

LONELINESS AND ATTACHMENT IN ADOLESCENTS OF PRE-UNIVERSITY COLLEGES

PRETTY CHAWLA, DR. KENNEDY ANDREW THOMAS,

Abstract: The term adolescence means the period between childhood and maturity which involves many physical, cognitive and social changes. The period of adolescence is vulnerable as they have many problems and there is a need to understand them. Adolescents want more autonomy and conflict with parents affects the attachment. This study was done on 600 students of Bangalore urban; 200 each from aided, unaided and P.U colleges of Bangalore. Random method of sampling was used. Data was collected using questionnaires. The adolescents belonged to Pre University Colleges (16-18) years. The tools used were ULCA Loneliness scale and IPPA scale. The statistical techniques used were descriptive statistics, co-relation regression, one way and two way Anova. The study revealed that girls have better companionship and attachment with others which makes them feel less lonely whereas boys feel more lonely and isolated. The girls have better relationships with their mothers and feel less insecure. The girls are dependent on the father but they also feel dissatisfied in some areas. Girls have a better relationship with friends as they can share their feelings with them. Attachment is very important as problems in attachment can have repercussions later. So, the parents and teachers should give more time to understand adolescents.

Keywords: Adolescence, Attachment, Loneliness, Parental, Peer, P.U.C

Introduction: The word adolescence has been derived from a Latin word 'adolescere' which means "to come to maturity". Oxford English dictionary states that adolescence is the process or condition of growing up; it is the period between childhood and maturity. (Onions 1947:25)

The period from childhood to adulthood is a long transitional period known as adolescence. It begins with puberty at 11 or 12 and continues till late teens or early twenties. Throughout adolescence, social and cognitive changes take place. Emotional maturity depends on many things as discovering one's identity, to be independent of parents, developing a system of values, and forming relationships is very important. Adolescence is the period of major changes between childhood and adulthood which leads to major physical, cognitive and psychosocial changes. Early adolescence ranges from 11-14, mid- adolescence between 14-16 and late adolescence; 16-18 years which offers opportunities for growth, autonomy, self-esteem and intimacy.

Physical development: The biological changes take place in puberty, which is considered the end of childhood. It results in the rapid growth in height and weight, changes in body proportions and form, and attainment of sexual maturity. These physical changes are due to maturation that begins even before birth, and their psychological effects continue even in adulthood. The growth spurt in adolescents is a rapid increase in height and weight, which begins for girls at 9 and continues till 15 and in boys between 11-16. The growth spurt lasts for 2 years, and after it ends, the young person reaches sexual maturity. It is believed that children who are better nourished and

cared tend to mature earlier and they grow bigger in size as compared to others. Most young teenagers are more concerned about their looks than about any other aspect of themselves. Effects of early or late maturation are most likely to be negative when adolescents are much more or less developed than their peers, when they do not see the changes as advantageous, and when several stressful events occur at about the same time (Peterson, 1993, Simmons, Blyth and McKinney, 1983).

Adolescence can be described as the best of times or the worst of times or both for some adolescents. It is affected by the society one lives in. Adolescence can be divided into 3 overlapping stages:

Young adolescence (12 to 14) years are a period of puberty and conformity. It is considered the most difficult phase of life as the kids are not fully mature and they are neither considered adults. The conflicts occur due to parents not providing freedom to the children. Studies get more difficult and physical changes lead to more irritability.

Middle adolescence (14 to 16) is a period of intense friendships, heterosexual relationships, and search for identity, peer and parental relationship. This is a period of transformation. Lots of changes take place physically, mentally, cognitively and sexually. Boys take a longer time to mature physically.

Late adolescence is a decisive turning point in development (BLOS, 1962). This stage is close to adulthood where kids are more stable emotionally, have an identity and lots of patience. There is increase in abstract thinking which consolidates personality.

Cognitive Development: During adolescence, the

cognitive development is the highest which starts around 11 years of age. This stage is known as Piaget's final stage of cognitive development which is considered as the stage of formal operations. Deductive reasoning and problem solving skills develop at a faster pace. Vocabulary and other aspects of development increase during this period. Teenagers have a developed general knowledge and they apply the learned concepts to new tasks. Teenagers are interested in learning life skills, such as cooking, fixing things, driving and learn others from parents and the environment. In junior school, the kids are at the superior position, whereas they become the youngest, smallest and least powerful in middle or high school. A sense of ego and personal uniqueness also develops in the teenager which leads him to think that no one can really understand him.

Social Development: There is constantly a friction of adolescents with their parents, siblings and relatives for their values, political thoughts and lifestyle. When the parents fail to give personal space to their teenager, he starts feeling that his parents are too interfering and do not understand him at all. This might be due to physical and hormonal changes which change the mood and thinking of the teenager. During adolescence, teens spend much of their time with their friends. Peer pressure is also one of the important factors during this age. Groups and crowds become more heterogeneous and heterosexual and dating becomes very important. Students whose parents are closely involved in their school lives and monitor their progress regularly perform best in high school (National centre for education statistics, 1985). The changes that take place include development of new values in selecting friends, social acceptance, rejection, social activities, self-disclosure, secure relationship, social support and identity development.

Need for understanding adolescents: Adolescents are more vulnerable because of higher divorce rates, increased family mobility, rising competition for schools and jobs, easier access to alcohol and drugs. As the experiences during earlier stages of development and socio economic and cultural factors also influence the opportunities, this stage of life is considered very important. Adults have to be sensitive to understand the pubertal changes and to help the young people understand the changes positively. In today's world it is very necessary to understand adolescents and their problems as they would be better adults and the future of the nation as well as the society

Review of Literature:

Studies related to loneliness: According to Weiss, loneliness is of two types: emotional; due to the absence of an attachment figure and social; due to

the absence of a social network. Studies on loneliness have showed that college going adolescents are very lonely. Studies show that loneliness is at its peak at adolescence and declines as age increases.

Brennan and Auslander (1979) considered family, school, and peers as the major variables associated with loneliness and interpersonal dissatisfaction among adolescents.

Cheng and Furnham (2002) studied the extent of peer relations, self-confidence and some other variables in co-relation with happiness and loneliness among adolescents.

Wadell (1984) found that adolescents who have little contact with their friends have low self-confidence and feelings of inadequacy.

According to the studies by Culp, Clyman and Culp (1995) about 66% of the adolescents suffer from loneliness.

2.2 Studies related to Attachment to parents:

Michal Al-Yagon conducted a study on adolescents' subtypes of attachment security with parents and self-perceptions of socio emotional adjustment. The aim of the study was to find out adolescents attachment with his parents, both versus one parent. This study aimed to identify different attachment profiles with father and mother. The sample consisted of 203 adolescents between 15-17 years and to find out its influence on peer network loneliness, its positive and negative effect and internalizing behavior problems. The participants were 203 adolescents (119 girls, 84 boys). The sample was taken from 10 different classrooms in two public high schools in Israel; 102 from 10th standard and 101 from 11th standard. The parental marital status had 181 married couples and 22 divorced. Initial analysis showed no significant difference between the two classes on the basis of study variables. Therefore, all further analyses were limited to two grade levels as one group. The tools used were, Peer -network loneliness and peer dyadic loneliness scale (PNCLS; Hoza et al, 2000)-16 item scale, affect scale (Moos, Cronkite, Billings & Finney, 1987), 28 item two factor scale, YSR-youth self-report version for age 11-18 (Achenbach, 1991)-112 items. Questionnaires completed by adolescents with disabilities were excluded from the sample. Two statistical analyses were conducted before the cluster analysis. Chi square tests were conducted to find out individual's sex differences. To identify the internal validity, Manova was conducted. Other methods as TukeyHsd and Scheffe were used.

Updegraff, McHale, Crouter and Kupanoff (2001) studied the role of parents' direct involvement in adolescents' peer relationships and to examine the links between parents' involvement and qualities of adolescents' friendship and peer experiences. The

sample size taken was 187 students .The data was collected through home visits and telephonic interviews. The details were collected through the reports of activities, parents' knowledge about adolescent peer experience and the time spent with adolescents. Findings showed that mothers knew more about their peer relationships than fathers. Mothers with daughters had also more peer oriented activities.

Studies related to attachment to peers:

Lieberman, Doyle, Dorothy Markiewicz (1999) conducted a study on developmental differences in dimensions of parental availability and child dependency on parents in adolescence and peer relations. The sample size taken was 267 students .The findings showed that children's perceptions of mother's availability and perception of father's availability was not influenced by age. Dependency on parents decreased with age .Positive friendship qualities and lack of conflicts with friends depended on parental attachment. Good relationship with fathers showed lower conflict with friends in boys .Findings showed that the quality of parent child relationship influences the quality of children's close peer relations.

Objectives Of The Study:

The present study was undertaken with the following major objectives:

- To study the loneliness, peer & parental attachment.
- To measure the relationship between loneliness and peer and parental attachment.
- To find out the level of loneliness among adolescents.
- To find out if there are differences among demographics and loneliness, parental attachment and peers with respect to gender and age of adolescents.

Variables Of The Study:

The following variables were selected for the study:

- **Dependent variable**---. Loneliness
- **Independent variable**----Peer & parental attachment
- **Biographical variables**--a. Age b. Sexc. Type of institutions

Hypotheses:

Correlation Analysis:

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between total Loneliness and Mothers' relationship, loneliness and fathers' relationship, loneliness and close friends' relationship of students belonging to Government institution.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between total Loneliness and Mothers' relationship, loneliness and fathers' relationship, loneliness and

close friends' relationship of students belonging to private unaided institution.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between total Loneliness and Mothers' relationship, loneliness and fathers' relationship ,loneliness and close friends' relationship of students belonging to private aided institution.

Hypothesis 4:There is no significant relationship between parental attachment Mothers' relationship and Parental Attachment fathers' relationship, Parental Attachment Mothers' relationship and close friends' relationship, Parental Attachment fathers' relationship and close friends(peer) relationship of pre-university college students.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant relationship between Parental Attachment Mothers' relationship and Parental attachment fathers' relationship, Parental Attachment Mothers' relationship and close friends' relationship, Parental Attachment fathers' relationship and close friends' relationship of male students.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant relationship between Mothers' attachment and fathers' relationship, Mothers' relationship and close friends' relationship, fathers' relationship and close friends' relationship of female students.

Hypothesis 7: There is no significant relationship between Mothers' relationship and fathers' relationship, Mothers' relationship and close friends' relationship, fathers' relationship and close friends' relationship of students belonging to government institution.

Hypothesis 8: There is no significant relationship between Mothers' relationship and fathers' relationship, Mothers' relationship and close friends' relationship, fathers' relationship and close friends' relationship of students belonging to private aided institution.

Hypothesis 9: There is no significant relationship between Mothers' relationship and fathers' relationship, Mothers' relationship and close friends' relationship, fathers' relationship and close friends' relationship of students belonging to private unaided institution.

Regression Analysis:

Hypothesis 10:Healthy mother – child relationship, Insecurity, Dissatisfaction, Understanding Mother and Resentment scores of mothers' component would not be significant predictors of loneliness of students.

Differential Statistics:

Hypothesis 11: There is no significant difference in mean scores of Students' loneliness dimensions i.e., Meaningless relationships, Sense of isolation, Sense of attachment, and companionship between male and female pre-university college students.

Hypothesis 12: There is no significant difference in

mean scores of Students' parental attachment Mother's relationship dimensions i.e., Understanding Mother, Insecurity, Dissatisfaction and Resentment between male and female pre-university college students.

Hypothesis 13 : There is no significant difference in mean scores of Students' Father's relationship dimensions i.e., Caring Father, Dependence on the Father, Insecurity and Dissatisfaction between male and female pre-university college students.

Hypothesis 14: There is no significant difference in mean scores of Students' close friends' attachment dimensions i.e., Healthy Peer Relationship, Sharing thoughts, Perplexed and Insecure Relationship between male and female pre-university college students.

ANOVA

Hypothesis 15: There is no significant difference in mean scores Meaningless relationships of Loneliness dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Meaningless relationships score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 16: There is no significant difference in mean scores Sense of isolation of Loneliness dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Sense of isolation score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 17: There is no significant difference in mean scores Sense of attachment of loneliness dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Sense of attachment score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 18: There is no significant difference in mean Companionship scores of loneliness dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of companionship score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 19: There is no significant difference in mean scores Understanding Mother Responsibility score of parental attachment dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Understanding Mother significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 20: There is no significant difference in mean scores Insecurity of Parental Attachment dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Insecurity

score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 21: There is no significant difference in mean scores Dissatisfaction of Mothers' Responsibility of Parental Attachment dimension among students of types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Dissatisfaction score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 22: There is no significant difference in mean scores Resentment Mothers' Responsibility of Parental Attachment dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 23: There is no significant difference in mean scores Caring Father of Parental Attachment dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Caring Father score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 24: There is no significant difference in mean Dependence on the father score of parental Attachment dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Dependence on the Father score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 25: There is no significant difference in mean scores Insecurity of parentalattachment-Fathers' Responsibility dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Insecurity of parental attachment -Fathers' Responsibility score significantly differs between Government college students and private aided and private un-aided and so on.

Hypothesis 26: There is no significant difference in mean Dissatisfaction scores Responsibility of parental attachment fathers' responsibility dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Commitment score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 27: There is no significant difference in mean scores sharing thoughts parental attachment fathers' responsibility dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of sharing thoughts score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 28: There is no significant difference in mean perplexed score of Parental Attachment fathers' responsibility dimension among students of three

types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of perplexed score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 29: There is no significant difference in mean scores Healthy Peer relationship of parental attachment close friends dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Healthy Peer relationship score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 30: There is no significant difference in mean Insecure Relationship scores of parental attachment-close friends' Responsibility dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Insecure Relationship score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 31: There is no significant difference in mean scores Insecurity of Mothers' Responsibility dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Insecurity score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 32: There is no significant difference in mean scores Dissatisfaction of Mothers' Responsibility dimension among students of types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Dissatisfaction score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 33: There is no significant difference in mean scores Understanding Mother Responsibility score of attachment dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Understanding Motherscore significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 34: There is no significant difference in mean scores Resentment Mothers' Responsibility of Parental Attachment dimension among students of three types of institutions. The mean score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 35: There is no significant difference in mean scores Caring Father of Parental Attachment dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Caring Father score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 36: There is no significant difference in mean Dependence on the father score of Parental

Attachment dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Dependence on the Father score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 37: There is no significant difference in mean scores Insecurity of Parental Attachment-Fathers' Responsibility dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Insecurity-Fathers'Responsibility score significantly differs between Government college students and private aided and private un-aided and so on.

Hypothesis 38: There is no significant difference in mean Dissatisfaction scores Responsibility of fathers' responsibility dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Commitment score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 39: There is no significant difference in mean scores sharing thoughts, fathers'responsibility dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of sharing thoughts score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 40: There is no significant difference in mean perplexed score of fathers' responsibility dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of perplexed score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 41: There is no significant difference in mean scores Healthy Peer relationship of close friends dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Healthy Peer relationship score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Hypothesis 42: There is no significant difference in mean Insecure Relationship scores of -close friends' Responsibility dimension among students of three types of institutions. In a sense, the mean score of Insecure Relationship score significantly differs between Government and private aided and private un-aided college students and so on.

Final Sample: The population of the study consists of all PUC students studying in various colleges of Bangalore city namely private aided, private unaided and government colleges. The sample has given equal representation to the sexes namely male and female students.

Sampling Procedure: The population taken is 1 Lakh P.U students from Bangalore urban, (north and

south); (statistics taken from Karnataka P.U.E board) PUC 1 AND PUC 2 students of private colleges of Bangalore city. The sample size was 600 students, 200 each from aided, unaided and P.U colleges of Bangalore. This sample represents 5% of the population. The sampling technique used was stratified random sampling.

Findings: The data was collected on Loneliness (ULCA), Inventory of Parental and Peer Attachment (IPPA) – [Mother, Father and close friends relationship] have been analyzed using one-way, two way ANOVA, t-test and Karl Pearson’s correlation coefficient techniques using SPSS 13.0 version statistical software.

Table 1: Results of t-test between male and female students with respect to IPPA CLOSE FRIENDS’ responsibility scores

| Variable | N | Gender | Mean | SD | t-value | p-value |
|----------------------------------|-----|--------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Healthy Peer Relationship | 280 | Male | 55.47 | 11.02 | -7.552 | 0.000* |
| | 320 | Female | 62.18 | 10.67 | | |
| Sharing thoughts | 280 | Male | 15.86 | 4.43 | -1.134 | 0.257 |
| | 320 | Female | 16.30 | 4.86 | | |
| Perplexed | 280 | Male | 7.42 | 2.06 | -4.901 | 0.031* |
| | 320 | Female | 8.21 | 1.89 | | |
| Insecure Relationship | 280 | Male | 6.21 | 1.84 | -1.524 | 0.128 |
| | 320 | Female | 6.46 | 2.16 | | |
| Total | 280 | Male | 84.95 | 14.18 | -7.052 | 0.000* |
| | 320 | Female | 93.14 | 14.19 | | |

* Significance at 5 % level

Table 2: Results of t-test between male and female students with respect to dimensions of Loneliness scores

| Variable | N | Gender | Mean | SD | t-value | p-value |
|----------------------------------|-----|--------|-------|------|---------|---------|
| Meaningless relationships | 280 | Male | 12.38 | 3.09 | -3.487 | 0.001* |
| | 320 | Female | 11.48 | 3.23 | | |
| Sense of isolation | 280 | Male | 12.14 | 2.97 | -0.111 | 0.912 |
| | 320 | Female | 12.17 | 2.86 | | |
| Sense of attachment | 280 | Male | 8.61 | 2.59 | 2.618 | 0.009* |
| | 320 | Female | 8.03 | 2.85 | | |
| companionship | 280 | Male | 8.83 | 2.60 | 1.519 | 0.129 |
| | 320 | Female | 8.51 | 2.54 | | |
| Total | 280 | Male | 41.96 | 7.45 | 2.899 | 0.004* |
| | 320 | Female | 40.18 | 7.57 | | |

*Significant at 5 % level

Table 3 - : Two-way ANOVA between type of institutions and gender for *Meaningless relationships* Score under ULCA

| | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|---------|
| Main Effect | | | | | |
| Between Institution | 73.833 | 2 | 36.917 | 3.743 | 0.024* |
| Between Gender | 120.42 | 1 | 120.424 | 12.209 | 0.001* |
| Interaction Effect | | | | | |
| Institution x Gender | 55.141 | 2 | 27.570 | 2.795 | 0.062** |
| Error | 5870.19 | 594 | | | |
| Total | 6119.59 | 599 | | | |

*Significant at 5 % level ** Significance at 10 % level

Results: The boys feel that their relationships are superficial as they don't feel attached to their peers. Girls are better than boys. The government college students do not feel connected to their friends. 2. Both boys and girls give importance to companionship. The private aided students feel more closer and friendly towards their peer group. 3. Girls feel more attached to their peers as compared to boys. Students of private aided institutions showed better attachment with others. 4. At some time or the other both boys and girls feel lonely. The students of govt. college feel lonelier. 5. The girls have a healthier relationship with their mothers as compared to boys. Sometimes, girls feel insecure as they feel that mothers cannot understand all their problems. 6. The study shows that govt. college students have a better relationship with their mothers. The students of private aided institutions are not satisfied with their mothers. 7. The students of private unaided institutions feel more dissatisfied with their mothers. 8. The girls feel that their mothers understand them better and they can share most of the things with them. They feel more closer to them as compared to their fathers. The students of private aided institutions feel that their mothers are understanding. Sometimes, the girls also feel resentment for not understanding them at times. 9. The results show that girls feel they have caring fathers as compared to boys. The private aided students and private unaided both are dependent on their fathers, whereas girls are more dependent on them. 10. Girls are also dissatisfied with their fathers for not understanding them fully and sometimes they feel insecure because of this. The private unaided college students are more dissatisfied with their fathers. 11. The girls have a better peer relationship as compared to boys. They feel free to discuss their feelings with their friends. Sometimes they also feel insecure even with their friends around them. 12. The students of private aided institutions have a more healthy relationship than their counterparts but sometimes they also feel insecure around them. The students of private unaided institutions share their feelings more, whereas govt. college students find it difficult to understand their friends. 13. The study shows that dissatisfaction may lead to loneliness among adolescents. A healthy peer relationship may reduce chances of loneliness. Similarly, if students can easily share their feelings with their friends will reduce loneliness in their lives.

Discussion: During adolescence, the views of the parents and children can differ. Open communication helps to strengthen the relationship whereas changes also take place in terms of autonomy and responsibility. Mothers have more frequent and close contacts with their children as

compared to fathers. Mothers and adolescents share household responsibilities, homework, and discipline and leisure time activities. (Montemayor & Brownlee) The families should be flexible and adaptable. Studies suggest that the adolescents have fewer conflicts with fathers as they interfere less and have greater respect for the adolescents' independence. The individuals become more independent and dependence on family decreases, friendships provide emotional support with close friends. Individuals with a considerable history of insecure attachments have been found to have persistent loneliness (Hojat and Borenstein, 1990; Rokach, 2000; Shaver and Hazan, 1989; Van Buskirk and Duke, 1991). Park Hurst and Hopmeyer (1999) show that relationships become important for adolescents especially for discussing personal issues, social and philosophical issues, and establishing intimacy. O'Neil and Parke (2000) and Rotenberg (1999b) state that parents can directly help adolescents with developing social skills through parental advice and social guidance. As adolescents learn to negotiate through the social circle, parental advice and experience may help adolescents learn social skills quicker and establish intimate relationships more easily. The disengaged family offers little or no advice (Parke, 2000; Rotenberg, 1999b). Parents provide opportunities for adolescents to have increased social contact having friendly relationships as inviting peers over for a birthday party, encouraging adolescents to go to social events, and for parents to be part of the community and knowing other parents which forms a greater social network. Hojat (1982) in his study found that adolescents whose parents were not a secure source of advice and thought that their parents did not understand them or devote enough time to them had significantly higher scores on loneliness than others whose parental relationships were more positive. The family system therefore is unable to assist the adolescent in resolving their loneliness.

Limitations: This study is limited to Bangalore urban only. Further studies can be done on Bangalore rural or another part of the country. The variables used in this study are loneliness and attachment. Other variables can also be used. This study is done on pre-university students (16-18 years) in this research. Another study can be conducted on different age group. The three types of institutions were covered in this research namely, government, private unaided, and private aided. Other researches can be conducted on adolescents of different institutions.

Implications/Recommendations: The present study emphasizes the relationship between loneliness, and attachment, both peer and parental. School interventions and counselling may help

students. Developing adolescent educational programs can be helpful to the adolescents. Counsellors, teachers, administrators, principals, wardens and social workers should be trained about knowledge and methods of teaching adolescents and their problems to assist adolescents. Adolescent

education should be included in Teacher education curricula. The society should also be more receptive towards adolescents and should try to help them if they are in trouble and should be more sensitive to their issues.

References:

1. Armsden, G. (1986). Attachment to parents and peers in late adolescence: Relationships to affective status, self-esteem, and coping with loss, threat and challenges. (Doctoral thesis, University of Washington, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47(4), October, 1986.
2. Armsden, G. C., and Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment: Relationships to well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and adolescence*, 16(5)427-454.
3. Armsden, G. C., McCauley, E., Greenberg, M.T.; Burke, P., and Mitchell, J. (1991). Parent and peer attachment in early adolescence depression. *Journal of Youth and adolescence*, 18,683-692
4. Awasthi, B. 1999, Agra University.
5. Allen, J.P., Moore, C., Kupermine, G., & Bell, K. (1998). Attachment and Adolescent Psychosocial Functioning, *Child Development*, October; 69(5), 1406-1419.
6. Adams, E. K, E. K., Chase-Lansdale, P. L. (2002). Home sweet home: Parental separations, residential moves, and adjustment problems in low-income adolescent girls. *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 792-805.
7. Bicakci, f. g. (2006). A study on the loneliness level of adolescents. *Journal of qafqaz university*, 140-146.
8. Brenaman, p. r. (1991). *Measures of depression and loneliness*. San diego: ca:academic
9. Barrocas, L. andrea. *Adolescent attachment to parents and peers*Working paper no.50, TheEmory centre for myth and ritual in American life.
10. Borden's,S.K&Abbott B. (2006) *Research designs and methods*, 6th edition, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.
11. Black, K. A., & McCartney, K. (1997). Adolescent females' security with parents predicts the quality of peer relations. *Social Development*, 6, 91-110.
12. Benson, M.J., McWey, L.M., & Ross, J.J. (2006). Parental attachment and peer relations in adolescence: A meta-analysis. *Research in Human Development*, 3(1), 33-43.
13. Beitel, M., & Cecero, J. J. (2003). Predicting psychological mindedness from personality style and attachment security. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 59, 163-172.
14. Bornstein, m. e.(2011). *Social and personality development*. New York: psychology press.
15. Buist, K. L., Dekovic, M. Meeus, W. H., & van Aken, M. A. G. (2004). Attachment in adolescence: A social relations model analysis. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19, 826-850.
16. Burge, D., Hammen, C., Davila, J., Daley, S.E., Paley, B., Lindberg, N., Herzberg, D., &
17. Rudolph, K.D. (1997). The relationship between attachment cognitions and psychological adjustment in late adolescent women. *Development and Psychopathology*, 9, 151-167 Cambridge University Press.
18. Capaldi, D. M., & Stoolmiller, M. (1999). Co-occurrence of conduct problems and depressive symptoms in early adolescent boys: III Prediction to young-adult development. *Development and Psychopathology*, 11, 59-84.
19. C.E.Cutrona, p. a. (1982,291-309). *Loneliness:a sourcebook of current theory,research and therapy*. new york: wiley.
20. Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: : Sage
21. Chipuer, H. M. (2001) Dyadic attachments and community connectedness: Links with youths' loneliness experiences. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 29, 429-446.
22. Chang Gung Journal of Humanities and social sciences (October 2009), 411-432
23. Cotterell, J. L. (1992). The relation of attachments and support to adolescent well-being and school adjustment. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7, 28-42.
24. Coleman, C.J & Broen, E.W *Abnormal psychology & Modern life*; 1972, Scott, fores man & company
25. Coleman, P. K. (2003). Perceptions of parent-child attachment, social self-efficacy, and peer relationships in middle childhood. *Infant and Child Development*, 12,351-368
26. Costa, N.M., & Weems, C.F. (2005). Maternal and child anxiety: Do attachment beliefs or children's perceptions of maternal control mediate their association? *Social Development*, 14(4), 574.

27. Corsini encyclopedia of psychology, 4th edition, vol.3: John Wiley & sons, Inc
28. Dekovic, M., & Meeus, W. (1997). Peer relations in adolescence: effects of parenting and adolescents' self-concept. *Journal of Adolescence*, 20, 163-176.
29. Ecs&Mcrel. (2004). A policymaker's primer on educational research: how to understand, evaluate & use it.
30. Essau, C. A. (2004). The Association between family factors and depressive disorders in adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33(5), 365-372.
31. Elkit, M. L. (2009). Prototypic features of loneliness in a stratified sample of adolescents. *Interpersona* 3, 85-110
32. Formoso, D. Gonzales, N. A., & Aiken, L. S. (2000) Family conflict and children's internalizing and externalizing behavior: Protective factors. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28, 175-199.
33. Gullone, E., & Robinson, K. (2005). The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment--Revised (IPPA-R) for Children: A Psychometric Investigation. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 12, 67-79.
34. Greenberg, M.T., Siegal, J., & Leitch, C. (1984). The nature and importance of attachment relationships to parents and peers during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 12(5), 373-386.
35. Gomez, R., & McLaren, S. (2007). The inter-relationships of mother and father attachment, self-esteem and aggression during late adolescence. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33(2), 160-169.
36. Haigler, V. F., Day, H. D., & Marhsall, D. D. (1995). Parental attachment and gender-role identity. *Sex Roles*, 33, 203-220. 5
37. Impact of Attachment Relationships. *Proceedings of the Australian Psychological Society's Psychology of Relationships Interest Group 4th Annual Conference, 150-155*. Melbourne, Australia: The Australian Psychological Society.
38. Icker, C. M. (1989). Loneliness: a theoretical review with implications for measurement. *Journal of social and personal relationships*, 93-128.
39. *International Journal of Instruction* July 2011, Vol.4, No.2
40. J. Craig, G. (1996, 7th edition). *Human development*. USA: Prentice Hall.
41. Johnson, L. N., Ketring, S. A., Abshire, C. (2003) The revised inventory of parent attachment: Measuring attachment in families. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 25, 333-349.
42. Kenny, M. E., Rice, K. G. (1995). Attachment to parents and adjustment in late adolescent college students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 23, 433-456.
43. Laible, D. J., Carlo, G., & Raffaelli, M. (2000). The differential relations of parent and peer attachment to adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29, 45-59.
44. Lyddon, W. J., Bradford, E., Nelson, J. P. (1993). Assessing adolescent and adult attachment: A review of current self-report measures. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 71, 390-395.
45. McCarthy, C. J., Moller, N. P., & Fouladi, R.T. (2001). Continued attachment to parents: Its relationship to affect regulation and perceived stress among college students. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 33, 198-213.
46. Meeus, W., Oosterwegel, A., & Vollebergh, W. (2002). Parental and peer attachment and identity development in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 25, 93-106.
47. Milne, L. C., & Lancaster, S. (2002) Predictors of depression in female adolescents. *Adolescence*, 36, 207-223.
48. Moon, M. J., Dekovic, M., & Meeus, W. H. J. (1999). Autonomy, attachment and psychosocial adjustment during adolescence: a double-edged sword. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22, 771-783.
49. McElhaney, K.B., Immese, A., Smith, F.D., & Allen, J.P. (2006). Attachment organization as a moderator of the link between friendship quality and adolescent delinquency. *Attachment and Human Development*, March; 8(1), 33-46.
50. M.Hojat. (1982). Psychometric characteristics of the ULCA loneliness scale: a study with Iranian college students. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 917-925.
51. Nickerson, A.B. & Nagle, R.J. (2005). Parent and peer attachment in late childhood and early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, May 1, 25(2), 223 - 249.
52. O'Koon, J. (1997). Attachment to parents and peers in late adolescence and their relationship with self-image. *Adolescence*, 32, 471-483
53. Orzolek-Kronner, C. (2002). The effect of attachment theory in the development of eating disorders: Can symptoms be proximity-seeking? *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 19, 421-435.
54. Papin, D.R. & Roggmen, L.A. (1992). Adolescent perceived attachment to parents in relation to competence, depression, and anxiety: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 12, 420-440.
55. Papalia, O. F. (2004, 9th edition). *Human development*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill.
56. Paterson, J. E., Field, J., Pryor, J. (1994). Adolescents' perceptions of their attachment

- relationships with their mothers, fathers, and friends. *Journal of Youth of Adolescence*, 23, 579-599.
57. Paterson, J., Pryor, J., Field, J. (1995). Adolescent attachment to parents and friends in relation to aspects of self-esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 24, 365-376.
58. Pavlidis, K., McCauley, E. (2001). Autonomy and relatedness in family interactions with depressed adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 29, 11-21.
59. Perlman, S. A. (1985). Gender differences in loneliness. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 63-74.
60. Rhodes, J. E., Grossman, J. B., & Resch, N. L. (2000). Agents of change: Pathways through which mentoring relationships influence adolescent' academic adjustment. *Child Development*, 71, 1662-1671.
61. Rice, K. G., & Mirzadeh, S. A. (2000). Perfectionism, attachment and adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47, 238-250.
62. Raja, S.N., McGee, R., & Stanton, W.R. (1992). Perceived attachments to parents and peers and psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 21, 471-485.
63. Rubin, K.H., Dwyer, K.M., Booth-LaForce, C. Kim, A.H., Burgess, K.B., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (2004). Attachment, friendship, and psychosocial functioning in early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, November 1, 24(4): 326 - 356.
64. R.M. Matteo, d. h. (1987). A short form measure of loneliness. *Journal of personality assessment*, 69-81.
65. Russel, D. (1982). *Loneliness :a source book of current theory, research and therapy*. New york: Wiley.
66. Russel, D. W. (1996). UCLA loneliness scale (version 3): reliability, validity and factor structure. *Journal of personality assessment*, 20-40.
67. Santrock. ,W.J, *Human development*. Brown & benchmark publishers, US
68. Schultheiss, D. E. P., & Blustein, D. L. (1994). Role of adolescent-parent relationships in college student development and adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41, 248-255.
69. Schwartz, J. P., & Buboltz, W. C. (2004). The Relationship between attachment to parents and psychological separation in college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45, 566-577.
70. Sermat, N. S. (1983). Measuring loneliness in different relationships. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 1038-1047.
71. Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Guterman, E., Abbott, C. B., & Dawud-Noursi, S. (2005). Adolescents' perceptions of attachments to their mothers and fathers in families with histories of domestic violence: A longitudinal perspective. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 29(8), 853-869.
72. Simon, K. J., Paternite, C. E., & Shore, C (2001). Quality of parent/adolescent attachment and aggression in young adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 21, 182-203. 6
73. Smetana, J. G., Crean, H. F., & Daddis, C. (2002). Family processes and problem behaviors in middle-class African American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 12, 275-304
74. Sund, A. M. & Wichstrom, L. (2002). Insecure attachment as a risk factor for future depressive symptoms in early adolescence. *Journal of the American*
75. Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 41, 1478-1485.
76. Vivona, J. M. (2000). Parental attachment styles of late adolescents: Qualities of attachment relationships and consequences for adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47, 316-329.
77. Woodward L.J., Fergusson D.M., & Belsky J. (2000) Timing of parental separation and attachment to parents in adolescence: Results of a prospective study from birth to age 16. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(1), 162-174.
78. Wilkinson, R. B., & Walford, W. A. (2001). Attachment and personality in the psychological health of adolescents, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 473-484
79. Weiss, R. (1973). *Loneliness: the experience of emotional and social isolation*. Cambridge MA: Mit press.
80. Yarcheski, N. (1990). The dimensionality of the ulca loneliness scale in early adolescents. *Research in nursing and health*, 45-52.

Pretty Chawla /Research scholar at Christ University/Bangalore/ prettysjc@gmail.com
 Dr. Kennedy Andrew Thomas/Dr. .KennedyAndrewThomas/Director/
 Total Quality Management System (TQMS)/Christ University/India/
 Phone 91-800-40129451/Mobile : 91+ 09343521435/ kennedy.andrew@christuniversity.in