

Attachment Styles, Quality of Friendship, And Psychological Capital in
Adolescents



BY
MARYUM ALTAF

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY
Center of Excellence
QUAID-I-AZAM UNIVERSITY
Islamabad, Pakistan

2018

**Attachment Styles, Quality of Friendship, and Psychological Capital
in Adolescents**

**By
Maryum Altaf**

The research report submitted in
Partial Fulfillment of the requirements of
The Degree of Masters of Science in Psychology

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal
National Institute of Psychology
Center of Excellence
Quaid-e-Azam University
Islamabad Pakistan
2018

Attachment Style, Quality of Friendship and Psychological Capital in Adolescents

By

Maryum Altaf

Approved By



(Ms. Raiha Aftab)
Supervisor



(Dr. Uzma Masroor)
External Examiner



(Prof. Dr. Anila Kamal)
Director, NIP

CERTIFICATE

Certified that M.Sc. Research Report on "Role of Attachment styles and quality of friendship in Psychological Capital of Adolescence" by Maryum Altaf has been approved for submission.



Supervisor

(Ms. Raiha Aftab)

DEDICATED TO

MY BELOVED PARENTS

**Attachment Styles, Quality of Friendship, and Psychological Capital
in Adolescents**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| List of tables | i |
| List of figures | iii |
| List of Appendices | iv |
| Acknowledgements | v |
| Abstract | vi |
| CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW | 3 |
| Psychological Capital | 3 |
| Self-efficacy | 4 |
| Optimism | 5 |
| Hope | 7 |
| Resilience | 8 |
| Attachment | 10 |
| Theoretical Perspective of Attachment | 12 |
| Friendship | 18 |
| Characteristics of Friendship | 19 |
| Adolescents Friendship | 22 |
| Theoretical linkage between variables | 23 |
| Rationale of the Study | 27 |
| CHAPTER III: METHOD | 28 |
| Objectives | 28 |
| Hypothesis | 28 |
| Operational definition | 28 |
| Sample | 30 |
| Instrument | 32 |
| Procedure | 33 |

| | |
|-----------------------|----|
| CHAPTER IV: RESULTS | 34 |
| CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION | 50 |
| References | 60 |
| Appendices | 71 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table # | Title | Pg.# |
|----------|--|------|
| Table 1 | Demographic of the study (N=270) | 31 |
| Table 2 | Alpha reliabilities and descriptive statistics for Psychological Capital, Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality (N=270) | 34 |
| Table 3 | Correlation of Psychological Capital , Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality (N=270) | 36 |
| Table 4 | Mean, standard deviation and One-Way ANOVA Analysis on attachment styles for Psychological Capital, Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality (N=270) | 37 |
| Table 5 | Mean, Standard Deviation, t-test Analysis on Gender for Psychological Capital (N=270) | 39 |
| Table 6 | Mean, standard deviation and One-Way ANOVA Analysis on Age for Psychological Capital (N=270) | 40 |
| Table 7 | Mean, standard deviation and One-Way ANOVA Analysis on Number of Close Friends for Psychological Capital (N=270) | 40 |
| Table 8 | Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Peer Attachment, Secure attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270) | 41 |
| Table 9 | Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Peer Attachment, fearful attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270) | 43 |
| Table 10 | Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Peer Attachment, preoccupied attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270) | 44 |
| Table 11 | Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Peer Attachment, dismissing attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270) | 45 |
| Table 12 | Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Friendship Quality, Secure attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270) | 46 |
| Table 13 | Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Friendship Quality, Fearful attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270) | 47 |
| Table 14 | Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Friendship Quality, Preoccupied attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270) | 48 |

Table 15 Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Friendship Quality, 49
Dismissing attachment style on Psychological Capital
(N=270)

LIST OF FIGURE

| Figure # | Title | Page# |
|----------|---|-------|
| 1 | Two dimensional model of adult attachment | 16 |



LIST OF APPENDICES

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Appendix A | Informed Consent |
| Appendix B | Demographic Sheet |
| Appendix C | The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) |
| Appendix D | Inventory of parent and peer attachment (IPPA) |
| Appendix E | Friendship Quality Questionnaire-Friends Function |
| Appendix F | Psychological Capital Scale |

ACKNOWLEDEMENT

Praise is due to Almighty ALLAH, the Compassionate and the Merciful. Peace and blessings are on the brilliant light, the giver of good tidings and warnings, our master Muhammad and on His infallible household and the righteous companions. In total and absolute submission; I bow before Almighty Allah, for His explicit and implicit favors. That enabled me to peruse higher goals in life. Every success in my life comes from Heavens and every achievement I accomplish, comes from destiny. I have always received guidance and help when I needed that most. I thank you indeed my Lord.

I gratefully offer my greatest attitude to Miss Raiha Aftab, my supervisor, who has always been a source of great inspiration and a tower of light for me throughout the course of this study. It was her vision, precise understanding and scrupulous guidance that led my work to presentable form.

I am extremely thankful to my family, for their prayers, love and affection. Especially my Parents for their never ending support which motivated me throughout the task of completing the research work. I also extend my special thanks to my siblings Amna, Ayesha & Abdur-Rehman for their continuous moral support that served as a beacon for me. I am also thankful to all my class fellows and my dear friends for their encouragement and valuable suggestions.

It is the reality that without the support and help of all these people, this study would not have been possible.

Maryum Altaf

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to explore the relationship between attachment styles, friendship quality and psychological capital in adolescents. Moreover, different demographics variables like age, birth order, number of siblings, number of close friends, time spent with friends were also studied along the study variables. A sample of 300 students (aged 12-20) was selected belonging to different schools and colleges in Islamabad. Relationship Questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), Inventory of Parent and Peer attachment (Armesdon & Greenberg, 1987), McGill Friendship Questionnaire- Friendship Functions (Mendelson & Aboud, 2014) and Psychological Capital Scale (Afzal, 2013) were employed to measure the research variables. Alpha reliabilities were found to be .88 for Inventory of Parent & Peer Attachment, .90 for McGill Friendship Questionnaire and .87 for Psychological Capital scale. Results of the study showed that Peer attachment, secure attachment style, fearful attachment style, age, no of close friends significantly predict Psychological capital [$R^2 = .165$, $R^2 = .168$]. Furthermore, Friendship Quality, secure attachment style, fearful attachment style, age, no of close friends significantly predict Psychological capital [$R^2 = .133$, $R^2 = .142$]. Correlation analysis showed that peer attachment, friendship quality and psychological capital have significant positive relationship with ($r = .264^{**}$) for Psychological Capital and Peer Attachment, ($r = .201^{**}$) for Psychological Capital and Friendship Quality and ($r = .711^{**}$) for Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality. It was also hypothesized that there will be a significant difference on Psychological Capital, Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality across different attachment styles. Results show that there is a statistically significant difference on attachment styles for Psychological Capital, Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality. However, hope show non-significant difference.

INTRODUCTION

Psychological capital is defined as a meaningful and progressive change within individual by incorporating high self-efficacy, hope, resilience and optimism (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). The aim of psychological capital is to bring change in lives of general population in order to lead a more creative and meaningful life and acknowledge their potential abilities. It helps in channeling a dialogue within the individual about what areas are lacking in their lives and what is good about them and how much they are capable of. Specifically it emphasizes on one's strengths and well-being rather than looking into flaws and malfunctioning of individual. In addition to focusing on positive thinking and positive emotions, psychological capital especially tries to recognize the factors that enable individuals and groups to succeed and flourish and of course to be happy. The current research is an attempt study how such processes fare with respect to adolescents in Pakistan.

In the process of focusing on individual strengths, friendship seems to play a significant role by assisting people to cope with unusual happenings. As children transition to adolescents, they become autonomous, self-sufficient and are more concerned with developing personality. Peer relationships play a significant role in their lives. Good quality friendship provide them with companionship, support, and a sense of belonging. They encourage or reinforce healthy behaviors, push them toward academic and sports-related goals, making them more successful and as supported by literature, positive friendship provides the basis for later successful adult relationships including romantic relationships and life satisfaction. Adolescents share a lot with and copy a great deal from their friends. The solid network of friends provides adolescents with encouragement and social skills, teach them how to act in social situations thus bringing them up well for the future life.

Similarly early attachment styles also play a significant role in adolescent's life. Secure relationships with parent's influences personality characteristics throughout childhood and adolescence, including emotional health, self- esteem, self- confidence, positive affect, ego resiliency, social competence and interactions with peers, teachers, romantic partners, and others. These secure attachment styles predict a more positive



relationship maintenance in future which feeds into the adolescent's psychological capital.

In the previous researches, psychological capital construct has been widely studied in organizational settings where it was investigated how work productivity of employees can be increased through positive constructs. However, the present study has broadened its inquiry to study how attachment with peers and being in a company of good friends help in shaping high psychological capital and how they help in preparing them for a good future. In addition to this, present study has used the version of psychological capital scale which was developed by Afzal (2013) specifically for adolescent's sample.

So all the three variables used in the present study have an implied association with each other and the current study will show the role of different attachment styles, peers attachment and friendship quality in contributing optimal functioning and high psychological capital in adolescents. While understanding these constructs, it is necessary to get familiar with them first. So grasping the constructs, a brief literature of all the variables has been given.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Psychological Capital

In the research of psychology, during past several years, knowledge about positive psychological traits, personality strengths and virtues, qualities and principles that are followed by many societies and cultures has increased to a much larger extent. As positive psychological traits are very stable in an individual's life, rather than through short-lived events, they can serve as a resilient basis for the development of more temporary states. For example, hope changes and progress with the passage of time as it possess certain state like characteristics but it also has stable trait-like basis that can enhance or decrease the level of an individual's situational hope. Constant motivation and drive to increase state hope can ultimately results in building trait hope over time and across different circumstances (Youssef, & Luthans, 2007).

Snyder and Lopez (2005) presented another classification. According to them positive psychological approaches can be conceptualize and classify as emotion focused (e.g., emotional comfort and well-being), intellectual focused (e.g., self-ability, aims and pathways, knowledge), self-based (e.g., reality, honesty, modesty), interpersonal (e.g., tolerance, appreciation, sympathy), biological (e.g., hardiness), and coping approaches (e.g., absurdity, thought reflection, sanctity). This system of classification is also in parallel with current uses of positive psychology to the organization settings.

Psychological Capital goes far away from (what you knows) and (whom you knows) in social network and is more focused on (who you are) and more specifically (what you are in future) i.e., emerging one's real self to become the possible self. Basically Psychological Capital is defined as follows: One's positive psychological state of growth that is described by (1) to build confidence (self-efficacy) and determination to prosper in different situations, (2) having positive attitude (optimism) about achieving goals in present and in future, (3) focused towards aims and ambitions, and when necessary, generate alternative paths towards objectives (hope) to achieve success, and (4) sustaining and bouncing back when overwhelmed with problems and life challenges (resiliency) to achieve goals and success (Luthans et al., 2007). So

psychological capital is basically composed of four psychological components, self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience.

Self-efficacy. The idea of self-efficacy was given by Bandura (2002), he defines self-efficacy as individual belief and confidence in his or her abilities towards particular action or work to achieve specific goals. High objectives are set by individuals who have higher self-efficacy, they put more energy and are determined towards their aims and ambitions and attempt again and again when face hurdles and obstacles across life events. According to Stajkovic and Luthans (1998), self-efficacy is defined as a trust in oneself that one can accomplish challenging tasks. Individuals with high self-efficacy are more likely to prosper. Mastery experiences, indirect learning, social influence and physical and psychological readiness are the four foundations of self-efficacy (Bandura, 2002).

Basically self-efficacy principles are related with constructive perceptions. Self-efficacious individuals are self-motivated and it also relates with high enthusiasm, confidence and self-assurance (Luthans et al., 2007). According to Bandura (1999), self-efficacy is not a trait that is present in one individual and is absent in another, rather than he suggested that anyone, irrespective of their previous or present circumstances, has the capability of strengthening their self-efficacy. Based on five features, self-efficacious individuals can be distinguished from others. They have tremendous ambitions, welcome challenges and hardships, highly self-motivated, are determined to achieve aims and keep on working hard even in harsh circumstances (Herbert, 2011).

Antecedents of self-efficacy. Comprehensive knowledge, indirect learning, encouragement by society, physical and psychological readiness are the four types of sources of self-efficacy.

Mastery experiences or performance attainments. The major and primary foundation of self-efficacy is comprehensive knowledge. The main influencing thing in increasing self-efficacy is to have direct experience of mastery. Achieving victory, for example in mastering a particular chore or having good grip on that particular task, will automatically build self-confidence in that area whereas efficacy belief would demoralize by failure. To have high self-efficacy belief, it is important to have knowledge and determination in facing hurdles.

Vicarious experience or modeling. Another foundation of self-efficacy is indirect learning. It arises from our thinking about people in our surroundings, particularly those people who are living examples. When we see achievements of people like us, their continuous determination behind their success, would elevate our self-confidence and belief that we also have those abilities which are mandatory for victory in that particular field.

Verbal/Social encouragement. First two approaches are more important in increasing self-efficacy as compared to social persuasion and simply sometimes it is categorized as can-do attitude. Influential and persuasive people in our lives such as parents, instructors, managers or coaches can strengthen and elevate our self confidence that we have the courage to perform such tasks which take us to our set goals and success. We hold the abilities to control over certain activities, means that we put in the energy to attain our goal and withstand by any hardships and obstacles that emerges in the way to success.

Physiological and psychological arousal. According to Chowdry, Endres, and Lanis (2002), physiological states differs across spheres that is why physiological arousal play a minimum role to determine self-efficacy. Most of the people judge their abilities through their physical and emotional feeling and have faith in what they feel. Negative and adverse feelings such as exhaustion, illness, depression, anxiety will disturb self-efficacy (F. Luthans, K. Luthans, & B. Luthans C.,2004). Although the self-efficacy is effected by negative feelings but is effected only when the problems are severe. So during decision making, such decisions should not be made that are regretted later on, for example (quitting a job, turning down a career move). Same is the case for positive feelings. One's good physical and mental states does not essentially pay a role in development of self-efficacy. For building self-efficacy both positive feelings and physical state are important in a good balance.

Imaginal Experiences. Psychologist James Maddux has given fifth source i.e. Imaginal experiences, the skills an individual have to imagine himself/herself as an efficient and victorious person in particular circumstances.

Optimism. According to Scheier and Carver (2006) "optimists are people who belief that everything that occurs in their life is good and pessimists are people who

assumes worse will occur” as optimists distinguish in the manner that they have more courage to face hurdles and obstacles and are more likely to achieve their goals by overcoming any challenge. Seligman (1998) defines an optimistic explanatory style as one that attributes positive events to personal, lasting and persistent causes, and negative events to external, temporary and situation specific ones. According to Martin, Sarrzon, Peterson & Famose, (2013), optimism is genuine and changeable. The ability to upgrade or improve performance for specific task or work is linked with optimistic approach. Optimism plays a fundamental role in the areas of psychological adjustment, academic and occupational fields. Achievement in particular task of an individual is absolutely associated with optimism (Shepperd, Maroto, & Pbert, 1996). This achievement is linked to individual to better coping skills of individual. This is highlighted in Park, Crocker, & Mickelson, 2004) study that individuals who is involved in conscious efforts can deal with any hardships in a better way. That is why optimistic people handle challenges and adversities of life more easily and quickly.

Self-regulation model provide basis for optimism regulation (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1992). People remain firm and put on their energies and efforts to face hurdle as far as they have strong belief in their success and are determined. When not clear about the set goals and doubts become severe, people give up their effort for those susceptible goals. Shepperd et al. (1996), found that individual’s success in different tasks is positively related with optimism. Optimistic people perform their tasks and jobs very well as compared to pessimist people across different phases of life. According to Wrosch and Sheier (2003), more determination to achieve the goal is seen in optimistic people as that of pessimist people. Optimistic people use problem focused coping strategies that helps them to face different challenges.

Antecedents of optimism. Tiger (1979) found that optimism is as essential as air for the survival. Researchers have identified antecedents of optimism such as opportunities to achieve goals, accessibility of alternatives, presence of external resources, having good fortune, increases self-esteem, internal locus of control, unrealistic evaluation of personal risk, impractical judgment of capability and uncertainty associated with possible outcomes (Mishel, 1988; Reker, & Wong, 2005; Scheier, & Carver, 2006).

Researchers have found some other antecedents of optimism as well as especially twin's related studies suggest, optimism is influenced by genetic factor (Plomin et al., 1992). Neuroticism and extraversion can be influenced genetically and both these traits are related with optimism. People's life is also influenced by early childhood experiences. Theories of attachment describe that some infants are more closed with their relationships while others are not and same is the case with adults (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). Snyder (1994) also confirms it with the research that safe and secure attachment and early childhood experiences may directly linked to optimism.

Hope. Snyder (2000) defined hope as a positive driving state of mind that involves the interaction of motivating sense of successful (a) agency (goal-directed) and (b) pathways (planning to meet goals. Basically hope is a trust or confidence in oneself in which one can find directions for particular goals and uses these pathways with great enthusiasm (Snyder, & Lopez, 2005). According to hope theory, hope is associated with three components: goals, pathway thoughts and agency thoughts. First, goals can be attain in a short time span or achieved in long period, that are uncertain and are very valuable or important. Second, pathways are linked to the directions and ways we follow to reach and attain certain goal and ability of individual to generate these goal-directed pathways. Last, agency refer to eagerness and will-power we took to reach to our desired goals (Snyder, Rand, & Sigmon, 2002). Avey, Luthans, & Jensen (2009) present two components of hope as willpower (firm determination of an individual towards certain goal) and way power thinking (one's ability to find out substitutes in way of success despite facing challenges).

Antecedents of hope. Negative or troublesome events are major antecedents of hope. The reason is that the consequences of this construct were mostly studied with alarming situation, difficult times and the diseases. There are various negative antecedents of hope. Hope is developed and elevated when there is difficult situation or stressful circumstances (Jacoby, 1993; Yancey, Greger, & Coburn, 1994). Certain catastrophic events like loss can also result in development of hope. According to Miller (1989) and Nowotny (1989) hope arises and elevated when an individual is facing worse circumstances in life.

Implicit theory (Dweck, 1996) also suggests an antecedent of hope. This theory tells us that every individual have self-confidence about their abilities and skills and this confidence and trust make them so determined towards their goals. Peterson, Gerhardt and Rode (2006) also believe that this supposition is valid because goal directions or pathways play a dynamic part in development and elevation of hope and hence significance of goal is also cleared by this theory.

Last antecedent oh hope is verbal cues. Positive and negative verbal cues can affect the development of hope. Positive verbal cues stimulates optimistic and hopeful thoughts which are most important to increase the motivation to achieve the goal. In the same manner level of hope is decreased by negative and adverse verbal cues (Herbert, 2011).

Park, Peterson, and Seligman (2006) found that those individuals who have optimistic approach towards their future have elevated level of hope in them. And due to this belief their self-confidence has increased to a much greater level which would ultimately help them and motivate them to reach towards desired goals. Hence it is safely concluded that individuals having elevated level of hope get more chances and ways to attain their goals which will ultimately assist them to gain a sense of fulfilment or satisfaction.

Resilience. The last component of psychological capital is resilience that is explained as (Luthans et al., 2007) the ability to withstand or bounce back from hardships, clash, disappointments or even positive circumstances, progress and greater responsibility. According to (Masten & Reed, 2002) resilience can be defined as how an individual make adjustment and adaption to stressful circumstances, misfortunes and bad happenings. Simply resilient people are internally motivated to overcome hardships and face challenges and risky situation effectively (Abbas & Raja, 2015). Positive beliefs provides foundation of resilient thinking and it makes an individual capable to perceive another way of thinking, that is flexible and reduce problematic situations and provides with capability to carry on with daily routine, despite long-term difficulties (Shabir, Baig, & Javed, 2014).

The concept of resilience has been linked with the ability to survive successfully in stressful environment, which generates long lasting positive healthy outcomes

(Jenkins, 2016). Resilience is learned and developable. Social support is one of its factors. This may comprise teachers, directors, parental involvement, peers etc. One's stress level is determined by how much social and emotional support they get from their social circle and to which extent an individual is open to change and extrovert. Research showed that students who are more resistant to stress and have resilient attitude are basically those who are communicative with others and have great social circle and this help them to attain more psychological health (Almedom, 2008).

Antecedents of resilience. Adversity is more significant antecedent of resilience. This variable distinguish resilience from personality. As Abbas and Raja (2015) pointed out that it is an individual's capability to overcome difficulties and adversities. Main characteristics of adversity are distraction, change and challenging task. These factors play significant role before the occurrence of resilience process. Several different factors are also associated with resilience which includes

Personal factor that help build resilience. Individual's own talents are very significant to cope up with stressful and harsh conditions and raise his or her capability to become resilient.

Positive social skills. Another factor that plays a vital role to enhance resilience is to be sociable and extrovert. It develops good sense of humor and elevates our confidence to communicate with others.

Problem-solving skills. This strategy is basically a capability possess by an individual to ponder upon things before showing reaction and giving feedback to a certain element. The major aspect of problem solving skill is to find substitute ways and evaluating the effectiveness of consequences. In this process, social support may also assist establish resilience.

Secure feelings. Sense of safety, feeling of self-importance and self-identification are dynamic antecedents of resilience. By possessing these feelings, one can distance himself/herself through unpleasant circumstances.

Thus the presence of resilience is very important to assist individuals in building up their strength from sufferings or personal hindrances when they occur (Avey et al., 2009).

Attachment

The concept of attachment is explained in several ways but something which is common in all definitions is that, for an individual's growth attachment is the fundamental key. John Bowlby is generally considered as father of attachment theory. He dedicated himself doing wide range study on the idea of attachment, and illustrated it as an emotional and enduring relation between two individuals (Bowlby, 1977). Papalia and Feldman (1999) explain it as mutual, persistent affiliation between child and caretaker, each of whom plays significant role in this bonding. Individual development at later stages depends upon the quality and effectiveness of attachment.

According to Bowlby there are four features of attachment (i) Safe Heaven, when the child is feeling scared or frightened, he or she can come back to the caretaker or guardian for relief and calming (ii) Secure Base, a safe, trustworthy and reliable platform is given to the child by caretaker to discover the nature and universe (iii) Proximity maintenance, the child struggles to stay close the guardian, to feel the child secure (iv) Separation distress: The child will be worried, stressed out and disturbed when taken away from the caretaker (Bowlby, 1988).

Bowlby's theory on attachment is in parallel with the structural concept of attachment, that primary knowledge gained by infants in perspective of their relationship with their parents or caretaker will continue to effect growth of infants in their other relationships as well (Weinfield, & Sroufe, 2000). However, in this current era, attachment has been redefine that comprises all the important bonding and relationships throughout the entire life comprising those with peers and spouses (Armsden, & Greenberg, 1987; Mikulincer, & Shaver, 2005).

Adolescence is a significant period of change due to intellectual, biological and social development that happens during this time frame (Eisenberg, & Fabes, 1997). The way the adolescents successfully direct the course of attachment and those who do not depends on the quality of relationship they have with their parents and friends. Strong associations with companions is directly related to self-confidence, elevated levels of perceptive taking and voluntary behavior (Azmitia, & Perlmutter, 1989) and reduced possibility of emotional and developmental problems.



Attachment theory provides a significant context regarding how development of peer bonding occurs in adolescent phase and in later stages. An increasing knowledge in recent times has revealed that peers as attachment figures may be persuasive bases of social and emotional support. While the primary and foremost attachment interactions are made with parents, individuals can also have made long term relationships with the people outside their family across life span (Cassidy, & Shaver, 2008).

The probability that peers may be as more persuasive as attachment figures in adolescence is present in various researches, which has proposed that adolescents depend on their companions more frequently, than parents for their support and guidance (Furman, & Buhrmester, 1992). This increase dependence on peers for social and emotional support involve aspects that includes an adolescent's increasing need for independency, concerns and mutual interests which are easily shared between peers due to same comfort zone, and improvement in intellectual level, which in turn encourage them to raise their confidence level and sense of self- examination.

A well-known context is present in research on adolescents that pays attention on the attachment features of non-familiar peer bonding (Armsden, & Greenberg, 1987; Laible, 2007). A prominent contribution has been provided by Armsden and Greenberg (1987) which hypothesized that the internal working model of attachment figures may be selected by evaluating (1) the optimistic intellectual experience of trust and reliance in the availability and awareness of attachment figures, and (2) the negative emotional experiences of annoyance and frustration occurring from neglecting attachment figures. Most importantly, Armsden and Greenberg (1987) suggested to study both adolescent parent and peer attachment concentrating on three dimensions: (1) Trust, related to the adolescent's belief that parents and peers recognize and respect their requirements and wishes; (2) Communication, associated with adolescents' thinking that parents and peers are sensitive and responsive to their physical and psychological conditions and to which level they are involved and do oral conversation with them; and (3) Alienation, which mentions about adolescents' feelings of isolation, annoyance, and experienced separation with parents and peers. Individuals who described their close bonding with elevated level of trust, communication and low level of isolation/alienation could be categorized as individuals with secure basis, while those were categorized as low

security individuals who defined their peer relationships with low level of trust, communication and elevated level of alienation.

Theoretical Perspective on Attachment Styles

A number of attempts have been made to account for the development of attachment styles. The general distinctions in explanation have followed theoretical differences associated with psychoanalysis, social learning theory, cognitive theory, learning theory and evolutionary considerations with a primary focus on origins of attachment styles.

Psychoanalytic Perspective. According to psychoanalytic theory, attachment is an outgrowth or secondary development of oral primary drive gratification (Cohen, 1976). Freud (1983) traced the origins of attachment with its association with the hunger drive, where the mother becomes a source of pleasure through oral gratification and gradually the baby comes to associate the pleasure and satisfaction with her. As the child's primitive needs are met during the oral stage, bonds of attachment strengthen and mother is recognized as a love object. Therefore according to psychoanalytic perspective, the role of parents in care taking functions, which are essential for the survival of child is very important in attachment formation.

Attachment is perceived as an emotional relationship that is shaped by the Freudian concept of instinctual psychic energy. During the child psychosexual stages of development, this energy is directed towards the mother because she is perceived as a source of pleasure and satisfaction. Freud (1983) stressed that the infant-mother relationship is an unalterable, lifetime bond serving as the primary and durable love object as an example for all other attachments.

Learning Perspective. Learning theory provides several explanations of the origin of attachment. In partial explanation, the interest of social learning theory has been founded upon drive-reduction theory. In addition, social learning theory has directed greater energy in consideration of dependency as a basic vehicle of social relations with little distinction drawn between dependency and attachment (Gewirtz, 1996).

Attachment in terms of learning criteria have been addressed by Bijou and Baer (1995). They argued that attachment may be defined as a behavioral consequences of contingency relationship established through patterns of mother infant interaction. As mother and infant create stimuli relative to each other and as such effects elicits attention leading to reinforcement; a union of reciprocal relationship is established. Response maintenance is subsequently a consequence of continued practice.

Evolutionary Perspective. A third approach to the study of attachment has been made through naturalistic descriptive accounts based upon ethological consideration. Observation among different species have provided evidence that indicates that primary behavior dispositions (clinging, following) in confluence with an accepting adult usually the mother serve to ensure the survival of young offspring by the creation of systems of reciprocal interchange shortly following birth. Extrapolating from these findings, Bowlby (1969) and Ainsworth (1979) have argued that there exist an analogous and comparably significant relationship focused on the human level in terms of attachment phenomenon.

According to this position, each species incorporate a distinct set of appropriate behaviors, relative to the survival of its young, based upon structural and adaptive evolution of the group in question. These species-specific responses, which appear as a part of the endowed repertoire of the young organism, became evident at receptive periods in early development of the offspring in order to bind the young to its caretaking agent, among most species, such behaviors appear relatively early in life and are singular in expression. One such example would be clinging by certain class of subhuman primates.

John Bowlby's Attachment Theory

According to Bowlby (1969) the progression of social actions leading to attachment consist of four different phases that appears sequentially and possess independent identity. Behavioral distinctions characteristic of each phase, however, are not isolated, rather phases may overlap. Attachment during the first year of life follows a sequence of (1) indiscriminate responsiveness to people, (2) differentiated responsiveness to the mother but with continuing responsiveness to other people, (3) sharply defined attachment to mother with striking waning of indiscriminate

friendliness, concluding with (4) a stage of affection to one or more similar figures other than mother.

As infants leaves the third phase of exclusive association with his mother, he rapidly extends supplementary social ties. This capacity for generalization is significant and immediate, and possible long range, social development. In the near term it allows for expanded social learning opportunities via increased social contacts whereas overtime such actions provide direction in the formation of the future social bonds, serving possible prototypical significance. According to Bowlby theory, children with passage of time adopt the things with caregivers in such a way that initial bonding comes to form an example for relationships in near future, exclusive of family. Different experiences leads to distinctive internally represented sets of expectations about (1) the attachment figures' accessibility and responsiveness, (2) an individual's capability to provoke conduct from the caregivers. The child's first interest is the reflection of other people; the second interest is the reflection of the self (Ainsworth, 1989; Bowlby, 1988).

Mary Ainsworth Theory

Psychologist mostly extended the work and research of Bowlby in the research of Ainsworth (1979). Her innovative research showed that attachment has significant effects on behavior and conduct. In the research, psychologist experienced the reaction of children among 12 to 18 months of age when they were isolated for some time and also when they were reunited again in certain situations (Ainsworth, 1979). On the basis of their responses, Ainsworth defined three main styles of attachment: secure, ambivalent/anxious-insecure and avoidant-insecure attachment which are as follow:

Secure attachment style. Infants with secure attachment to their parents or caregivers calm and relax very easily when anxious or disturbed. A secure feeling of attachment is established in infants when their caretaker react properly to their requirements and is responsive to their emotions. According to Bowlby (1980), an individual who has developed secure basis of attachment in themselves is likely to have internal working model of attachment figures as being accessible, helpful, and attentive.

Avoidant-insecure attachment style. Children with avoidant attachment style have low self-confidence and do not completely familiarize with their attachment figure

while exploring the environment. They are physically and mentally independent of their attachment figure. They do not talk or convey their feelings to the attachment figure when upset about something. Such children mostly have a caretaker who are not giving proper attention to them and are not concern about their requirements (Ainsworth, 1979). The attachment figure do not help them in their difficult situations and is absent at the time when they are having emotional stress.

Anxious/ambivalent-insecure attachment style. Children with anxious attachment style toward attachment figures elicit very insecure and dependent attitude in every situation but also reject the attachment figure when they engage in communication. Consequently, they face difficulties to interact with their surroundings and explore the world. When they are upset they are not easily calm and relax even by their attachment figure. This behavior mainly occurs because the primary caretaker does not respond to their necessities when required.

Shaver and Hazan Attachment Theory

Hazan and Shaver (1990) described six similarities between childhood and adolescent attachment. First, is that the quality of attachment is based on sharing, understanding and awareness of the attachment figure/caretaker. Second, individuals with secure attachment style are generally more satisfied, contented than individuals with insecure basis. Third, adult and infant both possess feeling of attachment to their attachment figure. Fourth, high level of stress and frustration occur in individual when separated from figure. Fifth, both adults and infants show high sensitivity to show their success and achievements to their attachment figure for appreciation. And lastly, both adult and infant attachment demands baby talk type communication in which they express their feelings and emotions.

Karen Attachment Theory

Karen (as cited in Yaseen, 2006) suggests that individual's behavior of attachment at one stage of life effect the behavior at later developmental stage. Her study about attachment theory put forward that mental representation provides a process of connection from childhood through the early adolescents. These internal cognitive framework maintains the connection between infant and adolescent attachment

measures by expectations, derived during childhood of the behavior of attachment figures and one's ability in social situation.

Bartholomew and Horowitz Attachment Theory

Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) have proposed four group attachment styles that are based on internal representation and cognitive framework of self and others as positive and negative. They are secure (positive self and others) preoccupied (negative self, positive others), dismissing (positive self, negative others) and fearful (negative self and others). The other positive model specifies degree to which others are generally expected to be available and compassionate thus the self-model is related with tendency to have or avoid intimacy in relationships. The four attachment patterns that are derived from a combination of two dimensions are given in figure below:

| Positive | Negative |
|---|---|
| <p>Secure comfortable with attachment figure and independent</p> | <p>Preoccupied preoccupied with relationships</p> |
| <p>Dismissing dismissing of closeness, codependent</p> | <p>Fearful fearful of intimacy socially avoidant</p> |

Figure 1. Two dimensional model of adult attachment (Fraley & Shaver,2004)

Secure attachment style. This style of attachment usually occurs when an individual has feeling of comfort and active interactions with their attachment figure. Strongly attached individuals are very affirmative about their opinions and others and have positive opinions about their relationships. They tend to have higher gratification and adjustment in their relationships. Securely attached individuals feel satisfied when they are independent of others and when in a close relationship with others. Secure and safe attachment basis is given by a caretaker who is mentally or physically present and appropriately responsive to his or her child's attachment behavior, and has the capability of modifying both his and her positive and negative feelings.

Preoccupied attachment style. Individuals with this style of attachment are very close to their attachment figure and seek their support, approval and attention in every situation. Their closeness sometimes elevated to such an extent that they become overly dependent on the attachment figure. People who are highly concerned with attachment figures tend to have less positive opinions about themselves. They may develop feeling of uneasiness that only lessens when they are in touch with the attachment figure. They are often uncertain about themselves and consider themselves responsible for the negligence of attachment figure. Such type of attachment style in individual results in elevated levels of expressiveness of their feelings, Emotional Dysregulation (ED), fear, and carelessness in their relationships.

Fearful attachment style. Individuals with anxiety or other shocks, such as sexual harassment in childhood and adolescence may often develop this type of attachment. They want mentally and physically safe and secure bonding, but due to their fear of trusting others they cannot get closer to them emotionally. On the other hand, they do not feel comfortable when they are emotionally close to someone. These diverse feelings and emotions create negative opinions about themselves and their attachments. They mostly consider themselves as worthless and highly sensitive, and they do not believe in intentions of their attachments. People with a fearful-avoidant attachment style are not very close to their attachment figure and usually hide their feelings. Because of this, they do not feel comfortable in expressing affection.

Dismissing attachment style. Individuals with this attachment style wants great level of independency. Due to aspiration for independence they avoid closeness with attachment figure. They consider themselves as independent and do not want to share their feelings to their close ones. They mostly refuse close bonding with attachment figure. Some may even do not give importance to the attachment figures. As expected, they are not very close with attachments, and do not think positive about them rather than considering themselves as more positive. Individuals with a dismissive-avoidant attachment style do not express their emotions easily and hide them. They can handle rejection by isolating themselves from their attachment figures or relationships.

Thus Attachment bonds are tremendously influential and are very productive or worthless in one's life, and like any influential system the outcomes can be very

beneficial when the system is ideal, well balanced and working efficiently, but very distorting if the system is not working to optimal level, irregular and associated with social and emotional consequences of a range of problems.

Friendship Quality

According to Wright (1984), friendship is a relationship which involves unrestricted communication where the members or the participants physically respond to each other. Hays (1988) defines that friendship is a relationship where two persons are dependent on each other over a period of time. Friendship facilitates the participants to achieve social emotional goals and involves variety of companionship, understanding, liking and mutual assistance. For many people, friendship is sometimes only to think and speak powerfully about different things. Most of the people classify the friendship in different categories such as school friends, childhood friends, neighbor's friends etc. Moreover, this friendship also varies in their relationship such as good friends, best friends, casual friends and work/social friendship.

Friendships are important facets of adolescence life where the friends have more influence than parents (Mounts, 2001). Friendship also serve as foundation for intimate relationships during which, the children develop social and emotional competence, experience good mutual understanding on reciprocal basis With regards to females, the supportive friendship is positively related to school achievements, self-confidence, psychological adjustment and success in subsequent relationship, whereas lack of supportive friendship leads to loneliness, depression, school problems and identity issues(Hartup, 2000; Sullivan, 2000).One of the most noticeable feature of early adolescent friendship is the development of intimacy and different studies highlight that during early adolescence, affection and intimacy becomes very important aspect for friendship within similar sex (Berndt, & Perry, 1990; Collins, & Repinski, 1994).

The importance of friendship across the life span can be assessed by examining how the children and adults feel the significance of their relationship as well as the social exchanges they have with each other. There is a probability that friends do not share their likes and dislikes but they support each other on reciprocal basis. According to (Hartup, & Stevens, 1997) good friends provides benefits and enhances the social capital who support each other to face different challenges and crises of the life. On the

contrary, the friendship with weak relationship may not be of any help or support during difficult time rather they become burden and tend to drain the resources of their friends and generates poor developmental outcomes.

According to Percival (2015), friendship comprises of three different categories. First type of friendship is based on utility where both the partners get benefit from each other. The second category of friendship is based on pleasure where both the people derive pleasant qualities from each other like fun, humor, good looks etc. The third type of friendship is based on goodness where the people appreciate and help each other for betterment and righteousness. Goodness is a long lasting quality. Friendship based on goodness is bonded for longer time as good friends always help and remain pleasant with each other.

Characteristics of Friendship

Most of the people are dependent upon friends and families in their lives. Friendship comprised of attraction on reciprocal basis where the individual equally share their social values. Friendship believes lot of expectations that best friends always spend more time than other friends, provide emotional support, and remain loyal and trustworthy to each other. Not everyone may have real friendship but these relationships are sought and valued from childhood to old age. Friendships are ranked among the things that matter most to children, adolescents, and adults (Klinger, 1977).

By adolescence stage, individual spend more time with their friends than to their parents as their friends become primary source of affection and disclosing of secrets and major source of deriving social and emotional support from their friends. (Wilkinson, 2008). According to Doherty and Freeney (2004), the formation of intimate adolescent friendships can be seen as part of the developmental extension of attachment networks that culminates in the transfer of attachment functions to peers and the development of secure base romantic relationships in adulthood.

Friendship is comprised of various traits such as positive and fair treatment, mutual respect, trust worthiness and fairness (Laursen, 1995). There are certain qualities of friendship which are explained as follows:

- (a) **Faithfulness.** It is the first characteristic of a close relationship and that is truthfulness and loyalty. It refers to that how much a person is faithful in his or her relationship and his/hers friends can rely on that person who is friend. This relationship is not harmful for any friend
- (b) **Respect.** Respect is the second important characteristic of friendship. To deal with another person means that as a person not making fun of their personality, feelings and thoughts. To respect someone else means that a person is important in society.
- (c) **Integrity.** It is a third characteristic of a good relationship. As it is said that in friendship or any other intimate relationship one is always serving you, but this thing is still a little ideal nowadays. True love is actually straightforward and standing in the friendship and not violating the relationship by lying and cheating intentionally.
- (d) **Edification.** Edification refers to learning, is fourth important issue of friendship. True friendship is about building up your companion not tearing them down. Edification is about helping another person become the best they can be. According to which, you must speak positive words that lift them. Any necessary criticism should be constructive in nature.
- (e) **Nearness.** It is another quality of good friendship. To be near means to be present in the other person's life. This shows the availability of a person in any relationship and to spend a lot of good time with their friend.
- (f) **Durability.** It is a sixth important factor of friendship which says that true friendship is long-lasting. And durability of friendship depends on how a person is dealing with her/his friends in a positive manner.
- (g) **Sacrificial.** Being sacrificial refers kind and sympathetic with your friend. it also means to prefer likes and dislikes of your friend and also prefer their opinions upon your own wishes. Friends who are having strong relationships with other friends often sacrifices for their friend's wishes are a symbol of good and strong positive relationships.
- (h) **Humor.** It is an eighth trait of friendship. True friendship includes laughter and the ability to laugh at one's own self.
- (i) **Inspirational.** It refers to friendship that motivates people to do an activity. It encourages the person and provide opportunities to learn many things and to perform certain good activities in their life.

- (j) **Personal.** The last characteristic of a true friendship is personal. It includes the sharing of almost everything with your friend. To be personal with one's friend shows their strong relationships with them.

According to Hartup (2000), friends help one another with logical reasoning, provide social and emotional support that is different from what non-friends provide, and also predict good outcomes across developmental stages. However, behavioral characteristics, reliability, consistency and attitudes of peers group is important to know in predicting consequences in adolescent's life across course of action. Some companions are helpful, extrovert and socially capable; others are not. Sometimes friends are trouble making. Information suggest that negative interaction within friendships account for more antisocial behavior, unstructured and unsupervised activities whereas positive interactions within friends result in positive relationship quality (Dishon, Andrews, & Crosby, 1995).

Friendship varies greatly and show a discrepancy from person to person and friend to friend (Hartup, 2000). These differences in friendship lies in certain qualities that one's friend possess. Some of the companions are helping, cheerful, ambitious and competent in facilitating interactions and communication, unlike others. At times, some friends causes annoyance and disapproval in others. Such variations in friendship is noticeable but often neglected. New evidence put forward that personal and social characteristics of one's friends is accounted for more outcome differences across life span (Dishon et al., 1995).

Quality of friendship varies in terms of content and certain course of actions (e.g. activities the two individual collectively perform), their productiveness (whether one's friend peacefully resolves unpleasant arguments and quarrels using effective negotiation skills or make use power assertion strategy), and their familiarity (e.g. when two friends spend time in each other company, they participate in activities that sometimes different to each other's, which ultimately results in more disclosing of self), their proportion (whether two friends influence each other in the same way or one friend is more authoritative than other), their personality traits (whether one feel secure and safe in one's friend company and provides you with social and emotional support

or friendship deprives support and involve minor and major conflicts) (Bowlby, 1969; Gottman, 1980).

Adolescents Friendship

According to Kagan and Coles (1972), friendship is given much importance during the period of early adolescence in most of the findings of psychological development. Adolescent is a period of rapid change beginning with the process of physical changes in body followed by biological changes which may be upsetting or distressing due to which they may turn to peers for seeking help in understanding and adjusting to them. These biological, cognitive and social changes during adolescents phase determined the features of their friendships. According to (Douvan & Adelson, 1966), friendship within same gender is much deeper and understanding particularly during early adolescence than any other age group, furthermore friendship at this time frame significantly impacts on the development of personality, social skills and social behavior.

Close friendships are good source of information for adolescences regarding their hidden potentials to utilize them efficiently, enhance self-confidence and self-worth which ultimately generates good outcomes in them across life span. Furthermore, positive friendship provides opportunities to practice skills interaction skills as well as opinions and suggestions about their particular behaviors and stay beside by them during the time of exploring of self and others (Mannarino, 1978). Frankel (1990) and Grotevant (1998) found out positive relationship between friendship support and adolescent's self-esteem, indicating close friendship plays a significant role in adolescent development.

According to Sullivan (2000), reciprocity, mutuality and intimacy are three important pillars that are new to adolescent friendship which includes increased kindness toward individual considered friends. Furthermore the increased sense of reciprocity cause adolescents to change their behavior in an attempt to achieve mutual satisfaction and decreases the adolescent's likelihood to seek advantages at the friend's expense. Mutuality, which is another pillar of friendship also involves shared success and achievement, praising to one another and encouraging them on failures, thus increases adolescent's self-confidence. Mutuality is therefore related to another pillar,

as identified by Sullivan (2000), of adolescent friendships, that of intimacy. Close friendship fulfils the need for intimacy in adolescents in a time when they are becoming less close to their early attachment figures (family) in an attempt to seek independence and explore their own-self.

According to Berndt (2002), interactions with peers and friendship relations occupy such a large place in the social life of adolescents because they relate with individuals who are finding themselves confronted with the same developmental realities: freedom of parental authority, beginnings of romantic attraction and concerns of one's personal identity. Friendship can not only gives vital life skills which helps shaping in personality tremendously but also do much more. For instance, good friendship quality are capable of sharpening minds, make discover our potentials, inspire to reach goals, advance our career and live a stress-free, longer and healthier life. Ledhingham and Reisman, have noted that the quality of relations maintained with peers during childhood and adolescence set up a good bases of later social and psychological problems as cited in Claes and Simard (1992).

Theoretical linkage between study Variables

Internal working models of attachment throughout childhood and adolescents are believed to influence the ways in which children and adolescents act in certain social situations involving peers. Specifically secure attachment style provides an individuals with the ability to meet the difficulties in a positive manner in developing and maintaining healthy peer relationships as well as to explore the social world around them (Carlson, Sroufe, & Egeland, 2004). In 2012 Seven and Ogelman carried out a research on relationship between attachment style and peer relationship of preschool children. The sample comprised of 30 children of age 10 from Denizili in which relational sampling technique was used. The study concluded that children with secure mother-child relationship showed more acceptance towards their peers whereas children with insecure relationship with their mothers exhibited more hostility, antisocial and hyperactive behavior in their peer relationships, were more fearful-anxious and being unfairly treated by their peers.

Findings on the studies on attachment styles and friends relationships during preadolescence and adolescence have revealed that secure attachment style is positively

related to quality of friendship as described by trust, intimacy and emotional support (Lieberman, Doyle, & Markeiwicz, 1999). In 2000 a study was conducted by Grabil and Kerns on attachment styles and closeness in friend relationships. The sample consisted of 600 college students. Findings supported the hypothesis that secure attached individuals positively correlated with intimacy. Individual with secure internal working model are more likely to disclose their feelings to their peers, respond positively when other disclose to them and are cared by others than individuals with insecure attachment style.

In 2000, Sullivan particularly focused on friendship and loneliness, giving attention to the importance of adolescents peer relationships as a means of avoiding the feelings of isolation and dissatisfaction. Asher and Jeffrey (1993) conducted study on peer group adjustment and feelings of isolation and social displeasure on a sample of 801 elementary school going children in United States. Results of the study showed that children friendship adjustment influences child feeling of isolation. It was found that children with high peer acceptance and best friendship were less lonely and socially dissatisfied as than children with low peer acceptance.

Attachments are the distinct patterns of behavior that attributes the ability to direct close association between acquaintances. These behavioral patterns assist individual to control their emotions as well as to seek out and accept social support when facing life challenges which is necessary mechanism underlying resilience. Jenkins (2016) conducted a study on the relationship between resilience, attachment pattern and emotional coping styles. A convenience sample of 266 participants participated. Results of the study showed that secure attachment and dismissive attachment style as well as the repressive coping style positively associated with resilience whereas fearful and preoccupied attachment styles are not.

Positive relationship with peers significantly influences on later adjustment and psychological well-being throughout life time as well as promote resilience by providing effective coping styles to manage life stressors and fostering belongingness. In 2016 Graber, Turner & Madill conducted a study on socio-economic at the risk British adolescents to examined whether high quality friendship promote psychological resilience in them. Sample consisted of 409 adolescents in which both girls and boys of age 11 to 19 years participated in the study and completed self-report measures of close

friendship quality, psychological resilience, social support, and other resources. Findings showed that there is a positive relationship between supportive friendship and resilience. It was found that seeking social and emotional support, supportive peers group, development of effective coping skills and reduce engagement in externalizing coping may facilitate the relationship between quality of friendship and resilience.

According to Bowlby (1988) individuals with secure attachment style possess greater ability and skills to understand and explore their surroundings. Within the framework of attachment measures, secure attachment by caregiver is important element in learning goal-directed behavior and thoughts because person's thinking of developing routes to goals and beliefs in achieving those goals are learned across all stages of life (Snyder et al., 1991). Social development plays a significant part in developing hope. It is believed that hopefulness is learned through communication and interaction with families and friends and is effected by human environment. That is, being hopeful or not, depends on how much adolescents interacts with others (Fletcher, Darling, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1995).

Healthy discussion among peers group play a significant part in one's vision and beliefs about the world thus contributing in directing one's life; these exchanging of ideas and thoughts with acquaintances and group members contribute to the formation of their world views, future life plans, developed deeper insight of self with optimistic vision of the future and the belief of recognizing future goals and dreams. Being accepted by friends reduces worries and anxieties in circumstances where adolescent is a beginner, therefore increases self-efficacy and subjective well-being (Rabagliatti, & Ciaviano, 2008).

According to (Caprara & Steca, 2005) adolescents with greater self-efficacy for close interactive relationships have more ways of generating favorable life events as compared to those adolescents who regard themselves as inefficacious and have less positive views of their social abilities. Such close and supportive relationships, in turn, develop high self-efficacy of adolescents and prepares them to deal with life stressors as caused by unpleasant life events such as being bullied or treated unfairly. In 2014, Fitzpatrick and Bussey conducted a study to examine the role of effectiveness of perceived friendship as a coping strategies against the negative effects of social victimization. A total of 1218 college students participated in the study. Findings

showed that the more adolescents have confidence in their perceived friendship self-efficacy, the less they would experience depression, anxiety and other externalizing symptoms as a result of social, emotional and psychological harm. Llorca, Richaud and Malonda (2017) conducted study on a relationship between peer relationships, academic self-efficacy and academic achievement. A total of 500 adolescents participated in the study. Result supported the hypothesis that adolescents peer attachment is positively related to academic self-efficacy.

According to the literature, adolescents who have healthy interpersonal relationships with their parents exhibit high self-confidence, have more ability of psychological adjustment, more efficiently face the problems and generate alternating ways for solution. (Amiri et al., 2013) conducted a study to find out relationship between attachment measures and self-efficacy beliefs with respect to gender. A total of three hundred and sixty nine students participated from different schools of Iran. Results showed that participants with secure attachment style have more self-confidence on their abilities then people with insecure-avoidant and insecure-ambivalent attachment styles. The findings further suggested that self-efficacious people are securely attached with attachment figures.

Early attachments set the stage for a child's development of dispositional optimism. A child with warm parents will likely have a secure attachment, which provides a secure base from which he or she may venture with confidence (Gillham, & Reivich, 2004; Snyder, 2000.) This basic trust instills in the child a sense that the world is a good place that can be understood, and therefore allows them to take risks and develop competence.

Social support plays a vital role in feeling hopeful and confident (optimistic) about the future. Optimism, in turn, promotes wellbeing, increases life satisfaction and decreases the risk of anxiety and depression. Symister and Friend (2003) conducted a study to examine the impact of social and problematic support on optimism and depression in patients with chronic illness as facilitated by self-esteem. A total of 86 renal disease patients who were at their last stage were assessed. Results showed that social support positively related to self-esteem which in turn increases optimism and reduces depression. However problematic support was negatively related to self-esteem and optimism.



Rationale of the Study

The current study has particularly selected adolescents sample because this is the time when they experience certain changes in their lives. They experience social interactions and subsequently seeks out to friends for their social and emotional support. According to Seligman (1998), despite the new technologies and facilities adolescents have high rates of pessimism, sadness and depression are getting higher, so studying Psychological capital will be helpful in the context of exploring positive outcomes in adolescents.

Positive social connection and early secure attachment with parent-caregivers in adolescent's life provides them with a sense of belonging, feeling of being worthy as well as prepares them in dealing with challenges and expect positive for the future success with full determination in spite of obstacles. Moving from high school to greater world and encounter new and more challenging situations in life ahead, thus developing high Psychological Capital will serve as a protection against the impact of unpleasant life experiences and ensure healthy development in future.

As it has been identified by the literature that early secure attachment styles provides adolescents with the ability to explore the social world, confidently and to meet the challenges. Similarly healthy peer relationships influence on later development, promote well-being and more adaptive ways of coping during certain situations.

Research on Psychological Capital is taking shape in its early stages by directing its attention to the importance of knowing the existing potential in individual to promote positive outcomes. Past researches have focused on problematic behaviors, academic problems, negative thoughts, malfunctioning, psychopathology as well as effect of negative life events on later development. Also Psychological capital have been studied with stress, burnout rate and employee's work productivity in organizational settings. So the current study will try to understand how this multiple construct, incorporated of hope, resilience optimism and self-efficacy gives better insight into one's strengths and their capabilities and leads to greater life satisfaction when studied with attachment styles, along with peer attachment and friendship quality in Pakistani context.

METHOD

Objectives

The current research examined the relationship between Attachment Styles, Friendship Quality and Psychological Capital in the life of adolescents. The main objectives of the present study were as follows.

1. To explore the construct of psychological capital in the life of adolescents.
2. To study attachment styles on Psychological Capital, Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality.
3. To study the predicting role of Peer Attachment, Friendship Quality, Attachment styles, age, birth order, number of close friends, no of siblings and time spent with friends on Psychological Capital.

Hypotheses

1. There will be a positive relationship between Psychological Capital and Friendship Quality.
2. There will be a positive relationship between Psychological Capital and Peer Attachment.
3. There will be a positive relationship between Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality.
4. There will be a significant difference on Psychological Capital, Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality across different Attachment styles.
5. Peer Attachment, Attachment styles will significantly predict Psychological Capital
6. Friendship Quality, Attachment styles will significantly predict Psychological Capital.

Operational definitions of Variables

Operational definitions of the variables in the study are as follows:

Attachment styles. Attachment is an emotional long-lasting bond between people across different stages of life (Ainsworth, 1989). According to Bowlby (1969), attachment in children is explained by certain behaviors such as getting close to significant figures when distressed and in danger. The present study measured attachment styles by Relationship Questionnaire which was developed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). The following types of attachment styles are:

Secure. Secure attachment style is characterized by feeling of safety, warmth and friendliness as well as sooth stress by supporting calm and create happiness.

Fearful. Fearful attachment style is characterized by the belief that the person is not good enough and worth important. They find difficult to rely on others and have negative view of themselves and for others. .

Preoccupied. Preoccupied attachment style is characterized by the feeling that other people do not get as close to them as they are close to others. They seek nearness but feel a sense of not being important in their relationships. They have more positive opinions for others and view themselves as less positive.

Dismissing. Dismissing attachment style indicates a sense of autonomy and are uncomfortable with intimacy. They view themselves as self-sufficient and prefer others not to depend on them. They are invulnerable to feelings associated with being close to significant others.

Peer attachment. Peer attachment is the belief that that one's peers will be available to their needs and stay beside them across time leading the individuals with opportunities to build their sense of self-worth (Wright, 1984). The present research aims to study the construct of Psychological Capital in the life of adolescents by assessing the extent of their positive and negative views of attachment bond with friends and associates.

Friendship Quality. According to Reisman (1985) friendship can be defined as strong bond of affiliation between individuals hold together by mutual caring, sharing of thoughts, interests and spending time in each other's company. In the present study high scores indicate high friendship quality and low scores indicate the person has low friendship quality.

Psychological Capital. Psychological capital is a multiple construct which included hope, self-efficacy, resilience and optimism (Luthans et al., 2007)

- *Hope.* Hope can be defined as strong beliefs towards goals and when required take on different paths to reach out those goals in order to be successful.
- *Self-efficacy.* Psychological capital defined self-efficacy as “having confidence (self-efficacy) and firm belief to accomplish challenging tasks effectively.
- *Resilience.* Resilience can be defined as ability of sustaining and bouncing back when overwhelmed with problems and adversity of live in order to be successful.
- *Optimism.* Optimism in psychological capital is defined as responding to problems with self-confidence and high personal ability about succeeding now and in the future

Sample

A sample of 300 students were contacted belonging to different schools and colleges of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. Both males and females participated, of age ranged between 12-20 years. In case of any confusion, respondents were assured to ask any questions. Random sampling technique has been conducted in the present study. However, after excluding extreme values, a total data of 270 individuals were left behind on which further analysis was done in current study.

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage of demographic variables, which includes age, gender, birth order, father and mother occupation, number of close friends and time spent together. Categories of friends have been specified in terms of number of close friends as Acquaintance (these friends have occasional contact and talk about general knowledge), Casual friends (these friends meet more frequently and share common interests) and best friends (these friends have mutual interests and life goals and work together to achieve those goals. They understand and are emotionally close to each other). Categories of time spent together have been specified in terms of number hours they spent together where less time means spending 2-3 hours, average time means spending 3-5 hours and maximum time means spending 5-7 hours.



Table 1

Demographic of the Study (N=270)

| Demographics | <i>f</i> | % |
|-----------------------------|----------|------|
| Age | | |
| 12-14 Early adolescent | 93 | 34.4 |
| 15-17 Middle adolescent | 93 | 34.4 |
| 18-20 Late adolescent | 84 | 31.1 |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 139 | 51.5 |
| Female | 131 | 48.5 |
| Birth order | | |
| The first born | 70 | 25.9 |
| The middle born | 78 | 28.9 |
| The last born | 56 | 20.7 |
| The only child | 65 | 22.8 |
| Father's occupation | | |
| Working | 230 | 85.2 |
| Nonworking | 40 | 14.8 |
| Mother's occupation | | |
| Working | 67 | 24.8 |
| Nonworking | 200 | 74.1 |
| No. of close friends | | |
| Acquaintance | 67 | 24.8 |
| Casual friends | 93 | 34.4 |
| Best friends | 108 | 40.0 |
| Time spent together | | |
| Less time | 91 | 34 |
| Average time | 105 | 39.2 |
| Maximum time | 72 | 26.7 |

Note. The categories shown in table have been developed for comparison and analysis

Instruments

Following instruments were used for the collection of data. Description of the scale used in the study are given below.

The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ). The Relationship Questionnaire was developed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). It is a self-report measure made up of short paragraphs, each describing different attachment pattern. Participants were asked to select one of a four style that best described them as secure, preoccupied, fearful-avoidant and dismissing avoidant attachment styles respectively. This helps in providing a profile of an individual's attachment feelings and insight of one self.

Peer attachment Scale. The current study used peer attachment scale to measure the adolescent's quality of attachment, they have with their peers. Inventory of parent and peer attachment (IPPA) was developed by Armesdon and Greenberg (1987) .It is self-report questionnaire. The scale has three measures i.e. father, mother and peer. Each measure or questionnaire has three subscales i.e. trust, communication and alienation comprised of 25 items in which 10 items of trust, 8 items of communication and 7 items of alienation included.

The current study has used the revised version of IPPA in which measure of peer attachment has been used. The scale is a 5 point Likert scale and responses were Almost never or never true=1, Not very often true=2, Sometimes true=3, Often true=4 and Almost always or always true=5. There are 7 negative items in total. Alpha reliability of peer attachment is .92, for peer trust $\alpha=.90$, peer communication $\alpha=.84$ and for peer alienation $\alpha=.81$ respectively.

Friendship Quality Questionnaire-Friends Function. The friendship quality questionnaire developed by Mendelson and Abound (2014). It is self-report questionnaire and measure the extent to which friends fulfill certain friendship functions. It has 6 subscales which includes stimulating companionship, intimacy, reliable alliance, help, self-validation and emotional security. The current study has used 4 subscales i.e. stimulating companionship, intimacy, reliable alliance and emotional security.

The scale is a 5 point Likert scale and responses were Never=0, Rarely=1, Once in a while=3, Fairly often=4 and Always=5. There are no reverse items. Alpha reliability of friendship quality questionnaires is .92, for stimulating companionship $\alpha=.91$, intimacy $\alpha=.94$, reliable alliance $\alpha=.95$, and emotional security $\alpha=.92$. High scores on the scale indicate high quality of friendship and low scores on scale indicate low quality of friendship

Psychological Capital Scale. Psychological capital scale was developed by Afzal (2013) and used to measure PsyCap among adolescents. The scale has 34 items which is divided into four subscales i.e. resilience, self-efficacy, hope and optimism. There are 13 items in resilience, 7 items in self-efficacy, 8 items in hope and 6 items in optimism. The scale is 4-point Likert scale and responses were Strongly disagree=1, Disagree=2, Agree=3 and Strongly agree=4. Alpha reliability of PsyCap is .87, for resilience $\alpha=.84$, self-efficacy $\alpha=.74$, hope $\alpha=.67$ and for optimism $\alpha=.68$. High scores on the scale means individual is high on PsyCap and low scores on scale means that individual is low on the specific construct.

Procedure

The data for the present research was collected from schools, colleges, and universities of twin cities of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. At first step, consent was obtained from principals and directors of different institutions. Also informed consent was obtained from the participants. Consent form was given to the participants to be signed before participated in the study and they were assured that their given information would be used only for academic purposes and that it would be kept confidential and anonymity would be maintained. The students were requested to respond to each item honestly and not to skip any item. No time limit was mentioned and questionnaires were completed and collected at the spot. At the end, the whole data was organized, summarized and analyzed with the help of software i.e. SPSS.

A total sample of 500 questionnaires were distributed and on the collection of 300 questionnaires, data collection was stopped. The response rate for the present research was thus 60%.

RESULTS

The present study took a sample of 300 individuals, in which data of 270 individuals was left behind after excluding extreme values. Missing values and errors were found out through descriptive statistics. To test the formulated hypothesis, a series of statistical analysis were carried out, for this purpose statistical package for social sciences (SPSS 18) was used to analyze the data. First of all, psychometric properties were computed, followed by correlation, *t*-test, ANOVA and hierarchical regression analysis to create results. However, only significant results have been shown. Analysis on birth order and time spent together across the categories were non-significant, thus it has not been reported.

Table 2

Alpha Reliabilities and Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Capital, Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality (N=270)

| Variables | No. of items | M | SD | α | Range | | Kurtosis | Skew |
|-------------|--------------|-------|-------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|-------|
| | | | | | Actual | Potential | | |
| PsyCap | 34 | 103.6 | 10.87 | .87 | 76-130 | 34-136 | -.277 | -.291 |
| Hope | 8 | 26.86 | 2.90 | .72 | 15-28 | 8-32 | -.062 | -.384 |
| Optimism | 6 | 17.55 | 2.47 | .70 | 8-24 | 6-24 | .828 | -.483 |
| Resilience | 13 | 39.21 | 5.22 | .81 | 24-52 | 13-52 | -.151 | -.286 |
| S-efficacy | 7 | 19.91 | 3.23 | .64 | 10-27 | 7-28 | -.222 | -.203 |
| PeerAtt | 25 | 98.00 | 11.67 | .88 | 63-121 | 25-125 | -.453 | -.315 |
| PeerTr | 10 | 40.6 | 5.88 | .84 | 18-50 | 10-50 | .240 | -.590 |
| PeerCom | 8 | 30.6 | 4.70 | .77 | 19-40 | 8-40 | -.212 | -.466 |
| PeerAln | 7 | 26.86 | 2.94 | .71 | 12-34 | 7-35 | -.704 | .042 |
| FriendshipQ | 20 | 66.21 | 9.39 | .90 | 41-80 | 0-80 | -.207 | -.615 |
| Stim.Com | 5 | 17.08 | 2.49 | .75 | 7-20 | 0-20 | .696 | -.895 |
| Intimacy | 5 | 15.74 | 3.41 | .82 | 3-20 | 0-20 | .657 | -.899 |
| Reliable.A | 5 | 17.13 | 2.89 | .81 | 6-20 | 0-20 | 1.19 | -1.16 |
| Emo.Sec | 5 | 16.25 | 2.84 | .73 | 5-20 | 0-20 | .241 | -.702 |

Note. PeerAtt= Peer Attachment Scale; PeerTr= peer trust; PeerCom=peer communication; PeerAln=peer alienation; FriendshipQ=Friendship Quality Questionnaire; Stim.Com=stimulating companionship; Emo.Sec=emotional security; Reliable.A=reliable alliance; PsyCap=psychological capital; S-efficacy=self-efficacy.

Table 2 shows alpha reliability coefficient of psychological capital, peer attachment, friendship quality, and their subscales. Reliability of psychological capital is $\alpha=.87$ and reliability of its subscales ranged from $\alpha=.64$ to $\alpha=.81$. Reliability of peer attachment is .88 and reliability of its subscales ranged from $\alpha=.71$ to $\alpha=.84$. Similarly reliability of friendship quality is $\alpha=.90$ and reliability of its subscales ranged from $\alpha=.73$ to $\alpha=.82$. Table indicates that all scales and subscales achieved good alpha levels. Furthermore the table also shows that all variables and their subscales are normally distributed.

Table 3 shows the correlation matrix computed for all variables and their subscales. Results indicated that Psychological Capital and its subscales have significant positive relationship with each other. Peer Attachment and its subscales have significant positive relationship with each other. Friendship Quality and its subscales have significant positive relationship with each other. Results also indicated that psychological capital and its subscales have significant positive relationship with Peer Attachment, Friendship Quality and their subscales. Peer Attachment and its subscales have significant positive relationship with psychological capital, Friendship Quality and their subscales. Furthermore, Friendship Quality and its subscales have significant positive relationship with psychological capital, Peer Attachment and their subscales.

Table 3

Pearson Correlation between Psychological Capital, Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality and Their Subscales (N=270)

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|----------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1.PsyCap | - | .57** | .53** | .49** | .37** | .26** | .21** | .29** | .17** | .20** | .25** | .19** | .28** | .21** |
| 2.Hope | | - | .36** | .43** | .55** | .14* | .13* | .17** | .12* | .15* | .17** | .15* | .15* | .16** |
| 3.Optimism | | | - | .56** | .45** | .34** | .31** | .34** | .20** | .26** | .15* | .26** | .14* | .22** |
| 4.Resilience | | | | - | .55** | .19** | .14* | .25** | .19* | .15* | .14* | .14* | .16** | .18** |
| 5.S-efficacy | | | | | - | .17** | .14* | .18** | .15** | .17** | .13* | .14* | .15* | .13* |
| 6.PeerAtt | | | | | | - | .43** | .38** | .47** | .71** | .53** | .59** | .54** | .43** |
| 7.PeerTr | | | | | | | - | .55** | .30** | .38** | .52** | .55** | .53** | .58** |
| 8.PeerCom | | | | | | | | - | .47** | .45** | .43** | .51** | .43** | .48** |
| 9.PeerAln | | | | | | | | | - | .43** | .39** | .24** | .39** | .39** |
| 10.FriendshipQ | | | | | | | | | | - | .59** | .59** | .41** | .53** |
| 11.Stim.Com | | | | | | | | | | | - | .45** | .59** | .58** |
| 12.Intimacy | | | | | | | | | | | | - | .48** | .56** |
| 13.Reliable.A | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | .56** |
| 14.Emo.Sec | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - |

Note. PsyCap=psychological capital; S-efficacy=self-efficacy; PeerAtt= Peer Attachment Scale; PeerTr= peer trust; PeerCom=peer communication; PeerAln=peer alienation; FriendshipQ=Friendship Quality Questionnaire; Stim.Com=stimulating companionship; Reliable.A=reliable alliance; Emo.Sec=emotional security.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 4

Mean, Standard Deviation and One-way ANOVA on Attachment Styles for Psychological Capital, Peer Attachment and Friendship Quality (N=270)

| Variables | Attachment Styles | | | | | | | | F | i-j | D (i-j) | 95% CI | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-------|
| | Secure (n=123) | | Fearful (n=52) | | Preoccupied (n=31) | | Dismissing (n=64) | | | | | LL | UL |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | | | | | |
| Psyc. Capital | 105.16 | 9.69 | 99.69 | 12.13 | 103.6 | 12.05 | 104.1 | 10.49 | 3.25* | 1>2 | 5.47* | 1102.4 | 104.9 |
| Hope | 24.12 | 2.78 | 23.00 | 3.04 | 23.65 | 2.48 | 23.45 | 2.55 | 1.36 | - | - | 23.22 | 23.85 |
| Optimism | 18.00 | 2.72 | 16.44 | 2.71 | 17.80 | 2.61 | 17.81 | 2.03 | 4.94** | 1>2 | 1.55* | 17.29 | 17.88 |
| Resilience | 39.87 | 4.87 | 37.75 | 5.42 | 38.51 | 5.43 | 39.80 | 5.03 | 3.71* | 1>2 | 2.05* | 38.65 | 39.89 |
| Self-efficacy | 20.47 | 2.93 | 18.19 | 3.60 | 19.64 | 3.45 | 19.59 | 3.25 | 3.30* | 1>2 | 1.02* | 19.53 | 20.31 |
| Peer Attachment | 99.71 | 10.99 | 90.21 | 13.93 | 91.41 | 11.61 | 96.42 | 10.55 | 10.2** | 1>2 | 9.50* | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1>3 | 8.29* | 94.69 | 97.60 |
| | | | | | | | | | | 4>2 | 6.21* | | |
| Peer Trust | 42.36 | 5.13 | 38.25 | 7.09 | 38.41 | 5.29 | 40.14 | 5.42 | 8.69** | 1>2 | 4.11* | 39.88 | 41.29 |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1>3 | 3.94* | | |
| Peer Communication | 32.15 | 4.31 | 28.15 | 4.99 | 28.96 | 4.86 | 30.39 | 3.92 | 11.6** | 1>2 | 3.96* | 30.04 | 31.17 |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1>3 | 3.18* | | |
| Peer Alienation | 25.89 | 3.28 | 23.76 | 4.24 | 24.03 | 3.78 | 25.19 | 4.04 | 3.56* | 1>2 | 2.12* | 26.50 | 27.21 |
| Friendship Quality | 69.19 | 8.84 | 64.67 | 9.08 | 63.58 | 10.31 | 63.59 | 8.25 | 7.78** | 1>2 | 5.52* | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1>3 | 4.61* | 65.24 | 67.46 |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1>4 | 4.60* | | |
| Stimulating Companionship | 17.55 | 2.42 | 17.15 | 2.37 | 16.48 | 2.80 | 16.54 | 2.28 | 3.30* | 1>3 | 1.02* | 16.82 | 17.41 |
| Intimacy | 16.82 | 2.93 | 14.50 | 2.37 | 15.12 | 2.80 | 15.17 | 3.25 | 8.12** | 1>2 | 2.32* | 15.38 | 16.19 |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1>4 | 1.65* | | |
| Reliable alliance | 17.69 | 2.50 | 16.87 | 3.38 | 16.71 | 3.48 | 16.52 | 2.73 | 3.69* | 1>2 | 2.80* | 16.82 | 17.50 |
| Emotional security | 17.12 | 2.43 | 16.15 | 2.96 | 15.25 | 3.13 | 15.21 | 2.87 | 8.58** | 1>3 | 1.90* | 15.92 | 16.61 |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1>4 | 1.86* | | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 4 indicates significant difference of attachment style for Psychological Capital. From the mean values, it is indicated that adolescents with secure attachment style ($M=105.16$, $SD=9.69$) report high PsyCap as compared to adolescence with fearful ($M=99.69$, $SD=12.13$), preoccupied ($M=103.6$, $SD=12.05$) and dismissing attachment styles ($M=104.1$, $SD=10.49$). For all the subscales of PsyCap, except for Hope, there is shown a significant difference of attachment styles on Resilience, Optimism and Self-efficacy.

There is significant difference of attachment style for Peer Attachment. From the mean values it is indicated that adolescents with secure attachment style ($M=99.71$, $SD=10.99$) have more peer attachment as compared to adolescents with fearful ($M=90.21$, $SD=13.93$), preoccupied ($M=91.41$, $SD=11.61$) and dismissing attachment styles ($M=96.42$, $SD=10.55$). For all the subscales of Peer Attachment, there is shown a significant difference of attachment styles on more peer trust, peer communication and peer alienation.

Furthermore, results indicates significant difference of attachment style for Friendship Quality. From the mean values it is indicated that adolescents with secure attachment style ($M=69.19$, $SD=8.84$) show high Friendship Quality as compared to adolescent with fearful ($M=64.67$, $SD=9.08$), preoccupied ($M=63.58$, $SD=10.31$) and dismissing attachment styles ($M=63.59$, $SD=8.25$). Similarly significant difference is shown on all dimensions of Friendship Quality i.e. stimulating companionship, intimacy, reliable alliance and emotional security.

Table 5
Mean, Standard Deviation, t-test Analysis on Gender for Psychological Capital
(N=270)

| Variable | Male (n=138) | | Female (n=131) | | <i>t</i> | 95% CI | | Cohen's <i>d</i> |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | <i>LL</i> | <i>UL</i> | |
| PsyCap | 108.3 | 8.15 | 98.78 | 11.16 | 7.9** | 7.17 | 11.87 | .10 |
| Hope | 24.31 | 2.16 | 22.72 | 2.84 | 5.2** | 0.98 | 2.91 | .63 |
| Optimism | 18.40 | 2.03 | 16.73 | 2.61 | 5.8** | 1.12 | 2.23 | .72 |
| Resilience | 41.43 | 4.01 | 36.98 | 5.26 | 7.8* | 3.33 | 5.58 | .96 |
| Self-efficacy | 20.76 | 2.83 | 19.04 | 3.41 | 4.5* | 0.96 | 2.46 | .55 |

Note. PsyCap=psychological capital; CI= confidence interval; LL=lower limit; UL=upper limit.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 5 indicates significant difference on gender for Psychological Capital and its subscales. The mean values of males and females are 108.3 and 98.78 for psychological capital which shows that males have high PsyCap as compared to females. Similarly on all dimensions of PsyCap i.e. Hope, Optimism, Resilience and Self-efficacy, there is a significant difference on gender showing males to be more resilient and have more self-efficacy than females.

Table 6 shows that there is a significant difference between early adolescents, middle adolescents and late adolescents on Psychological Capital. Late adolescents ($M=105.4$, $SD=9.48$) report high PsyCap as compared to middle adolescents ($M=104.4$, $SD=10.73$) and early adolescents ($M=100.4$, $SD=11.32$). Similarly for three subscales there is a significant difference between late adolescents, middle adolescents and early adolescents, reporting high Self-efficacy, Optimism, and Resilience in late adolescents. However, non-significant difference is shown on hope.

Table 6
Mean, Standard Deviation and One-way ANOVA Analysis on Age for Psychological Capital (N=270)

| Variables | Early adolescents (n=92) | | Middle adolescents (n=94) | | Late adolescents (n=84) | | F | i-j | D (i-j) | 95% CI | |
|------------|-----------------------------|-------|------------------------------|-------|----------------------------|-------|--------|------------|----------------|--------|--------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | | | | LL | UL |
| | PsyCap | 100.4 | 11.32 | 104.4 | 10.73 | 105.4 | | | | 9.48 | 6.67** |
| Hope | 22.64 | 2.47 | 23.82 | 2.73 | 23.17 | 2.46 | 1.35 | - | - | 23.22 | 24.85 |
| Resilience | 37.65 | 5.48 | 40.03 | 5.07 | 40.25 | 4.45 | 5.72** | 2>1 3>1 | 2.38* 2.60* | 38.65 | 39.89 |
| Optimism | 17.26 | 2.59 | 18.76 | 2.51 | 19.59 | 2.27 | 5.21** | 2>1 3>1 | 2.14* 2.60* | 17.29 | 17.88 |
| S-efficacy | 18.50 | 3.38 | 20.02 | 3.49 | 20.81 | 2.70 | 4.85* | 3>1 | 2.34* | 19.53 | 20.31 |

Note. PsyCap=psychological capital, S-efficacy=self-efficacy, LB=lower bound, UB=upper bound.
 * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 7
Mean, standard deviation and One-Way ANOVA Analysis on Number of Close Friends for Psychological Capital (N=270)

| Variables | Acquaintance (n=67) | | Casual friends (n=93) | | Best friends (n=108) | | F | i-j | D (i-j) | 95% CI | |
|---------------|------------------------|--------|--------------------------|-------|-------------------------|--------|--------|------------|----------------|--------|--------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | | | | LL | UL |
| | PsyCap | 101.46 | 11.73 | 104.4 | 10.53 | 105.89 | | | | 10.45 | 4.46** |
| Hope | 23.73 | 2.82 | 24.44 | 2.61 | 25.99 | 2.42 | 3.25** | 3>1 | 3.21* | 23.22 | 24.85 |
| Optimism | 16.35 | 2.53 | 17.77 | 2.48 | 19.58 | 2.41 | 3.56** | 3>1 3>2 | 3.41* 3.96* | 17.29 | 17.88 |
| Resilience | 37.12 | 5.94 | 38.98 | 4.95 | 39.65 | 4.81 | 4.80** | 3>1 | 2.65* | 38.65 | 39.89 |
| Self-efficacy | 18.83 | 3.53 | 19.84 | 3.15 | 20.05 | 2.99 | 2.83* | 3>1 | 1.21* | 19.53 | 20.31 |

Note. PsyCap=psychological capital, LB=lower bound, UB=upper bound.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 7 shows significant difference on number of close friends for psychological capital. Adolescents with best friends (M=105.89, SD= 10.45) report high psychological capital as compared to adolescents with casual friends (M=104.44, SD=10.53) and acquaintances (M=101.46, SD= 11.73). Similarly in all subscales of PsyCap, adolescents with best friends report high Resilience, Self-efficacy, Optimism and Hope.

Tables 8-15 are based on regression analysis which were conducted to check the role of peer attachment, friendship quality, attachment styles (secure, fearful, preoccupied, dismissing) and socio-demographic variables (age, birth order, number of close friends, number of siblings and time spent together) in predicting Psychological Capital. Hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to check whether different attachment styles and socio-demographic variables when added with peer attachment and friendship quality in steps accounted for more significant prediction in psychological capital.

Table 8

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Peer Attachment, Secure attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270)

| Model | B | SE | β | P | R ² | ΔR^2 | F |
|----------------------|-------|-------|---------|------|----------------|--------------|---------|
| Step I | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 80.41 | 5.05 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .242 | .052 | .273 | .000 | .074 | .071 | 21.50** |
| Step II | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 81.14 | 5.12 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .229 | .054 | .258 | .000 | | | |
| Secure Attachment | 3.82 | 1.50 | 1.48 | .012 | .096 | .089 | 14.20** |
| Step III | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 50.18 | 11.39 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .217 | .049 | .248 | .000 | | | |
| Secure Attachment | 3.17 | 1.48 | .124 | .033 | | | |
| Age | 1.14 | .584 | .146 | .012 | | | |
| Birth order | .032 | .534 | .005 | .952 | | | |
| No. of close friends | 1.36 | .506 | .210 | .008 | | | |
| No. of siblings | .023 | .091 | .015 | .802 | | | |
| Time spent Together | .064 | .176 | .022 | .71 | .166 | .146 | 7.30** |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 8 indicated significant prediction accounting for total 16.6% of variance in Psychological Capital by Peer Attachment, Secure attachment style, age and number of close friends.

Results showed that in step 1 Peer Attachment is statistically significant predictor and explained 7% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 2, Peer Attachment and Secure attachment style both were entered and model was found statistically significant predictors and explained 9.6% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 3, Peer Attachment, Secure attachment style, age, birth order, number of close friends, number of siblings and time spent together were entered, in which Peer attachment, Secure Attachment style, number of close friends and age was found statistically significant predictors and explained 16.6% of variance in Psychological Capital. However, birth order, no. of siblings and time spent together were the non-significant predictors of Psychological Capital.

Table 9 indicated significant prediction accounting for total 16.8% of variance in Psychological Capital by Peer Attachment, Fearful attachment style, age and number of close friends.

Results also showed that in step 1 Peer Attachment is statistically significant predictor and explained 7.1% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 2, Peer Attachment and Fearful attachment style both were entered and model was found statistically significant predictors and explained 8.9% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 3, Peer Attachment, Fearful attachment style, age, birth order, number of close friends, number of siblings and time spent together were entered, in which Peer attachment, fearful Attachment style, no. of close friends and age was found statistically significant predictors and explained 16.8% of variance in Psychological Capital. However, birth order, no. of siblings and time spent together were the non-significant predictors of Psychological Capital.

Table 9

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Peer Attachment, fearful attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270)

| Model | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | β | <i>P</i> | <i>R</i> ² | ΔR^2 | <i>F</i> |
|----------------------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------------------|--------------|----------|
| Step I | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 80.41 | 5.05 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .242 | .052 | .273 | .000 | .074 | .071 | 21.50** |
| Step II | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 81.14 | 5.12 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .216 | .053 | .243 | .000 | | | |
| Fearful attachment | -3.36 | 1.64 | -1.23 | .042 | .089 | .082 | 12.96** |
| Step III | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 52.24 | 11.32 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .213 | .052 | .243 | .000 | | | |
| Fearful attachment | -3.67 | 1.60 | -.135 | .023 | | | |
| Age | 1.51 | .579 | .151 | .009 | | | |
| Birth order | .025 | .529 | .003 | .963 | | | |
| No. of close friends | 1.37 | .502 | .213 | .007 | | | |
| No. of siblings | .026 | .090 | .017 | .772 | | | |
| Time spent Together | .097 | .175 | .033 | .580 | .168 | .145 | 7.41** |

p* < .05. *p* < .01

Table 10 indicated significant prediction accounting for total 15.5% of variance in Psychological Capital by Peer Attachment, age and number of close friends.

Results also showed that in step 1 Peer Attachment is statistically significant predictor and explained 7.4% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 2, Peer Attachment and Preoccupied attachment style both were entered, in which preoccupied attachment style was non-significant predictor predictors and explained 7.6% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 3, Peer Attachment, Preoccupied attachment style, age, birth order, number of close friends, number of siblings and time spent together were entered, in which Peer attachment, no. of close friends and age was found statistically significant predictors and explained 15.5% of variance in Psychological Capital. However Preoccupied attachment style, birth order, number of siblings and time spent together were the non-significant predictors of Psychological Capital.

Table 10

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Peer Attachment, preoccupied attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270)

| Model | B | SE | β | P | R ² | ΔR^2 | F |
|------------------------|-------|-------|---------|------|----------------|--------------|---------|
| Step I | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 80.41 | 5.05 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .242 | .052 | .273 | .000 | .074 | .071 | 21.50** |
| Step II | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 79.83 | 5.15 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .247 | .053 | .278 | .000 | | | |
| Preoccupied attachment | 1.23 | 2.01 | .036 | .540 | .076 | .069 | 10.91** |
| Step III | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 47.54 | 11.49 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .250 | .051 | .286 | .000 | | | |
| Preoccupied attachment | 2.15 | 1.96 | .065 | .274 | | | |
| Age | 1.51 | .585 | .151 | .010 | | | |
| Birth order | .010 | .533 | .001 | .945 | | | |
| No. of close friends | 1.39 | .506 | .215 | .006 | | | |
| No. of siblings | .003 | .091 | .002 | .974 | | | |
| Time spent Together | .061 | .176 | .021 | .728 | .155 | .132 | 6.73** |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 11 indicated significant prediction accounting for total 15.2% of variance in Psychological Capital by Peer Attachment, age and number of close friends.

Results also showed that in step 1 Peer Attachment is statistically significant predictor and explained 7.4% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 2, Peer Attachment and dismissing attachment style both were entered, in which dismissing attachment style was non-significant predictor predictors and explained 7.5% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 3, Peer Attachment, Dismissing attachment style, age, birth order, no. of close friends, no. of siblings and time spent together were entered, in which Peer attachment, no. of close friends and age was found statistically significant predictors and explained 15.2% of variance in Psychological Capital. However Dismissing attachment style, birth order, number of siblings and time spent together were the non-significant predictors of Psychological Capital.

Table 11

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Peer Attachment, Dismissing attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270)

| Model | B | SE | β | P | R ² | ΔR^2 | F |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|---------|------|----------------|--------------|---------|
| Step I | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 80.41 | 5.05 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .242 | .052 | .273 | .000 | .074 | .071 | 21.50** |
| Step II | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 80.31 | 5.07 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .242 | .052 | .272 | .000 | | | |
| Dismissing attachment | .507 | 1.49 | .020 | .735 | .075 | .068 | 10.77** |
| Step III | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 49.61 | 11.36 | | .000 | | | |
| Peer Attachment | .241 | .051 | .275 | .000 | | | |
| Dismissing attachment | .828 | 1.44 | .033 | .568 | | | |
| Age | 1.45 | .585 | .145 | .013 | | | |
| Birth order | .015 | .534 | .002 | .977 | | | |
| No. of close friends | 1.35 | .507 | .209 | .008 | | | |
| No. of siblings | .022 | .091 | .014 | .809 | | | |
| Time spent Together | .059 | .176 | .020 | .737 | .152 | .129 | 6.58** |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 12 indicated significant prediction accounting for total 13.3% of variance in Psychological Capital by Friendship Quality, Secure attachment style, age and number of close friends.

Results also showed that in step 1 Friendship Quality is statistically significant predictor and explained 3.5% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 2, Friendship Quality and Secure attachment style both were entered and model was found statistically significant predictors and explained 5.5% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 3, Friendship Quality, Secure attachment style, age, birth order, number of close friends, number of siblings and time spent together were entered, in which Friendship Quality, Secure Attachment style, number of close friends and age was found statistically significant predictors and explained 13.3% of variance in Psychological Capital. However, birth order, number of siblings and time spent together were the non-significant predictors of Psychological Capital.

Table 12

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Friendship Quality, Secure attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270)

| Model | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | β | <i>P</i> | <i>R</i> ² | Δ <i>R</i> ² | <i>F</i> |
|----------------------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Step I | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 89.17 | 4.68 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .219 | .070 | .188 | .002 | .035 | .032 | 12.7** |
| Step II | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 90.10 | 4.73 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .227 | .069 | .195 | .001 | | | |
| Secure attachment | 3.60 | 1.59 | 1.39 | .020 | .055 | .048 | 9.73** |
| Step III | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 57.81 | 11.39 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .226 | .069 | .196 | .001 | | | |
| Secure attachment | 2.87 | 1.51 | .112 | .040 | | | |
| Age | 1.44 | .594 | .144 | .016 | | | |
| Birth order | .063 | .543 | .009 | .908 | | | |
| No. of close friends | 1.35 | .515 | .209 | .009 | | | |
| No. of siblings | .017 | .093 | .011 | .851 | | | |
| Time spent Together | .090 | .180 | .030 | .620 | .133 | .130 | 6.16** |

p* < .05, *p* < .01

Table 13 indicated significant prediction accounting for total 14.2% of variance in Psychological Capital by Friendship Quality, Secure attachment style, age and number of close friends.

Results also showed that in step 1 Friendship Quality is statistically significant predictor and explained 3.5% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 2, Friendship Quality and fearful attachment style both were entered and model was found statistically significant predictors and explained 6.2% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 3, Friendship Quality, Fearful attachment style, age, birth order, number of close friends, number of siblings and time spent together were entered, in which Friendship Quality, Secure Attachment style, number of close friends and age was found statistically significant predictors and explained 14.2% of variance in Psychological Capital. However, birth order, no. of siblings and time spent together were the non-significant predictors of Psychological Capital.

Table 13

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Friendship Quality, Fearful attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270)

| Model | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | β | <i>P</i> | <i>R</i> ² | Δ <i>R</i> ² | <i>F</i> |
|----------------------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Step I | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 89.17 | 4.68 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .219 | .070 | .188 | .002 | .035 | .032 | 12.7** |
| Step II | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 91.17 | 4.68 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .202 | .069 | .173 | .004 | | | |
| Fearful attachment | -4.53 | 1.62 | -1.66 | .006 | .062 | .055 | 8.89** |
| Step III | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 59.22 | 11.28 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .200 | .068 | .174 | .004 | | | |
| Fearful attachment | -4.85 | 1.58 | -.179 | .002 | | | |
| Age | 1.55 | .588 | .155 | .009 | | | |
| Birth order | .061 | .537 | .009 | .910 | | | |
| No. of close friends | 1.38 | .509 | .214 | .007 | | | |
| No. of siblings | .042 | .091 | .027 | .649 | | | |
| Time spent Together | .143 | .179 | .045 | .458 | .142 | .119 | 6.10** |

p* < .05, *p* < .01

Table 14 indicated significant prediction accounting for total 11.4% of variance in Psychological Capital by Friendship Quality, age and number of close friends.

Results also showed that in step 1 Friendship Quality is statistically significant predictor explained 3.5% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 2, Friendship Quality and Preoccupied attachment style both were entered, in which preoccupied attachment style was non-significant predictor predictors and explained 4.6% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 3, Friendship Quality, Preoccupied attachment style, age, birth order, number of close friends, number of siblings and time spent together were entered, in which Friendship Quality, number of close friends and age was found statistically significant predictors and explained 11.4% of variance in Psychological Capital. However Preoccupied attachment style, birth order, number of siblings and time spent together were the non-significant predictors of Psychological Capital.

Table 14

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Friendship Quality, Preoccupied attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270)

| Model | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | β | <i>P</i> | R^2 | ΔR^2 | <i>F</i> |
|------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|-------|--------------|----------|
| Step I | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 89.17 | 4.68 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .219 | .070 | .188 | .002 | .035 | .032 | 12.7** |
| Step II | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 88.95 | 4.75 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .221 | .070 | .190 | .002 | | | |
| Preoccupied attachment | .606 | 2.04 | .018 | .767 | .046 | .036 | 8.92** |
| Step III | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 59.22 | 11.28 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .225 | .070 | .195 | .001 | | | |
| Preoccupied attachment | 1.44 | 2.02 | .044 | .470 | | | |
| Age | 1.51 | .599 | .151 | .012 | | | |
| Birth order | .052 | .546 | .007 | .924 | | | |
| No. of close friends | 1.38 | .519 | .214 | .008 | | | |
| No. of siblings | .027 | .094 | .018 | .770 | | | |
| Time spent Together | .082 | .181 | .028 | .652 | .114 | .099 | 5.67** |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 15 indicated significant prediction accounting for total 11.6% of variance in Psychological Capital by Friendship Quality, age and no. of close friends.

Results also showed that in step 1 Friendship Quality is statistically significant predictor and explained 3.5% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 2, Friendship Quality and dismissing attachment style both were entered, in which Dismissing attachment style was non-significant predictor predictors and explained 4.3% of variance in Psychological Capital. In step 3, Friendship Quality, Dismissing attachment style, age, birth order, number of close friends, number of siblings and time spent together were entered, in which Friendship Quality, number of close friends and age was found statistically significant predictors and explained 12% of variance in

Psychological Capital. However Dismissing attachment style, birth order, number of siblings and time spent together were the non-significant predictors of Psychological Capital.

Table 15

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Friendship Quality, Dismissing attachment style on Psychological Capital (N=270)

| Model | B | SE | β | P | R ² | Δ R ² | F |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|---------|------|----------------|-------------------------|--------|
| Step I | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 89.17 | 4.68 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .219 | .070 | .188 | .002 | .035 | .032 | 12.7** |
| Step II | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 88.11 | 4.82 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .230 | .071 | .197 | .001 | | | |
| Dismissing attachment | 1.42 | 1.54 | .056 | .358 | .043 | .033 | 7.31** |
| Step III | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 57.15 | 11.47 | | .000 | | | |
| Friendship Quality | .232 | .070 | .201 | .001 | | | |
| Dismissing attachment | 1.80 | 1.49 | .072 | .230 | | | |
| Age | 1.46 | .597 | .146 | .015 | | | |
| Birth order | .048 | .545 | .007 | .929 | | | |
| No. of close friends | 1.34 | .517 | .208 | .010 | | | |
| No. of siblings | .042 | .092 | .027 | .651 | | | |
| Time spent Together | .087 | .181 | .029 | .633 | .116 | .092 | 5.82** |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

DISCUSSION

The current study examine the relationship between Attachment styles, Friendship Quality and Psychological Capital in life of adolescents. The study also examined the role of demographic variables such as gender, age, birth order, no of close friends, no of siblings and time spent together on psychological capital. A sample of 300 adolescents was contacted from different schools and colleges of Islamabad and Rawalpindi, out of which 270 individuals were left behind for analysis after cleaning of the data. A scale of Relationship Questionnaire (Bartholomew, & Horowitz, 1991), Inventory of Parent and Peer attachment (Armesdon, & Greenberg, 1987), McGill Friendship Questionnaire- Friendship Function (Mendelson, & Abound, 2014) and Psychological Capital scale (Afzal, 2013) was applied in the current study.

For the determination of psychometric properties, alpha reliabilities of the scales and subscales that were used in the study were calculated. It was found that the reliability values for all scales and subscales in the present study had good alpha value which ranged from .64 to .90. This indicates that scales were reliable and internally consistent.

The research hypothesized a strong relationship between psychological capital and peer attachment and friendship quality. Psychological capital develops with the type of relationships. In this case we study peer attachment and friendship quality which are positively correlated with psychological capital. It is to mention that although peer attachment and friendship quality are overlapping concepts, though they are attaching to different pathways. Friendship taps quality of relationship between peers whereas peer attachment is more focused on measuring individual dependency on their peers. However, keeping in view the findings, which are supported by past literature, it is suggested that children who experienced high positive quality friendships tend to have more self-confidence and better understanding of their self (Way, & Greene, 2006; Mannarino, 1978; Bagwell, 2005). It is because our interactions with peers is meaningful that contributes a sense of believing self in individual. Also through different psychological pathways (including more intimacy, trust, sharing and revealing secrets, social buck up) individual experience many aspects of their personality which

enhances their self-worth. It is suggested that attachment with peers is consistently related to self-efficacy and sociability, which can contribute to high positive psychology and successful college adaptation (Ford as cited in Carey, & Borsari, 2006). Having reliable alliance and more communicative peers contributes in self-exploring and ability of adjusting in any situation. Furthermore a number of positive outcomes (less alienation and depression, more trust and higher level of emotional security) is positively linked to attachment with peers with whom to confide, receive validation and interact positively (Wentzel, Barry, & Caldwell, 2004). Having a strong connection with friends increases one's satisfaction with their peers and availability of emotional support from them (Bagwell, 2005).

To research also attempted to study the relationship of attachment style of adolescents with psychological capital, peer attachment and friendship quality. Adolescents with secure attachment style were found to have high Psychological capital, high friendship quality and greater attachment with peers. The findings are consistent with past literature. According to Atwood (2006) and Kolar (2011), attachment styles appear to play a key role in the development of positive psychological traits. This is because having a secure relationships with one's family and having a supportive person to rely on outside the family contributes in the development of social capital. Grusec and Hastings (2014) also demonstrated that people with secure attachment show more positive beliefs about themselves when compared to the people with insecure attachment. According to Mikulincer and Shaver (2005), individuals with secure attachment were found to be more communicative with their peers. They have more trusting, intimate and friendly close relationships when compared with individuals who have ambivalent attachment styles. Markiewicz, Doyle, and Brendgen (2001) elaborated on the link between attachment styles and quality of friendship in adolescents; they observed that secure attachment predicted the quality of what individuals characterized as their best friends. Similarly, Saferstein, Neimeyer and Hagans (2005) also found that individuals with secure attachment style reported high level of companionship, reliable alliance, support, intimacy, and security within their close friendships, and lower levels of interpersonal conflict.

The present research found non-significant difference between hope across different attachment styles (secure, fearful, dismissing, preoccupied). This findings of

the research is consistent with the previous literature. It is reported that attachment styles tend to be stable over life span but they may also change with changes in environment (Bowlby, 1988). As the adolescents mature, they undergo new relationship experiences, perspective-taking skills, cognitive transformation which contributes in the development of positive psychological traits (in this case hope) over time and across situations (Snyder, 2000).

The research was also interested to know differences with regard to gender. The result showed that male have high psychological capital than females. Findings are consistent with the previous literature. Jacobsen, Lee, Zhang and Marquering (2014) suggested in their study that boys tend to be more optimistic than girls regarding many aspects of life. According to Hampel and Petermann (2005), younger boys and boys from all age groups tend to be more resilient, make more use of coping skills (positive self-instruction, direct action) that focus on problem as compared to girls. Results indicated that boys are high on optimism, hope, self-efficacy and resilience. Boys often engaged in more risk taking challenges and have naturally developed ability to experience less frustration when dealing with them. They are less sensitive to anxiety and more invested in problem solving and competition. Also they keep on trying something new with their friends which enhances their sense of mastery and find work/life balance easier to obtain.

The research further attempted to study age differences. Result showed that late adolescents reported more psychological capital as compared to early and middle adolescents. On three dimensions of psychological capital, late adolescents reported more resilience, optimism and self-efficacy. This is usually because late adolescents have accumulated more knowledge and experience with age. They have larger network of friends, practice more independency and are more prone to both positive and negative life events which subsequently shapes their potentials and strengths. Whereas teenagers in their early and mid-adolescents are in the phase of developing social interactions, experiences and knowledge which is the reason why their psychological capital is not fully established as those of late adolescents. However, there is non-significant difference on hope. Since hope has more state like characteristics which could change according to situations. There could be a possibility that sample in current study, while filling questionnaire, might be undergoing some kind of unpleasant events

which effected the result. Moreover, previous research has indicated mixed trends. For example in district of Colombia, a survey was conducted on more than 70,000 students to check their hope and optimism level. Their findings revealed that students when they were in mid adolescents were not hopeful, they were more negative and disappointed about their current experiences. However, looking ahead in their late adolescents, the same students seem happier, more optimistic about their future (Riccards, 2017). In the previous researches, there seen a comparison between adolescents and adulthood to determine level of hope, resilience, optimism and efficacy beliefs in them (Chowdhury, Wolfe, Duzel, & Dolan, 2014). Whereas current study has selected adolescent sample, comprising of school and college students.

The research was also interested in knowing how many close friends that respondents have at the time of collection of data. Result showed that adolescents who have best friends reported high psychological capital as compared to adolescents who have casual friendships and acquaintances. On all dimensions of psychological capital, adolescents who described best friendship with their peers were high on resilience, hope, optimism and self-efficacy. The findings are consistent with the previous literature. Berndth, Hawkins and Jiao (1999) reported that adolescents with more best friends are high on sociability and leadership qualities as well as more involved in challenging tasks than adolescents with casual friends and acquaintances. Among a sample of shy children, Fordham and Stevenson-Hinde (1999) found that peers with best friends reported higher global self-worth, higher self-confidence and low negative traits than those who spent time with their associates and casual friends.

An important objective of the research was to study a model that predicted Psychological capital. Also previous research had established a close association between peer attachment, friendship quality, attachment styles and individual Psychological Capital. However, this research evidence is scattered and conducted on separate samples. Therefore the current research attempted to examine this.

Fifth hypothesis of the study was peer attachment, attachment styles, age, birth order, no. of close friends and time spent together significantly will predict psychological capital. The result showed that peer attachment, secure attachment style, fearful attachment style, number of close friends and age significantly predict psychological capital.

These findings are consistent with the previous literature. Several studies have suggested positive relations between peer support and individual competency within and across settings. High level of attachment to peers enhances competent functioning among adolescents, including general psychological well-being and ability to cope skilfully with challenges (Fass, & Tubman, 2002). Similarly teens with secure attachment style are more confident about the future, engage in more positive learning experiences and involved with the problems and try to find the right solution (Bartholomew, as cited in Perrone, & Wright, 2010).

Results further showed that fearful attachment style negatively predicts psychological capital. The findings are consistent with previous literature. Alonso-Arbiol and Lavy (2010) found out negative association between individual with anxious attachment style and positive developmental states. In addition, Mikulincer (2003) found that fearful style was associated with fewer positive reactions during group interactions and Gentzler and Kerns (2006) found that both anxiety and avoidance were associated with lower levels of efficiency beliefs and critical thinking abilities to face the adversities.

Preoccupied attachment style and dismissing attachment style showed non-significant result, which means that they are non-significant predictors of psychological capital when studied with peer attachment, and different socio-demographic variables. Findings are supported by the literature. Cohan, Cowan and Cowan (1994) suggested that some people change their attachment styles across their life span. According to Aoki (2012), people who have broken the cycle of insecure internal working model be considered earned-secure, and that differences are based on whether people have significant others who have become the source of safety, stability and confidence in their lives. Also the positive psychological capital is open to development and its multiple construct have more state-like properties (Youssef, & Luthans, 2007). Individual's strengths and hidden potentials is open to change through knowledge, life experiences, interactions and loyal friendship throughout life.

Analysis with regard to age showed significant results in predicting psychological capital. Few studies have addressed the effect of age on individual psychological capital indicating mixed findings. One such study (Isaacowitz, 2005) showed that older adults had a more positive states when explaining life events whereas

(Lachman, Roche, Rosnick, & Ryff, 2008) found out that younger, rather than older, adults had a more optimistic outlook about the future, more flexibility to bounce back from adversities and are more self-confident.

Analysis with regard to birth order showed non-significant result in predicting psychological capital. Findings are not consistent with the previous literature. Individual personality traits, reliable alliance, social and emotional support from peers and family, certain stressful events, life experiences can be taken into account in individual life which contributes in the development of more positive traits in them despite of characteristics of specific birth order one possess in their family.

Analysis with regard to number of close friends showed significant results in predicting psychological capital. The present study has taken number of friends as best friends, causal friends and acquaintances. Miething, Ostberg and Edling (2016) found out a positive relationship between quality of friendship and increased efficacy. Adolescents with large network of friends are likely to have positive outlook towards their future than peers with fewer connections. Biggs, Nelson and Sampilo (2010) suggested that having less friends and lack of positive interaction may elicit anxiety which in turn provoke more isolations from peers, thus worsening well-being and effects the adolescent's social skills and positive beliefs about future over time.

Analysis with number of siblings showed non-significant result. Findings are consistent with the previous literature. Research on individual positive strengths and number of siblings does not suggest significant personality outcomes. Blake (1991) in his research on number of siblings and personality outcomes find out that there may be no effect of number of siblings on openness to change at any age.

Similarly, analysis with regard to time spent together with friends showed non-significant result showing that amount of time spent with friends does not significantly predicts psychological capital. These findings are inconsistent with the previous literature. One possible explanation is that adolescents spend majority of their time on internet, through which they are connected with their peers 24 by 7. And once greater attachment is developed with peers and more trusting, reliable alliance one has, the significance of spending greater amount of time to enhance self-worth doesn't matter much.

The Sixth hypothesis of the study was based on Friendship quality, attachment styles, age, birth order, number of close friends and time spent together significantly predicting psychological capital. As mentioned before, previous researches separately find out association between friendship networks, psychological well-being, and attachment styles on self-esteem/self-worth. The current research took a step further and examine whether socio-demographic variables (age, birth order, number of close friends and time spent together), quality of friendship and attachment styles when added together accounted for more significant variance in psychological capital.

The result showed that friendship quality, secure attachment style, fearful attachment style, no. of close friends and age significantly predict psychological capital. Findings are consistent with the previous literature. According to Bagwell (2005), adolescents with positive peer support have greater ability to deal with challenges as well to adjust to new social interactions. Moreover, social network reduces fear of failure and enhances the peer's individual capital. According to Baker (2006), secure attach individual reported more resilience which results in greater ability to cope with unpleasant happenings. High scores in attachment security is associated with more effective skills and actively taking steps to solve the problems. Moreover, their internal security is related to the confidence and assertiveness they demonstrate in social situations (Park et al., 2004).

Results further showed that fearful attachment style negatively predicts psychological capital. The findings are consistent with previous literature. Leclerc (2007) reported that insecure attachment style is associated with fewer social and individual skills, community behavior and quality of life. Research has indicated that individual with avoidant attachment style reported lower level of hope and resilience as well as less ability to perceive positive future and positive attributes in themselves (as cited in Lysaker, Buchanan, Olesek & Ringer, 2014). According to Sroufe (2005), those with history of avoidant attachment style reported less self-confidence, lower self-worth and ego-resilient. In addition, individuals with insecure working model is linked with less flexibility to bounce back after stressful events and difficulties.

Preoccupied attachment style and dismissing attachment style showed non-significant result, which means that they are not significant predictors of psychological capital when studied with friendship quality, and different demographic variables.

Findings are supported by the literature. Cohan, Cowan and Cowan (1994) suggested that some people change their attachment styles across their life span. According to Aoki (2012), people who have broken the cycle of insecure internal working model be considered earned-secure, and that differences are based on whether people have significant others who have become the source of safety, stability and confidence in their lives. Also the positive psychological capital is open to development and its multiple construct have more state-like properties (Youssef, & Luthans, 2007). Individual's strengths and hidden potentials is open to change through knowledge, life experiences, interactions and loyal friendship throughout life.

Analysis with regard to age showed significant results in predicting psychological capital. Few studies have addressed the effect of age on individual psychological capital indicating mixed findings. One such study (Isaacowitz, 2005) showed that older adults had a more positive states when explaining life events whereas (Lachman et al., 2008) found out that younger, rather than older, adults had a more optimistic outlook about the future, more flexibility to bounce back from adversities and are more self-confident.

Analysis with regard to birth order showed non-significant result in predicting psychological capital. Findings are not consistent with the previous literature. Individual personality traits, reliable alliance, social and emotional support from peers and family, certain stressful events, life experiences can be taken into account in individual life which contributes in the development of more positive traits in them despite of characteristics of specific birth order one possess in their family.

Analysis with regard to number of close friends showed significant results in predicting psychological capital. The present study has taken number of friends as best friends, causal friends and acquaintances. Miething, Ostberg and Edling (2016) found out a positive relationship between quality of friendship and increased efficacy. Adolescents with large network of friends are likely to have positive outlook towards their future than peers with fewer connections. Biggs, Nelson and Sampilo (2010) suggested that having less friends and lack of positive interaction may elicit anxiety which in turn provoke more isolations from peers, thus worsening well-being and effects the adolescent's social skills and positive beliefs about future over time.

Analysis with regard to number of siblings showed non-significant result, indicating that how many siblings a person have, does not significantly predict psychological capital. Findings are consistent with the previous literature. Research on individual positive strengths and number of siblings does not suggest significant personality outcomes. Blake (1991) in his research on number of siblings and personality outcomes find out that there may be no effect of number of siblings on sociability at any age.

Analysis with regard to time spent together with friends showed non-significant result showing that amount of time spent with friends does not significantly predicts psychological capital. The findings are inconsistent with the previous literature. One possible explanation is that adolescents spend majority of their time on internet, through which they are connected with their peers 24/7. And once greater attachment is developed with peers and more trusting, reliable alliance one has, the significance of spending greater amount of time to enhance self-worth doesn't matter much.

Implications

This research is helpful in knowing the strengths and potentials of adolescents and how early attachment styles and quality of friendship to their peers play their role. As PsyCap is the capital of the people with which they can make their future brighter. The four constructs of PsyCap (hope, optimism, resilience and self-efficacy) can definitely help adolescents to get good grades, to cope with life stressors smoothly and above all to develop a positive outlook towards their future. The result of the present study will help school psychologist to tackle and resolve the problems of adolescents by enhancing their psychological capital and increase positivity in them. Furthermore, this study also provides insight for parents in order to understand the importance of early parent-child relationship for later positive development as well as to friends that how their closeness and social-emotional support could up bring their peer fellows in positive ways.

Limitations and Suggestions

First limitation is the use of self-report measure in the current study. It could be hindrance in accurate results due to response bias. The participants can response as

faking good and faking bad. For resolving this, it is recommended to the researcher to use qualitative methods along with questionnaire.

Secondly, the present study has been conducted in only one city of Pakistan. So constrains of generalization can occur. As the sample has not been taken from diverse cultures and cities of Pakistan, there would be no generalizability of present research, so it is suggested to include other cities as a sample as well.

Further, it has been suggested to explore psychological capital in different educational settings alike present research. However, keeping the limitation of the present study in mind, it has been recommended to future scholars to avoid exploring overlapping constructs that could contaminate result of the study. Also recommended to apply longitudinal research method to examine how the relationships among these constructs behave over time among adolescents produce some interesting insights.

Conclusion

The present study indicates that there is a significant positive relationship between psychological capital, peer attachment and friendship quality. It has been shown in the research that among different attachment styles, secure attachment style and fearful attachment style significantly predicts psychological capital along with peer attachment, friendship quality and demographic variables (age, no. of close friends) which was also supported by previous literature. Similarly gender difference was also examined which showed that boys have high psychological capital than girls. However there was no significant prediction by dismissing attachment and preoccupied attachment style on psychological capital.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, M., & Raja, U. (2015). Impact of psychological capital on innovative performance and job stress. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 32(2), 128-138.
- Afzal, A. (2013). *Positive psychological capital and its outcomes among adolescents: the moderating role of positive and negative emotions*. Department of Psychology, University of Sargodha.
- Ainsworth, M. S. (1979). Infant–mother attachment. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 932.
- Ainsworth, M. S. (1989). Attachments beyond Infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44(4), 709-16.
- Ainsworth, M. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Almedom, A. M. (2008). Resilience research and policy/practice discourse in health, social, behavioral, and environmental sciences over the last ten years. *African Health Sciences*, 8(3), 5-13.
- Alonso-Arbiol, I., & Lavy, S. (2010). Assessment of adult attachment across cultures: Conceptual and methodological considerations. In P. Erdman, K. M. Ng, & S. Metzger (Eds.), *Attachment: Expanding the cultural connections* (pp. 89-108). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Amiri, F., Banijamali, S., Ahadi, H., & Ahadi, Y. (2013). The relationship between attachment style and self-efficacy beliefs with regard to sex. *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3, 699-704.
- Aoki, Y. (2012). Approaches to infant abuse based on attachment studies and theory. In *Infant-caregiver relationship: Psychoanalysis and attachment* (pp. 70 – 186). Tokyo, Japan: Hukumura Syuppan.

- Armesdon, G.C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationships to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *17*, 427-454.
- Asher, S. R., & Jeffrey, G. P. (1993). Friends and friendship quality in middle childhood. Links with peer group acceptance and feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction. *Developmental Psychology*, *29*(4), 611-621.
- Atwool, N. (2006). Attachment and resilience: Implications for children in care. *Child Care in Practice*, *12*(4), 315-330.
- Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2009). Psychological capital: A positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. *Human Resource Management*, *48*(5), 677-693.
- Azmitia, M., & Perlmutter, M. (1989). Social influences on children's cognition. State of the art and future directions. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, *22*, 89-144
- Bagwell, C. L. (2005). Friendship quality and perceived relationship changes predict psychosocial adjustment in early adulthood. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *22*(2), 235-254.
- Baker, J. K. (2006). *The impact of attachment style on coping strategies, identity development and the perception of social support* (Master's thesis). Psychology Department, University of Canterbury, New Zealand.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of personality. In L. Pervin & O. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality* (2nd ed.) (pp. 154-225). New York, NY: Guilford press.
- Bandura, A. (2002). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. New York, NY: Cambridge university press.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment style among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*(2), 226-244.

- Berndt, T. J. (2002). Obtaining support from friends during childhood and adolescence. In D. Belle (Ed.), *Children's social networks and social support* (pp. 308-331). New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Berndt, T. J., & Perry, T. B. (1990). Distinctive feature and effects of early adolescent friendships. In R. Montemayor, G. R. Adams, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *From childhood to adolescence: A transitional period?* (pp. 269-287). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Berndt, T. J., Hawkins, J. A., & Jiao, Z. (1999). Influences of friends and friendships on adjustment to junior high school. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *45*, 13-41.
- Biggs, B. K., Nelson, J. M., & Sampiolo, M. L. (2010). Friendship networks and psychological well-being from late adolescence to young adulthood. *BMC Psychology*, *4*, 34.
- Bijou, S. W., & Baer, D. M. (1995). *Child development*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Blake, J. (1991). Number of Siblings and Personality. *Family Planning Perspectives*, *23*(6), 272-274.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment. In *Attachment and loss* (Vol. 1). New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *130*(4), 201-210.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). Loss: Sadness and depression. In *Attachment and loss* (Vol. 3). New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Clinical applications of attachment theory*. London, England: Routledge.
- Caprara, G. V., & Steca, P. (2005). Affective and social self-regulatory efficacy beliefs as determinants of positive thinking and happiness. *European Psychologist*, *10*(4), 275-286.

- Carey, K. B. & Borsari, B. (2006). How the quality of peer relationships influences college alcohol use. *Drug and Alcohol Review, 25*(4), 361-370.
- Carlson, E. A., Sroufe, L. A., & Egeland, B. (2004). The construction of experience: A longitudinal study of representation and behavior. *Child Development, 75*, 66-83.
- Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guildford Press.
- Chowdhury, R., Wolfe, T., Duzel, E., & Dolan, R. J. (2014). Optimistic update bias increases in older age. *Psychological Medicine, 44*(9), 2003-2012.
- Chowdhury, S., Endres, M., & Lanis, T. W. (2002). Preparing students for success in team work environments: The importance of building confidence. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 14*(3), 346-359.
- Claes, M., & Simard, R. (1992). Friendship characteristics of delinquent adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 3*, 287-301.
- Cohen, S. (1976). *Social and personality development*. New York: MacMillan publishing Company.
- Cohn, D. A., Cowan, P.A., Cowan, C. P. (1992). Mothers and fathers working models of childhood attachment relationships, parenting styles, and child behavior. *Development and Psychopathology, 4*, 417-431.
- Collins, W. A., & Repinski, D. J. (1994). Relationships during adolescence: Continuity and change in interpersonal perspective. In R. Montemayor, G. R. Adams, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Personal relationships during adolescence* (pp. 7-36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dishion, T. J., Andrews, D. W., & Crosby, L. (1995). Antisocial boys and their friends in early adolescence: Relationship characteristics, quality, and interactional process. *Child Development, 66*, 139-151.
- Doherty, N. A., & Feeney, J. A. (2004). The composition of attachment networks throughout the adult years. *Personal Relationships, 11*, 469-488.

- Douvan, E., & Adelson, J. (1966). *The adolescent experience*. New York: John Wiley and sons.
- Dweck, C. S. (1996). Implicit theories as organizers of goals and behavior. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior* (pp. 69-90). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1997). Prosocial development. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed.) (pp. 701-778). New York: John Wiley.
- Fass, M. E., & Tubman, J. G. (2002). The influence of parental and peer attachment on college students' academic achievement. *Psychology in the Schools*, *39*(5), 561-573.
- Fitzpatrick, S., & Bussey, K. (2014). The role of perceived friendship self-efficacy as a protective factor against the negative effects of social victimization. *Social Development*, *23*, 41-60.
- Fletcher, A. C., Darling, N. E., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. (1995). The company they keep: Relation of adolescents' adjustment and behavior to their friend's perceptions of authoritative parenting in the social network. *Developmental Psychology*, *31*(2), 300.
- Fordham, K., & Stevenson-Hinde, J. (1999). Shyness, friendship quality, and adjustment during middle childhood. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *40*(5), 757-768.
- Frankel, K. A. (1990). Girls' perceptions of peer relationship support and stress. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *10*, 69-88.
- Freud, S. (1983). *An outline of psycho-analysis*. London, England: Hogarth Press.
- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1992). Age and sex differences in perceptions of networks of personal relationships. *Child Development*, *63*, 103-115.

- Gentzler, A. L., & Kerns, K. A. (2006). Adult attachment and memory of emotional reactions to negative and positive events. *Cognition and Emotion, 20*, 20-42.
- Gewirtz, J. L. (1996). Mechanism of social learning: Some roles of stimulation of behavior in early human development. In D.A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 57-212). Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Gillham, J., & Reivich, K. (2004). Cultivating optimism in childhood and adolescence. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 59*, 146-163.
- Gottman, J. M., & Parkhurst, J, T. (1980). A developmental theory of friendship and acquaintanceship processes. In W. A. Collins (Eds.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology*. Hillsdale, N.J: Erlbaum.
- Graber, R., Turner, R., & Madill, A. (2016). Best friends and better coping: Facilitating psychological resilience through boys' and girls' closest friendships. *British Journal of Psychology, 107*(2), 338-358.
- Grabill, C. M., & Kerns, K. A. (2000). Attachment style and intimacy in friendship. *Personal Relationships, 7*(4), 363-378.
- Grotevant, H. D. (1998). Adolescent development in family contexts. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 1097-1149). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Grusec, J. E., & Hastings, P. D. (2014). *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Hampel, P., & Petermann, F. (2005). Age and gender effects on coping in children and adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 34*(2), 73-83.
- Hartup, W. W. (2000). Developmental science at the millennium. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 24*, 2-4.
- Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1997). Friendships and Adaptation across the Life Span. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8*(3), 76-79.
- Hays, R. B. (1988). *Friendship*. New York: S.W. Duck Edition.

- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1990). Love and work: An attachment-theoretical perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 270-280.
- Herbert, M. (2011). *An exploration of the relationships between psychological capital (hope, optimism, self-efficacy, resilience), occupational stress, burnout and employee engagement* (Doctoral thesis). Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch.
- Isaacowitz, D. M. (2005). Correlates of well-being in adulthood and old age: A tale of two optimisms. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39(2), 224-244.
- Jacobsen, B., Lee, J., Marquering, W., & Zhang, C. Y. (2014). Gender differences in optimism and asset allocation. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 107(11), 630-651.
- Jacoby, R. (1993). The miserable hath no other medicine, but only hope: Some conceptual considerations on hope and stress. *Stress Medicine*, 9, 61-69.
- Jenkins, J. K. (2016). The Relationship between resilience, attachment, and emotional coping styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53, 821-826.
- Kagan, J., & Coles, R. (1972). *Twelve to sixteen: Early adolescence*. New York: Norton.
- Klinger, E. (1997). Friendships and adaptation in the life course. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121(3), 355.
- Kolar, K. (2011). Resilience: Revisiting the concept and its utility for social research. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 9(4), 421.
- Lachman, M. E., Roche, C., Rosnick, C., & Ryff, C. D. (2008). Realism and illusion in Americans' temporal views of their life satisfaction: Age differences in reconstructing the past and anticipating the future. *Psychological Science*, 19(9), 889-897.
- Laible, D. (2007). Attachment with parents and peers in late adolescence: Links with emotional competence and social behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(5), 1185-1197.

- Laursen, B. (1995). Conflict and social interaction in adolescent relationship. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 17*(5), 55-70.
- Leclerc, C. (2007). Personality characteristics and attachment in first episode psychosis: impact on social functioning. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 195*(8), 631-639.
- Lieberman, M., Doyle, A., & Markiewicz, D. (1999). Developmental patterns in security of attachment to mothers and fathers in late childhood and early adolescence: Associations with peer relations. *Child Development, 70*, 202-213.
- Llorca, A., Richaud, M. C., & Malonda, E. (2017). Parenting styles, prosocial, and aggressive behavior: The role of emotions in offender and non-offender adolescents. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1246.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personal Psychology, 60*(3), 541-572.
- Luthans, F., Luthans, K., & Luthans, B. C. (2004). Positive psychological capital: Going beyond human and social capital. *Business Horizon, 47*, 45-50.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lysaker, C., Buchanan, K. L., Olesek, V., & Ringer, C. P. (2014). The composition of attachment networks throughout the adult years: Hope and resilience. *Personal Relationships, 12*, 469-488.
- Mannarino, A. P. (1978). Friendship patterns and self-concept development in preadolescent males. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 133*, 105-110.
- Markiewicz, D., Doyle, A. B., & Brendgen, M. (2001). The quality of adolescents' friendships: Associations with mothers' interpersonal relationships, attachments to parents and friends, and prosocial behaviors. *Journal of Adolescence, 24*(4), 429-445.

- Martin, A. J., Sarrzon, P. G., Peterson, C., & Famose, J. P. (2013). Explanatory style and resilience after sports failure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35(7), 1685-1695.
- Masten, A. S., & Reed, M. G. (2002). Resilience in development. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *The handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 74-88). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mendelson, M. J., & Aboud, F. E. (2014). Measuring friendship quality in late adolescents and young adults: McGill Friendship Questionnaires. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 31(2), 130.
- Miething, A., Ostberg, V., & Edling, C. (2016). Friendship networks and psychological wellbeing from late adolescence to young adulthood: A gender specific structural equation modeling approach. *BMC Psychology*, 4, 34.
- Mikulincer, M. (2003). Attachment theory and group processes: The association between attachment style and group-related representations, goals, memories, and functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(6), 1220.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2005). Attachment security, compassion, and altruism. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 34-38.
- Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R. (2003). Attachment theory and affect regulation: The dynamics, development, and cognitive consequences of attachment-related strategies. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27(2), 77-102.
- Miller, J. (1989). Hope-inspiring strategies of critically ill. *Applied Nursing Research*, 2, 23-29.
- Mishel, M. H. (1998). Methodological studies: Instrument development. *Advanced design in Nursing Research*, 2, 235-282.
- Mounts, S. N. (2001). Young adolescents' perceptions of parental management of peer relationships. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 21, 92-122.

- Nowotny, M. (1989). Assessment of hope in patients with cancer. Development of an instrument. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 16, 75-79.
- Papalia, D., & Feldman, R. (1999). *A child's world: Infancy through adolescence*. New York: The McGraw-Hill company, Inc.
- Park, L. E., Crocker, J., & Mickelson, K. D. (2004). Attachment styles and contingencies of self-worth. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(10), 1243-1254.
- Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2006). Character strengths in fifty-four nations and the fifty US states. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1(3), 118-129.
- Percival, G. (2015). *Aristotle on friendship*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Perrone, K. M., & Wright, S. L. (2010). An examination of the role of attachment and efficacy in life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 38(6), 796-823.
- Peterson, S. J., Gerhardt, M. W., & Rode, J. C. (2006). Hope, learning goals, and task performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40(6), 1099-1109.
- Plomin, R., Scheier, M. F., Bergeman, C. S., Pedersen, N. L., Nesselroade, J. R., & McClearn, G. E. (1992). Optimism, pessimism and mental health: A twin/adoption analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(8), 921-930.
- Rabaglietti, E. & Ciaviano, S. (2008). Quality of friendship relationship and development tasks in adolescence. *Cognition, Brain, Behavior*, 12 (2), 183--203.
- Reisman, J. M. (1985). Friendship and its implications for mental health or social competence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 5(3), 383-391.

Reker, G., & Wong, P. (2005). Personal optimism, physical and mental health. In L. Barren (Ed.), *Cognitions, strength and aging*. (pp. 134-172). Inglewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Riccards, K. L. (2017). Hope, self-efficacy, and optimism: Conceptual and empirical differences. In M. W. Gallagher & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Oxford library of psychology. The Oxford handbook of hope* (pp. 45-58). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Saferstein, J. A., Neimeyer, G. J., & Hagens, C. L. (2005). Attachment as a predictor of friendship qualities in college youth. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 33(8), 767-776.

Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S. (2006). Optimism, coping and health: Assessments and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology*, 43(3), 219-247.

Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1992). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the life orientation test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(6), 1063-1078.

Seligman, M. E. (1998). *Learned Optimism*. New York, NY: Pocket Books.

Seven, S., & Ogelman, H. G. (2012). Investigating preschool children's attachment styles and peer relationships. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47(2), 765 – 770.

Shabir, M., Abrar, M., Baig, S. A., & Javed, M. (2014). The contribution of workplace incivility and psychological capital towards job stress. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 4(2), 1-17.

Shepperd, J. A., Maroto, J. J., & Pbert, L. A. (1996). Dispositional optimism as a predictor of health changes among cardiac patients. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 30(4), 517-534.

Snyder, C. R. (1994). *The psychology of hope: You can get there from here*. New York, NY: Free press.

- Snyder, C. R. (2000). Conceptualizing, -measuring, -and nurturing hope. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73*, 355-360.
- Snyder, C. R., & Lopez, S. J., (2005). *Handbook of positive psychology*. New York: Oxford university press.
- Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T. (1991). The will and the ways. Development and validation of individual differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60* (4), 570-585.
- Snyder, C., Rand, K. & Sigmon, D. (2002). Hope theory: A member of the positive psychology family. In C. Snyder & S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp.257-276). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sroufe, L. A. (2005). Attachment and development: A prospective, longitudinal study from birth to adulthood. *Attachment & Human Development, 7*(4), 349-367.
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work related performance. A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*(2), 240.
- Sullivan, H. S. (2000). Psychiatry: Introduction to the study of interpersonal relations. *Psychiatry, 63*(2), 113-126.
- Symister, P., & Friend, R. (2003). The influence of social support and problematic support on optimism and depression in chronic illness: A prospective study evaluating self-esteem as a mediator. *Health Psychology, 22*(2), 123
- Tiger, L. (1979). *Optimism: The biology of hope*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Way, N., & Greene, M. L. (2006). Trajectories of perceived friendship quality during adolescence: The patterns and contextual predictors. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 16*(2), 293-320.
- Weinfield, N. S., Sroufe, L. A. (2000). Attachment from infancy to early adulthood in a high-risk sample: Continuity, discontinuity, and their correlates. *Child Development, 71*(3), 695-702.

- Wentzel, K. R., Barry, C. M., & Caldwell, K. A. (2004). Friendships in middle school: Influences on motivation and school adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(2), 195.
- Wilkinson, R. B. (2008). Development and properties of the adolescent friendship attachment scale. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 37*(10), 1270-1279.
- Wright, P. H. (1984). Self-referent motivation and the intrinsic quality of friendship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship, 16*, 115-130.
- Wrosch, C., & Scheier, M. F. (2003). Personality and quality of life: The importance of optimism and goal adjustment. *Quality of Life Research, 12*, 59-72.
- Yancey, D., Greger, H. A., & Coburn, P. (1994). Effects of an adult cancer camp on hope, perceived social support, coping and mood state. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 21*(4), 727-733.
- Yaseen, T. (2006). *Attachment styles and its relation with perception of bullying in school* (Unpublished M.Sc. thesis). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management, 33*(5), 774-800.

Informed Consent

My name is Maryum Altaf. I am M.Sc. research student of National Institute of Psychology (NIP), Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad. I am conducting a research on Attachment styles, friendship quality and Psychological Capital in adolescents. You are hereby invited to participate in the research project.

For this purpose, I need to collect data from you. Please rate each statement according to your experiences. There are no right and wrong answers. I assure you that your particulars will be kept confidential and used for research only. Before starting, kindly provide your details below.

Age: _____

Gender: _____

No. of siblings: _____

Birth order: _____

No of close friends: _____

Time spent with friends: _____

Activities shared/enjoyed with friends: _____

Father's occupation: Working Non-working

Mother's occupation: Working Non-working

THE RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read each description and CIRCLE the letter corresponding to the style that best describes you or is closest to the way you generally are in your close relationships.

- A. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.
- B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.
- C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.
- D. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

INVENTORY OF PARENT AND PEER ATTACHMENT

This part asks about your feelings about your relationships with your close friends. Please read each statement and circle the one number that tells how true the statement is for you now.

| S.No | Statements | Almost never or never true | Not very often true | Sometimes true | Often true | Almost always or always true |
|------|---|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|------------------------------|
| 1. | I like to get my friend's point of view on things I'm concerned about. | | | | | |
| 2. | My friends can tell when I'm upset about something. | | | | | |
| 3. | When we discuss things, my friends care about my point of view. | | | | | |
| 4. | Talking over my problems with friends makes me feel ashamed or foolish. | | | | | |
| 5. | I wish I had different friends. | | | | | |
| 6. | My friends understand me. | | | | | |
| 7. | My friends encourage me to talk about my difficulties. | | | | | |
| 8. | My friends accept me as I am. | | | | | |
| 9. | I feel the need to be in touch with my friends more often. | | | | | |
| 10. | My friends don't understand what I'm going through these days. | | | | | |
| 11. | I feel alone or apart when I am with my friends. | | | | | |
| 12. | My friends listen to what I have to say. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 13. | I feel my friends are good friends. | | | | | |
| 14. | My friends are fairly easy to talk to. | | | | | |
| 15. | When I am angry about something, my friends try to be understanding. | | | | | |
| 16. | My friends help me to understand myself better. | | | | | |
| 17. | My friends care about how I am feeling. | | | | | |
| 18. | I feel angry with my friends. | | | | | |
| 19. | I can count on my friends when I need to get something off my chest. | | | | | |
| 20. | I trust my friends. | | | | | |
| 21. | My friends respect my feelings. | | | | | |
| 22. | I get upset a lot more than my friends know about. | | | | | |
| 23. | It seems as if my friends are irritated with me for no reason. | | | | | |
| 24. | I can tell my friends about my problems and troubles. | | | | | |
| 25. | If my friends know something is bothering me, they ask me about it. | | | | | |

FRIENDSHIP QUALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

This part asks about the quality of friend your best/casual friend is to you. With that friend in mind, decide how often the item implies. On the scale directly to the right of each item circle the number that indicates how often your friend is or does what the item says. There are no right or wrong answers because adult friendships are very different from one another. Just describe your best friend as he or she really is to you.

| S.No | Statements | Never | Rarely | Once In A While | Fairly Often | Always |
|------|--|-------|--------|-----------------|--------------|--------|
| 1. | My friend would make me feel comfortable. | | | | | |
| 2. | My friend is someone I can tell private things to. | | | | | |
| 3. | My friend has good ideas about entertaining. | | | | | |
| 4. | My friend would want to stay my friend if we didn't see each other for a few months. | | | | | |
| 5. | My friend makes me laugh. | | | | | |
| 6. | My friend knows when I'm upset. | | | | | |
| 7. | My friend would be good to have around if I were frightened. | | | | | |
| 8. | My friend would still want to be my friend even we had a fight. | | | | | |
| 9. | My friend would make me feel better if I were worried. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 10. | My friend is someone I can tell secrets to. | | | | | |
| 11. | My friend would stay my friend if other people criticized me. | | | | | |
| 12. | My friend is exciting to talk to. | | | | | |
| 13. | My friend would stay me friend if other people did not like me. | | | | | |
| 14. | My friend knows when something bothers me. | | | | | |
| 15. | My friend is exciting to be with. | | | | | |
| 16. | My friend would make me feel calmer if I were nervous. | | | | | |
| 17. | My friend would still want to stay my friend even if we argued. | | | | | |
| 18. | My friend is fun to sit and talk with. | | | | | |
| 19. | My friend is easy to talk to about private things. | | | | | |
| 20. | My friend makes me feel better when I am upset. | | | | | |

PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL SCALE

This part asks your daily life attitude. On the scale directly to the right of each item circle the number that represents your attitude. There are no right and wrong answers.

| S.No | Statements | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|------|---|--|-------------------|----------|-------|----------------|
| 1. | I find many ways to get out of problems. | | | | | |
| 2. | I overcome my difficulties very soon. | | | | | |
| 3. | I have ability to handle difficulties of life. | | | | | |
| 4. | I confront any kind of situation with courage. | | | | | |
| 5. | I effectively handle domestic problems. | | | | | |
| 6. | I am mentally prepared for any difficult time. | | | | | |
| 7. | I remain courageous to confront difficulties. | | | | | |
| 8. | I have ability to make timely decisions in difficult situations. | | | | | |
| 9. | My belief in self gives me courage to come out from difficult situations. | | | | | |
| 10. | Whenever I face any trouble, I found some way to recover deal with it. | | | | | |
| 11. | I overcome bad situations due to consistency. | | | | | |
| 12. | I overcome problems by putting efforts. | | | | | |
| 13. | I know how to confront difficult situations. | | | | | |
| 14. | I overcome mental tension quickly. | | | | | |
| 15. | I succeed rapidly whatever work I start. | | | | | |



| | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 16. | In case of any trauma I handle myself quickly. | | | | | |
| 17. | I think carefully before doing anything. | | | | | |
| 18. | I am capable to control anger quickly. | | | | | |
| 19. | I am a stable human-being. | | | | | |
| 20. | I perform every work in a confident manner. | | | | | |
| 21. | In every situation I have hope for betterment from Allah. | | | | | |
| 22. | Having hope on Allah gives me satisfaction. | | | | | |
| 23. | I often recall joyful events. | | | | | |
| 24. | I have positive attitude toward myself and others. | | | | | |
| 25. | I give importance to positive aspects of life. | | | | | |
| 26. | In any case I expect positive attitude from my friends. | | | | | |
| 27. | Pleasant past experiences give me courage to fight with present problems. | | | | | |
| 28. | I have ability to spend a healthy life. | | | | | |
| 29. | In any mental shock I get worried rapidly. | | | | | |
| 30. | In unexpected situation I am capable of making right decisions. | | | | | |
| 31. | I do not get mental tension due to minor illness. | | | | | |
| 32. | Usually I take rest after completing work. | | | | | |
| 33. | I am not able to solve many problems of my life. | | | | | |
| 34. | I have ability to confront problems. | | | | | |

Folders

- Inbox 103
- Junk Email 24
- Drafts 58
- Sent Items
- Deleted Items
- Archive
- Conversation History
- Scheduled

Re:

- Mark as unread
- Mark as read
- Create rule...
- Print
- Save to OneNote
- Show in immer



maryum altaf

Dear Mam, Thank you for sending me scale. I am really grateful to you.



Anila Afzal <Hammna13@gmail.com>

Dear maryum sorry for being late. First 13 = Resilience, next 7 self-efficacy, than 7 items of hop



Anila Afzal <Hammna13@gmail.com>

Tue 4/24, 12:07 PM

You



scale PsyCap Eng.docx

16 KB

Download Save to OneDrive - Personal



Anila Afzal <Hammna13@gmail.com>

Dear maryum My scale is in Urdu, one of my friend translated that in English, I will send you soon.



maryum altaf

Dear Mam, Plz send me scale by today. So i can start my data collection. Thanks Regards



maryum altaf

Dear Mam, I will be really grateful if you send me scale by tomorrow i.e. Monday. In english version.



maryum altaf

Dear Mam, My research topic is about relationship between friendship quality and psychological



Anila Afzal <Hammna13@gmail.com>

Dear maryum I will send you scale tomorrow In Shah Allah, In which language do u need scale?



maryum altaf

Dear Mam, I hope you are in good spirits. I am Maryam Altaf a Master's student at National U



maryum altaf

Dear Mam, I hope you are in good spirits. I am Maryam Altaf a Master's student at National U

Upgrade to Premium



maryum alfaf

5/4/2018 9:40 AM

Anila Afzal <hammna13@gmail.com>;

m. according to your urdu version scale the first 7 items are for Hope, the next 6 items are for Optimism, the next 15 items are for Resilience and last 6 items are Self-efficacy

What so?

because I'm highly confused that which item comes under which subscale...

My 34 item urdu version scale is exactly translated in English in same order so please make me confirm whether the subscale order is exactly the same that I have mentioned above?

My 2nd question is, are there any items to be reverse scored?

Best regards

From: Anila Afzal <hammna13@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 12:09:40 PM

To: maryum alfaf

Subject: Re:

Dear maryum

Sorry for being late. First 13 = Resilience, next 7 self-efficacy, then 7 items of hope and last 6 items will be of optimism

Best regards

Anila Afzal

Tue, Apr 24, 2018 at 12:07 PM, Anila Afzal <hammna13@gmail.com> wrote:

On Tue, Apr 24, 2018 at 11:46 AM, Anila Afzal <hammna13@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear maryum