



Published in final edited form as:

*Curr Dir Psychol Sci.* 2014 February 1; 23(1): 54–59. doi:10.1177/0963721413510933.

## Partner Buffering of Attachment Insecurity

Jeffrey A. Simpson<sup>1</sup> and  
University of Minnesota

Nickola C. Overall  
University of Auckland

### Abstract

Insecurely attached people have less happy, unstable romantic relationships, but the quality of their relationships should depend on how their partners regulate them. Some partners find ways to *buffer* (emotionally and behaviorally regulate) insecurely attached individuals, which makes them feel better, behave more constructively, and improves their relationships. Understanding when and how this important interpersonal process works requires a dyad-centered approach. In this article, we describe core tenets of attachment theory and the two forms of attachment insecurity (anxiety and avoidance). We then present the Dyadic Regulation Model of Insecurity Buffering, which explains how and why certain types of buffering behaviors soothe the worries and improve the relationship perceptions and behaviors of anxious or avoidant people. We next review studies of couples trying to resolve major conflicts that illustrate some ways in which partners can successfully buffer the insecure reactions of anxious and avoidant individuals. We conclude by discussing other traits and social contexts to which our model can be applied.

### Keywords

Partner regulation; conflict; attachment theory; attachment insecurity

## INTRODUCTION

Matthew and Helen have a longstanding romantic relationship. Because of bad experiences with prior partners, Matthew worries that Helen does not completely love him. These chronic worries make Matthew occasionally “act out”, especially when they have major disagreements and Matthew feels the relationship could be threatened. Helen, however, has learned to give Matthew the reassurance he needs to control his emotions, feel more secure about the relationship, and behave more constructively when conflicts arise. Over time, Helen’s actions have helped Matthew feel better about himself and the relationship, and the two are now happier than ever.

This fundamental interpersonal process, called *partner buffering*, occurs every day in relationships. One might assume that partner buffering has been widely studied and is well

---

<sup>1</sup>Correspondence should be addressed to Jeffrey A. Simpson, Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA 55455-0344 (simp008@umn.edu) or Nickola C. Overall, Department of Psychology, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand (n.overall@auckland.ac.nz).

understood, but it is not. Instead, most prior research has adopted an individual-centered viewpoint to examine how Matthew's insecurity affects his relationship functioning. A complete understanding of partner buffering, however, requires a dyad-centered approach to determine what Matthew's partner [Helen] does to allay Matthew's insecurity and help him feel and behave better. In this article, we present a Dyadic Regulation Model of Insecurity Buffering and then describe behavioral observation studies of couples engaged in conflict discussions that illustrate ways in which partners can buffer two types of insecurity in relationships.

## ATTACHMENT INSECURITY AND RELATIONSHIP FUNCTIONING

According to attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969, 1973), humans evolved to form strong emotional bonds with their caregivers (attachment figures) because doing so increased the probability of survival. These attachment bonds operate in children and adults, especially when individuals feel threatened, distressed, or challenged (Bowlby, 1969; Simpson & Rholes, 2012). Depending on how they have been treated by prior attachment figures (e.g., parents, close friends, romantic partners), individuals develop different ways of viewing and relating to their current attachment figures, known as attachment orientations. Securely attached people have received good care and support from prior attachment figures, which leads them to have positive views of themselves and others and motivates them to turn to their attachment figures for comfort and support to reduce negative affect and remove the source of distress. This collaborative, "problem-focused" style of coping helps securely attached people build further closeness and intimacy with their partners (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

There are two primary types of insecurity. Anxiously attached people, who have received mixed or inconsistent care/support earlier in life, crave acceptance and closeness yet worry that their partners might hurt or leave them (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003). Consequently, anxious individuals are vigilant to signs of both their partner's love and possible rejection, which generates strong distress and dysfunctional behavior in relationship-threatening situations, such as major relationship conflicts (Simpson, Rholes, & Phillips, 1996) or when partners fail to provide sufficient support (Collins & Feeney, 2000). This "hypervigilant" form of coping allows anxious individuals to monitor and gain the attention of their partners, which makes them feel less insecure. Unfortunately, these responses typically produce anger and dissatisfaction in their partners (Downey, Freitas, Michaelis & Khouri, 1998).

Avoidantly attached people, who have been rejected or dismissed by earlier attachment figures, believe they cannot trust and depend on others. Accordingly, they learn to suppress their needs for closeness and intimacy and become rigidly independent and self-reliant. When stressed, avoidant individuals withdraw from their partners emotionally (Pietromonaco & Feldman Barrett, 1997), and become less inclined to seek or give support (Simpson, Rholes, & Nelligan, 1992). This "distancing" strategy allows avoidant people to maintain sufficient autonomy and independence so they can regulate their emotions and handle the source of distress on their own (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003).

Both types of insecurity destabilize relationships by lowering satisfaction, aggravating relationship problems, and curtailing the positive experiences that could be gained from having happier partners and better functioning relationships (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). However, Lemay and Dudley (2011) suggest that the *partners* of insecure individuals can regulate their insecurity in order to protect the relationship. In what follows, we describe how we have conceptualized and studied the ways partners can buffer anxious and avoidant individuals in relationship-threatening contexts, focusing on conflict.

## THE DYADIC REGULATION MODEL OF INSECURITY BUFFERING

Our research has been guided by the Dyadic Regulation Model of Insecurity Buffering (Figure 1), which considers how couples behave during attachment-relevant dyadic interactions (see also Overall & Simpson, 2013). At the top left of Figure 1, stressful/threatening events activate the prototypic concerns of insecurely attached people (targets). The non-distressed partner (agent), however, will often enact buffering behaviors to reduce (down-regulate) the target's distress and console him/her. Buffering behaviors can be enacted deliberately (consciously and intentionally) or automatically (non-consciously or unintentionally) by agents, and may include offering reassurance of continued love and support, accommodating the target's wishes/needs, using "softer" influence tactics when trying to persuade the target during conflicts, and providing the right type of support the target needs to regulate his/her emotions more constructively.

Buffering ought to be successful when the agent's behavior is responsive to the particular concerns/needs associated with the target's attachment orientation. Anxiously attached targets should benefit most from buffering behaviors that reassure them they are loved and supported, such as the provision of sufficient emotional support, attempting to fulfill their wishes and needs, or assuaging their relationship-relevant concerns. Avoidantly attached targets should benefit more from buffering behaviors that permit them to maintain their autonomy and independence, such as using "softer" influence tactics when trying to change their traits or opinions, providing instrumental forms of support designed to "fix" the problem and meet their needs while allowing them to retain personal control and remain self-reliant.

If the agent's buffering works, insecure targets should report greater felt-security during stressful/threatening interactions. This, in turn, should lead them to feel less distressed, manage their emotions better, and behave more constructively (see the middle of Figure 1). If this pattern of stress/threat → responsive partner buffering → positive relationship perceptions and behaviors occurs repeatedly, targets should come to view themselves more positively and report greater overall relationship satisfaction, and agents should experience better relationship outcomes with their better-adjusted insecure partners (see the right of Figure 1).

Returning to Matthew and Helen, if Matthew (who is anxiously attached) feels threatened by a major disagreement that he and Helen are having, Helen may directly reassure Matthew of her unwavering love, recounting all of his wonderful traits and why she remains so steadfastly committed to their relationship. This buffering attempt should make Matthew

feel more secure in the discussion, which should help him feel better, control his volatile emotions, and act more positively toward Helen. If this cycle continually reoccurs, Matthew should begin to automatically associate Helen with the dissipation of negative thoughts and feelings whenever he feels threatened, strengthening the emotional bond between them (especially for Matthew; see Simpson, 2007). Over time, Matthew should begin to view himself as a valued partner, he should trust Helen more, and their relationship should improve.

## **BEHAVIORAL DYADIC STUDIES**

We have conducted several behavioral observation studies with romantic couples to test components of our model. We have focused on conflict because this threatening context should activate the insecurities of both anxiously and avoidantly attached people.

### **Buffering Anxiety during Conflict**

Some of our research has investigated how partners buffer the destructive reactions to conflict commonly displayed by anxiously attached individuals. Tran and Simpson (2009), for example, videotaped married couples discussing important habits they wanted to change in each other, which elicit fears of rejection in anxious people. They measured each partner's emotional reactions and then had trained raters code each partner's accommodation behaviors (e.g., inhibiting the urge to hurt or retaliate against the partner, trying to maintain the relationship by calming the partner and working to solve the problem). Anxious individuals felt more negative emotions and displayed less behaviorally-rated accommodation during the discussions. However, the partners of anxious individuals displayed more accommodative behaviors if they (partners) were more committed to the relationship, and these actions led anxious individuals to report more acceptance and positive emotions during their discussions. In other words, illustrating the immediate benefits of partner buffering (see the middle of Figure 1), greater partner commitment and more behavioral accommodation by the partner allayed the fears and improved the threat-based reactions of anxious individuals, producing greater felt-security and more constructive emotions and behaviors.

### **Buffering Avoidance during Conflict**

We have also investigated the behaviors that buffer avoidantly attached individuals. Overall, Simpson, and Struthers (2013) videotaped romantic couples discussing relationship problems identified by one partner (the agent) who wanted changes in the other (the target). Given their need for autonomy, being targeted for change should be particularly threatening for avoidant people. As predicted, avoidant targets felt greater anger and displayed more coder-rated withdrawal during these discussions, which resulted in less successful problem resolution. Some partners, however, buffered avoidant defenses by "softening" their influence attempts, which involved being sensitive to the target's autonomy needs, validating his/her viewpoint, and acknowledging his/her constructive efforts and good qualities. Avoidant targets whose partners displayed more softening exhibited less anger and withdrawal, and their discussions were more successful.

Simpson, Winterheld, Rholes, and Oriña (2007) had romantic partners complete the Adult Attachment Interview, which assesses attachment orientations to one's parents. One week later, each couple was videotaped trying to resolve their most important relationship problem. At peak distress points during each discussion (the triggering event in Figure 1), coders rated the extent to which: (1) the less distressed partner (the agent) displayed emotional, instrumental, and/or physical caregiving behaviors, and (2) the distressed partner (the target) was calmed by their partner's caregiving attempts. Securely attached individuals were rated as more calmed when their partners gave them more emotional care (e.g., encouraging them to talk about their emotions/experiences with the problem, conveying unequivocal emotional support). However, because they manage stress by suppressing their emotions and limiting emotional closeness with partners, emotional caregiving should only exacerbate distress in avoidant individuals. Accordingly, avoidant individuals were rated as more calmed when their partners delivered less emotionally-imbued and more instrumental caregiving (e.g., giving concrete advice/suggestions for how to solve the problem, discussing the problem in an intellectual/rational manner). These findings confirm that, in order to be effective, partner buffering behaviors must be tailored to the specific needs, concerns, and defenses of insecure targets.

### **Buffering Insecurity following Conflict**

Finally, we have examined what individuals do to buffer their insecure partners in the aftermath of conflict discussions. In a longitudinal study by Salvatore, Kuo, Steele, Simpson, and Collins (2011), one partner in each couple had been studied since birth, so we had childhood attachment scores (rated in Ainsworth's Strange Situation) for these individuals. Immediately following a videotaped discussion of a major relationship problem, each couple did a "cooldown" discussion task during which they talked about the most positive aspect of their relationship. Salvatore et al. assessed how quickly and completely each partner "recovered" from the prior conflict discussion. Insecurely attached individuals (rated as insecure as children 20 years earlier) had more trouble recovering and were more likely to "re-engage" the conflict during the cool-down task. However, when their partners displayed better conflict recovery, insecure individuals felt much more positively about the relationship, and these couples were more likely to still be dating two years later. Thus, as depicted on the right of Figure 1, partner buffering produced more beneficial longer-term outcomes, including greater relationship stability across time.

## **CONCLUSIONS, CAVEATS, AND APPLICATIONS**

These studies of romantic couples engaged in conflict highlight the critical role that partner buffering plays in protecting relationships that have insecurely attached partners. We have focused on conflict because it is threatening to both anxious and avoidant people, albeit for different reasons. However, partner buffering should also occur in other situations, such as when insecure targets need support. When partners (agents) provide more visible/direct support, anxious people tend to be happier and more optimistic about their relationships (Campbell, Simpson, Boldry, & Kashy, 2005). Conversely, because avoidant people prefer to manage stress by themselves, more indirect, less emotionally-focused forms of support are required to circumvent their avoidant defenses (Simpson et al., 2007). Buffering

behaviors are also important outside the context of threatening interactions. Lemay and Dudley (2011) found that partners exaggerate their affection when they perceive targets feel insecure, which makes anxious individuals feel more accepted and secure. More frequent or satisfying sex can also improve the perceived emotional availability of partners (agents), which buffers insecure individuals (targets) from relationship dissatisfaction (Little, McNulty, & Russell, 2010).

Our research and the other studies described above show that attachment insecurity does not spell doom for insecure people or their relationships; partners who enact appropriate behaviors can—and do—buffer insecurity. Certain components of our model need to be tested more fully, and additional partner behaviors not depicted in our model might also buffer insecurity. Although we focused on attachment insecurity, our model can also be applied to others forms of insecurity (e.g., neuroticism, rejection-sensitivity, low self-esteem) known to produce emotion and behavior regulation difficulties in stressful or threatening situations. Notably, partner buffering behaviors will differ in effectiveness depending on how well and directly they address the underlying motives and reasons for a target's regulation difficulties. However, even the “right kind” of buffering behaviors must be delivered skillfully; exaggerated or prolonged buffering attempts could be perceived as insincere by insecure targets, failing to quell their distress (Lemay & Clark, 2008). When buffering attempts repeatedly fail, agents may burn out and stop trying to console insecure targets, amplifying agents' dissatisfaction (Lemay & Dudley, 2011). But when partner buffering successfully counteracts the worries and defenses of insecure people, persistent partner buffering may yield greater security across time. Partner buffering, therefore, may be a primary “agent of change” in making people more secure.

In conclusion, partner buffering is an important and understudied dyadic process that deserves more attention. The current studies reveal how appropriate partner buffering can assuage negative reactions associated with attachment insecurity in relationship-threatening contexts and lead to better long-term outcomes for both insecure people and their partners. We hope that this framework will motivate researchers to identify dyadic processes that buffer other forms of insecurity and help therapists stabilize and improve relationships that have insecure partners.

## Acknowledgments


This research was supported by grants from the *National Institute of Mental Health* to Jeffrey A. Simpson (R01-MH49599) and from the *Royal Society of New Zealand Marsden Fund* (UOA0811) to Nickola C. Overall.

## REFERENCES

- Bowlby, J. Attachment and loss, Vol. 1: Attachment. New York: Basic Books; 1969.
- Bowlby, J. Attachment and loss, Vol. 2: Separation. New York: Basic Books; 1973.
- Campbell L, Simpson JA, Boldry J, Kashy DA. Perceptions of conflict and support in romantic relationships: The role of attachment anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2005; 88:510–531. [PubMed: 15740443]
- Collins NL, Feeney BC. A safe haven: An attachment theory perspective on support seeking and caregiving in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2000; 78:1053–1073. [PubMed: 10870908]



- Downey G, Frietas AL, Michaelis B, Khouri H. The self-fulfilling prophecy in close relationships: Rejection sensitivity and rejection by romantic partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1998; 75:545–560. [PubMed: 9731324]
- Lemay EP Jr, Dudley KL. Caution: Fragile! Regulating the interpersonal security of chronically insecure partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2011; 100:681–702. [PubMed: 21171786]
- Lemay EP Jr, Clark MS. "Walking on eggshells": How expressing relationship insecurities perpetuates them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2008; 95:420–441. [PubMed: 18665711]
- Little KC, McNulty JK, Russell M. Sex buffers intimates against the negative implications of attachment insecurity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2010; 36:484–498. [PubMed: 20032269]
- Mikulincer, M.; Shaver, PR. The attachment behavioral system in adulthood: Activation, psychodynamics, and interpersonal processes. In: Zanna, M., editor. *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 35. New York: Academic Press; 2003. p. 53-152.
- Mikulincer, M.; Shaver, PR. *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. New York: Guilford; 2007.
- Overall NC, Simpson JA. Simpson JA, Campbell L. Regulation processes in close relationships. *The Oxford handbook of close relationships*. 2013 New York: Oxford University Press; 427–451. A general, comprehensive overview of the operation of partner regulation processes in romantic relationships.
- Overall NC, Simpson JA, Struthers H. Buffering attachment-related avoidance: Softening emotional and behavioral defenses during conflict discussions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2013; 104:854–871. [PubMed: 23607533] An empirical example of how the use of "soft" influence tactics can buffer and regulate avoidantly attached partners.
- Pietromonaco PR, Feldman Barrett LF. Working models of attachment and daily social interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1997; 73:1409–1423. [PubMed: 9418285]
- Salvatore JE, Kuo SI, Steele RD, Simpson JA, Collins WA. Recovering from conflict in romantic relationships: A developmental perspective. *Psychological Science*. 2011; 22:376–383. [PubMed: 21245491] Based on data from the Minnesota Longitudinal Study of Risk and Adaptation, an empirical example of how individuals can facilitate faster emotional recovery from conflict in their insecurely attached partners.
- Simpson, JA. Foundations of interpersonal trust. In: Kruglanski, AW.; Higgins, ET., editors. *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*. 2nd ed. New York: Guilford; 2007. p. 587-607.
- Simpson, JA.; Rholes, WS. Adult attachment orientations, stress, and romantic relationships. In: Devine, PG.; Plant, A.; Olson, J.; Zanna, M., editors. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Vol. 45. 2012. p. 279-328.
- Simpson JA, Rholes WS, Nelligan JS. Support-seeking and support-giving within couples in an anxiety-provoking situation: The role of attachment styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1992; 62:434–446.
- Simpson JA, Rholes WS, Phillips D. Conflict in close relationships: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1996; 71:899–914. [PubMed: 8939040]
- Simpson JA, Winterheld HA, Rholes WS, Oriña MM. Working models of attachment and reactions to different forms of caregiving from romantic partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2007; 93:466–477. [PubMed: 17723060] An empirical example of how emotional and instrumental forms of caregiving can be used to reduce distress in anxiously and avoidantly attached partners.
- Tran S, Simpson JA. Pro-relationship maintenance behaviors: The joint roles of attachment and commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2009; 97:685–698. [PubMed: 19785486]



**Figure 1. The Dyadic Regulation Model of Insecurity Buffering**

The examples in this model focus on the ways in which partners can down-regulate insecure reactions associated with attachment anxiety and avoidance during attachment-relevant behavioral interactions. The model can also be applied to other forms of insecurity (e.g., neuroticism, rejection-sensitivity, low self-esteem), but the specific type of partner buffering behavior must be responsive to the needs and motives of the target's form of insecurity. (See Lemay and Dudley [2011] for a different example of how partners can regulate chronic relationship insecurities on a daily basis).