child* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I wish someone would tell me they really love me,*” with 6.44 which has a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I really need to feel loved right now,*” with 5.11 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the anxiety scores of the *youngest child* respondents is 5.84 with a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*.

Table 16 Independent T-test calculation of *anxiety* scores between eldest child and middle child

Anxiety	
Eldest child	Middle child
N = 9 Mean = 5.25 SS = 8.64 Sample Variance = 1.08	N = 9 Mean = 4.49 SS = 11.56 Sample Variance = 1.44
T-Test Results Pooled Variance = 1.26 Standard Error = 0.53 $t = 1.4385$ df = 16	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.085$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

Table 16 shows the independent t-test calculation between the *anxiety* scores of the *eldest child* and *middle child* respondents. A t value of 1.4385 was obtained. And with a p value of 0.085, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 17 Independent T-test calculation of *anxiety* scores between eldest child and youngest child

Anxiety	
Eldest child	Youngest child
N = 9 Mean = 5.25 SS = 8.64 Sample Variance = 1.08	N = 9 Mean = 5.84 SS = 7.53 Sample Variance = 0.94
T-Test Results Pooled Variance = 1.01 Standard Error = 0.47 $t = -1.2392$ df = 16	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.117$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

As can be observed in Table 17, the independent t-test calculation between the *anxiety* scores of the *eldest child* and *youngest child* respondents produced a t-value of -1.2392. And with a p-value of 0.117, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 18 Independent T-test calculation of *anxiety* scores between middle child and youngest child

Anxiety	
Middle child	Youngest child
N = 9 Mean = 4.49 SS = 11.56 Sample Variance = 1.44	N = 9 Mean = 5.84 SS = 7.53 Sample Variance = 0.94
T-Test Results Pooled Variance = 1.19 Standard Error = 0.51 $t = -2.6207$ df = 16	
Result: Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups IS statistically significant ($p = 0.0093$). At the 0.05 significance level, we reject the null hypothesis. The data provides sufficient evidence to conclude that there is a real difference between the means of the two groups.	

The independent t-test calculation between the *anxiety* scores of the *middle child* and *youngest child* respondents in Table 18 produced a t-value of -2.6207. And with a p-value of 0.0093, this was found to be **statistically significant**.

Table 19 Avoidance Item Weighted Means Eldest child (n=9)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2. I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me	3.22	Slightly disagree
3. I feel alone and yet don't feel like getting close to others	4.22	Neutral
9. I am afraid someone will want to get too close to me	3.78	Neutral
10. If someone tried to get close to me, I would try to keep my distance	4.00	Neutral
15. I feel like I am loved by others but I really don't care	4.33	Neutral
16. The idea of being emotionally close to someone makes me nervous	5.22	Slightly agree
21. I have mixed feelings about being close to other people	5.78	Moderately agree
Grand Mean	4.37	Neutral

Table 19 shows the item weighted means of the *avoidance* scores of the *eldest child* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I have mixed feelings about being close to other people*,” with 5.78 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me*,” with 3.22 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly disagree*. It can also be seen that the grand mean of the *avoidance* scores of the *eldest child* respondents is 4.37 with a verbal interpretation of *neutral*.

Table 20 Avoidance Item Weighted Means Middle child (n=9)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2. I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me	2.00	Moderately disagree
3. I feel alone and yet don't feel like getting close to others	4.11	Neutral
9. I am afraid someone will want to get too close to me	3.44	Slightly disagree
10. If someone tried to get close to me, I would try to keep my distance	3.44	Slightly disagree
15. I feel like I am loved by others but I really don't care	2.89	Slightly disagree
16. The idea of being emotionally close to someone makes me nervous	4.00	Neutral
21. I have mixed feelings about being close to other people	5.44	Moderately agree
Grand Mean	3.62	Neutral

Table 20 presents the item weighted means of the *avoidance* scores of the *middle child* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I have mixed feelings about being close to other people*,” with 5.44 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me*,” with 2.00 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately disagree*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *avoidance* scores of *middle child* respondents is 3.62 with a verbal interpretation of *neutral*.

Table 21 Avoidance Item Weighted Means Youngest child (n=9)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2. I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me	3.78	Neutral
3. I feel alone and yet don't feel like getting close to others	4.22	Neutral
9. I am afraid someone will want to get too close to me	3.11	Slightly disagree
10. If someone tried to get close to me, I would try to keep my distance	2.89	Slightly disagree
15. I feel like I am loved by others but I really don't care	2.78	Slightly disagree
16. The idea of being emotionally close to someone makes me nervous	4.44	Slightly agree
21. I have mixed feelings about being close to other people	5.11	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	3.76	Neutral

Table 21 shows the item weighted means of the *avoidance* scores of the *youngest child* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I have mixed feelings about being close to other people*,” with 5.11 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I feel like I am loved by others but I really don't care*,” with 2.78 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly disagree*. It can also be seen that the grand mean of the *avoidance* scores of the *youngest child* respondents is 3.76 with a verbal interpretation of *neutral*.

Table 22 Independent T-test calculation of *avoidance* scores between eldest child and middle child

Avoidance	
Eldest child	Middle child
N = 9 Mean = 4.37 SS = 8.29 Sample Variance = 1.04	N = 9 Mean = 3.62 SS = 11.06 Sample Variance = 1.38
<u>T-Test Results</u> <u>Pooled Variance = 1.21</u> <u>Standard Error = 0.52</u> <u>$t = 1.4390$</u> <u>$df = 16$</u>	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.085$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

Table 22 presents the independent t-test calculation between the *avoidance* scores of the *eldest child* and *middle child* respondents. A t value of 1.439 was obtained. And with a p value of 0.085, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 23 Independent T-test calculation of *avoidance* scores between eldest child and youngest child

Avoidance	
Eldest child	Youngest child
N = 9 Mean = 4.37 SS = 8.29 Sample Variance = 1.04	N = 9 Mean = 3.76 SS = 6.24 Sample Variance = 0.78
<u>T-Test Results</u> Pooled Variance = 0.91 Standard Error = 0.45 $t = 1.3425$ df = 16	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.099$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

As can be seen in Table 23, the independent t-test calculation between the *avoidance* scores of the *eldest child* and *youngest child* respondents yielded a t-value of 1.3425. And with a p-value of 0.099, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 24 Independent T-test calculation of *avoidance* scores between youngest child and middle child

Avoidance	
Youngest child	Middle child
N = 9 Mean = 3.76 SS = 6.24 Sample Variance = 0.78	N = 9 Mean = 3.62 SS = 11.06 Sample Variance = 1.38
<u>T-Test Results</u> Pooled Variance = 1.08 Standard Error = 0.49 $t = 0.2914$ df = 16	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.387$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

The independent t-test calculation between the *avoidance* scores of the *middle child* and *youngest child* respondents in Table 24 produced a t-value of 0.2914. And with a p-value of 0.387, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 25 Security Item Weighted Means Eldest child (n=9)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
4. I feel loved	5.89	Moderately agree
6. If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone	3.78	Neutral
7. I feel like others care about me	5.67	Moderately agree
11. I feel relaxed knowing that close others are there for me right now	5.78	Moderately agree
13. I feel like I have someone to rely on	5.00	Slightly agree
18. I feel secure and close to other people	5.56	Moderately agree
20. I feel I can trust the people who are close to me	4.89	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	5.22	Slightly agree

Table 25 presents the item weighted means of the *security* scores of the *eldest child* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I feel loved*,” with 5.89 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone*,” with 3.78 which has a verbal interpretation of *neutral*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *security* scores of the *eldest child* respondents is 5.22 with a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*.

Table 26 Security Item Weighted Means Middle child (n=9)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
4. I feel loved	5.89	Moderately agree
6. If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone	4.89	Slightly agree
7. I feel like others care about me	5.56	Moderately agree
11. I feel relaxed knowing that close others are there for me right now	5.56	Moderately agree
13. I feel like I have someone to rely on	5.00	Slightly agree
18. I feel secure and close to other people	5.22	Slightly agree
20. I feel I can trust the people who are close to me	5.00	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	5.30	Moderately agree

Table 26 shows the item weighted means of the *security* scores of the *middle child* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I feel loved*,” with 5.89 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone*,” with 4.89 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*. It can also be seen that the grand mean of the *avoidance* scores of *middle child* respondents is 5.30 with a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*.

Table 27 Security Item Weighted Means Youngest child (n=9)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
4. I feel loved	6.56	Strongly agree
6. If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone	5.33	Moderately agree
7. I feel like others care about me	5.44	Moderately agree
11. I feel relaxed knowing that close others are there for me right now	5.56	Moderately agree
13. I feel like I have someone to rely on	6.00	Moderately agree
18. I feel secure and close to other people	5.11	Slightly agree
20. I feel I can trust the people who are close to me	4.89	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	5.56	Moderately agree

Table 27 presents the item weighted means of the *security* scores of the *youngest child* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I feel loved*,” with 6.56 which has a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I feel I can trust the people who are close to me*,” with 4.89 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *security* scores of the youngest child respondents is 5.56 with a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*.

Table 28 Independent T-test calculation of *security* scores between eldest child and middle child

Security	
Eldest child	Middle child
N = 9 Mean = 5.22 SS = 4.05 Sample Variance = 0.51	N = 9 Mean = 5.30 SS = 18.59 Sample Variance = 2.32
<u>T-Test Results</u> Pooled Variance = 1.41 Standard Error = 0.56 $t = -0.1415$ df = 16	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.445$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

Table 28 shows the independent t-test calculation between the *security* scores of the *eldest child* and *middle child* respondents. A t value of -0.1415 was obtained. And with a p value of 0.445, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 29 Independent T-test calculation of *security* scores between eldest child and youngest child

Security	
Eldest child	Youngest child
N = 9 Mean = 5.22 SS = 4.05 Sample Variance = 0.51	N = 9 Mean = 5.56 SS = 2.71 Sample Variance = 0.34
<u>T-Test Results</u> Pooled Variance = 0.42 Standard Error = 0.31 $t = -1.0881$ df = 16	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.146$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

As can be observed in Table 29, the independent t-test calculation between the *security* scores of the *eldest child* and *youngest child* respondents yielded a t-value of -1.0881. And with a p-value of 0.146, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 30 Independent T-test calculation of *security* scores between Youngest child and middle child

Security	
Youngest child	Middle child
N = 9 Mean = 5.56 SS = 2.71 Sample Variance = 0.34	N = 9 Mean = 5.30 SS = 18.59 Sample Variance = 2.32
<u>T-Test Results</u> Pooled Variance = 1.33 Standard Error = 0.54 $t = 0.4669$ df = 16	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.323$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

Lastly, the independent t-test calculation between the *security* scores of the *middle child* and *youngest child* respondents in Table 30 yielded a t-value of 0.4669. And with a p-value of 0.323, this was found to be not statistically significant.

Table 31 Profile of the Respondents in terms of sex (Romantic Experience Sample)

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	5	13.89%
Female	31	86.11%
Total	36	100%

Table 31 shows the distribution of the *romantic experience* sample respondents. There are 36 respondents in this sample and 13.89% are male while 86.11% are female.

Table 32 Anxiety Item Weighted Means Without romantic experience (n=18)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. I wish someone would tell me they really love me	5.67	Moderately agree
5. I wish someone close could see me now	4.89	Slightly agree
8. I feel a strong need to be unconditionally loved right now	4.06	Neutral
12. I really need to feel loved right now	3.94	Neutral
14. I want to share my feelings with someone	5.17	Slightly agree
17. I want to talk with someone who cares for me about things that are worrying me	5.61	Moderately agree
19. I really need someone's emotional support	4.89	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	4.89	Slightly agree

Table 32 shows the item weighted means of the *anxiety* scores of the *without romantic experience* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I wish someone would tell me they really love me,*” with 5.67 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I really need to feel loved right now,*” with 3.94 which has a verbal interpretation of *neutral*. It can also be seen that the grand mean of the *anxiety* scores of respondents belonging to *without romantic experience* is 4.89 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*.

Table 33 Anxiety Item Weighted Means With romantic experience (n=18)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. I wish someone would tell me they really love me	6.00	Moderately agree
5. I wish someone close could see me now	5.67	Moderately agree
8. I feel a strong need to be unconditionally loved right now	4.72	Slightly agree
12. I really need to feel loved right now	4.56	Slightly agree
14. I want to share my feelings with someone	5.83	Moderately agree
17. I want to talk with someone who cares for me about things that are worrying me	6.33	Strongly agree
19. I really need someone's emotional support	5.50	Moderately agree
Grand Mean	5.52	Moderately agree

Table 33 presents the item weighted means of the *anxiety* scores of the *with romantic experience* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I want to talk with someone who cares for me about things that are worrying me,*” with 6.33 which has a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I really need to feel loved right now,*” with 4.56 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *anxiety* scores of those belonging to *with romantic experience* is 5.52, which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*.

Table 34 Independent T-test calculation of *anxiety* scores between without romantic experience and with romantic experience

Anxiety	
Without romantic experience	With romantic experience
N = 18 Mean = 4.89 SS = 19.82 Sample Variance = 1.17	N = 18 Mean = 5.52 SS = 19.68 Sample Variance = 1.16
<u>T-Test Results</u> Pooled Variance = 1.16 Standard Error = 0.36 $t = -1.7451$ df = 34	
Result: Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups IS statistically significant ($p = 0.045$). At the 0.05 significance level, we reject the null hypothesis. The data provides sufficient evidence to conclude that there is a real difference between the means of the two groups.	

The independent t-test calculation of the *anxiety* scores of the *without romantic experience* and with romantic experience respondents in Table 34 produced a t-value of -1.7451. And with a p-value of 0.045, this was found to be **statistically significant**.

Table 35 Avoidance Item Weighted Means Without romantic experience (n=18)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2. I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me	3.21	Slightly disagree
3. I feel alone and yet don't feel like getting close to others	4.58	Slightly agree
9. I am afraid someone will want to get too close to me	3.74	Neutral
10. If someone tried to get close to me, I would try to keep my distance	4.05	Neutral
15. I feel like I am loved by others but I really don't care	3.42	Slightly disagree
16. The idea of being emotionally close to someone makes me nervous	5.32	Moderately agree
21. I have mixed feelings about being close to other people	5.53	Moderately agree
Grand Mean	4.26	Neutral

Table 35 shows the item weighted means of the *avoidance* scores of the *without romantic experience* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I have mixed feelings about being close to other people,*” with 5.53 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me,*” with 3.21 which has a verbal interpretation of

slightly agree. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *avoidance* scores of respondents belonging to *without romantic experience* is 4.26 which has a verbal interpretation of *neutral*.

Table 36 Avoidance Item Weighted Means With romantic experience (n=18)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2. I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me	2.56	Moderately disagree
3. I feel alone and yet don't feel like getting close to others	3.39	Slightly disagree
9. I am afraid someone will want to get too close to me	3.44	Slightly disagree
10. If someone tried to get close to me, I would try to keep my distance	3.00	Slightly disagree
15. I feel like I am loved by others but I really don't care	3.28	Slightly disagree
16. The idea of being emotionally close to someone makes me nervous	3.72	Neutral
21. I have mixed feelings about being close to other people	4.83	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	3.46	Slightly disagree

Table 36 presents the item weighted means of the *avoidance* scores of the *with romantic experience* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I have mixed feelings about being close to other people*,” with 4.83 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I would be uncomfortable having a good friend or a relationship partner close to me*,” with 2.56 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *avoidance* scores of respondents belonging to *with romantic experience* is 3.46, which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly disagree*.

Table 37 Independent T-test calculation of *avoidance* scores between without romantic experience and with romantic experience

Avoidance	
Without romantic experience	With romantic experience
N = 18 Mean = 4.40 SS = 13.86 Sample Variance = 0.82	N = 18 Mean = 3.46 SS = 17.45 Sample Variance = 1.03
T-Test Results Pooled Variance = 0.92 Standard Error = 0.32 $t = 2.9277$ $df = 34$	
Result: Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups IS statistically significant ($p = 0.0030$). At the 0.05 significance level, we reject the null hypothesis. The data provides sufficient evidence to conclude that there is a real difference between the means of the two groups.	

As indicated in Table 37, the independent t-test calculation of the *avoidance* scores of the *without romantic experience* and with romantic experience respondents produced a t-value of 2.9277 and with a p-value of 0.003, this was found to be **statistically significant**.

Table 38 Security Item Weighted Means Without romantic experience (n=18)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
4. I feel loved	5.63	Moderately agree
6. If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone	4.00	Neutral
7. I feel like others care about me	5.47	Moderately agree
11. I feel relaxed knowing that close others are there for me right now	5.84	Moderately agree
13. I feel like I have someone to rely on	4.79	Slightly agree
18. I feel secure and close to other people	5.21	Slightly agree
20. I feel I can trust the people who are close to me	5.11	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	5.15	Slightly agree

Table 38 shows the item weighted means of the *security* scores of the *without romantic experience* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I feel relaxed knowing that close others are there for me right now*,” with 5.84 which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone*,” with 4.00 which has a verbal interpretation of *neutral*. It can also be seen that the grand mean of the *security* scores of respondents from the *without romantic experience* is 5.15 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*.

Table 39 Security Item Weighted Means With romantic experience (n=18)

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
4. I feel loved	6.50	Strongly agree
6. If something went wrong right now I feel like I could depend on someone	5.22	Slightly agree
7. I feel like others care about me	5.83	Moderately agree
11. I feel relaxed knowing that close others are there for me right now	5.61	Moderately agree
13. I feel like I have someone to rely on	5.94	Moderately agree
18. I feel secure and close to other people	5.33	Moderately agree
20. I feel I can trust the people who are close to me	4.94	Slightly agree
Grand Mean	5.63	Moderately agree

Table 39 shows the item weighted means of the *security* scores of the *with romantic experience* respondents. The statement with the highest weighted mean is “*I feel loved*,” with 6.50 which has a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree*. The statement with the lowest weighted mean is “*I feel I can trust the people who are close to me*,” with 4.94 which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly agree*. It can also be observed that the grand mean of the *security* scores in Table 39 of those from the *with romantic experience* sample is 5.63, which has a verbal interpretation of *moderately agree*.

Table 40 Independent T-test calculation of *security* scores between without romantic experience and with romantic experience

Security	
Without romantic experience	With romantic experience
N = 18 Mean = 5.19 SS = 20.82 Sample Variance = 1.22	N = 18 Mean = 5.63 SS = 11.39 Sample Variance = 0.67
<u>T-Test Results</u> Pooled Variance = 0.95 Standard Error = 0.32 $t = -1.3454$ df = 34	
Result: Not Statistically Significant The difference between the two groups is NOT statistically significant ($p = 0.094$). At the 0.05 significance level, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. The observed difference could plausibly be due to random chance.	

As shown in Table 40, the independent t-test calculation of the *security* scores of the *without romantic experience* and *with romantic experience* respondents produced a t-value of -1.3454. And with a p-value of 0.094, this was found to be not statistically significant.

4. Discussion

Based on the independent t-test calculations of the anxiety, avoidance and security scores between the respondents belonging to intact and broken families, it can be surmised that there appears to be no significant differences. For the samples obtained for this study, being in an intact or broken family does not influence the 3 SAAM domains of anxiety, avoidance and security.

However, with regard to birth order a significant difference was found between the anxiety scores of middle child and youngest child respondents.

Lastly, a significant difference in anxiety scores between respondents without romantic and with romantic experience was discovered. Furthermore, a significant difference was also found between the avoidance scores of respondents without romantic and with romantic experience.

Among the 3 factors investigated by this study, romantic experience plays the most influential role on the 3 SAAM domains of anxiety, avoidance and security while family status has a negligible effect on these domains for the study samples.

5. Conclusions

With respect to the null hypothesis, “there is no significant difference in the state adult attachment scores between the respondents when grouped according to whether they come from intact or broken families,” this is *accepted* based on the findings.

In regard to the null hypothesis, “there is no significant difference in the state adult attachment scores between the respondents when grouped according to birth order,” the findings lead to a *rejection* of the same. A statistically significant difference was found between the anxiety scores of the respondents belonging to middle child and youngest child. And because the youngest child respondents have a higher mean, it can be inferred that they have higher anxiety.

Concerning the null hypothesis, “there is no significant difference in the state adult attachment scores between the respondents when grouped according to with or without romantic experience,” the results lead to a *rejection* of the same. A statistically significant difference was established between the anxiety scores of the respondents. And because the mean of the scores of the respondents with romantic experience is higher, this implies that their anxiety is greater. In addition, a statistically significant difference was established between their avoidance scores. And since the mean of the scores of the respondents without romantic experience is higher, it can be inferred that their avoidance is higher.

Recommendations

This study is limited by the sample sizes that were obtained. Further research could be pursued involving the same factors and additional ones with larger sample sizes.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

Statement of ethical approval

The relevant educational institution granted ethical approval for the study. This study preserved the respondents' anonymity. At the start of the online survey, they were informed that they were voluntarily participating in this study and that they could withdraw at any time. There was no funding for this study. AI was only used to improve the presentation of the text.

Statement of informed consent

The researchers obtained their informed and voluntary consent. The data collected is digitally stored in the Google form and is securely accessible by the researchers only. This study was conducted without any conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Alibudbud R. (2023). Addressing the Burnout and Shortage of Nurses in the Philippines. *SAGE open nursing*, 9, 23779608231195737. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23779608231195737>
- [2] Carleton, Audree, "Broken Bonds: The Lasting Effects of Divorce and Family Separation on Attachment and Relationships" (2025). *RCAC 2025 Posters*. 50. https://scholarworks.merrimack.edu/rcac_2025_posters/50
- [3] Caspers, K., Yucuis, R., Troutman, B., Arndt, S., & Langbehn, D. (2007). A sibling adoption study of adult attachment: The influence of shared environment on attachment states of mind. *Attachment & Human Development*, 9(4), 375–391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730701711581>
- [4] De Los Angeles-Anonuevo, C. (2025). Serving communities, shaping systems: The evolving role of public health nurses in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Nursing*, 95(2), 12-17
- [5] Foster, J. D., Kernis, M. H., & Goldman, B. M. (2007). Linking adult attachment to self-esteem stability. *Self and Identity*, 6(1), 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298860600832139>
- [6] Gillath, O., Hart, J., Nofle, E. E., & Stockdale, G. D. (2009). Development and validation of a state adult attachment measure (SAAM). *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 362-373.
- [7] Heffernan, M. E., Fraley, R. C., Vicary, A. M., & Brumbaugh, C. C. (2012). Attachment features and functions in adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 29(5), 671-693.
- [8] Pepping CA, Davis PJ, O'Donovan A (2015) The Association between State Attachment Security and State Mindfulness. *PLoS ONE* 10(3): e0116779. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0116779>
- [9] Pietromonaco, P.R., Beck, L.A. (2019). Adult attachment and physical health. *Current Opinion in Psychology* Volume 25 115-120. DOI 10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.04.004
- [10] Sinchana, L.R. Thomas, S. (2024) The Influence of Sibling Relationship on Romantic Attachment Styles in Young Adults: A Study Based on Sibling Constellation. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*. Volume 12, Issue 2, p800-808 DOI: 10.25215/1202.078

- [11] Stanton, S.C.E. and Campbell, L. (2014), Attachment and Health. *J Pers*, 82: 528-538. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12056>
- [12] Tammilehto, J., Kaurin, A., Bosmans, G., Kuppens, P., Flykt, M., Vänskä, M., Peltonen, K. and Lindblom, J. (2025), Everyday State Attachment: Dynamic Features and Role of Trait Attachment. *J Pers*, 93: 781-795. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12975>
- [13] Tonguç, A. B. (2025). Broken Trust in Childhood, Bonds Formed in Adulthood: The Effect of Adverse Childhood Experiences on Attachment Styles. *Acıbadem Univ. Sağlık Bilim. Derg.* <https://doi.org/10.31067/acusaglik.1916360>
- [14] Xu, J.H., Shrout, P.E. (2013). Assessing the reliability of change: A comparison of two measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Research in Personality* Volume 47, Issue 3 202-208 DOI 10.1016/j.jrp.2013.01.005
- [15] Zhang, X., Li, J., Xie, F., Chen, X., Xu, W., & Hudson, N. W. (2022). The relationship between adult attachment and mental health: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 123(5), 1089–1137. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000437>