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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this preliminary and exploratory research project was to identify possible links between insecure male attachment patterns and wife assault. Attachment theory suggests that the quality of early interpersonal relationships has a profound effect on the psychological, emotional and social development of the individual. Insecure attachment has been found to be associated with a number of relationship problems and these interpersonal problems have also been identified with men who assault their wives. Based on this similarity, the insecure attachment paradigm may offer a useful theoretical orientation for understanding the conflict behaviours of men who assault their wives.

The sample of fifty adult men who had assaulted their female partners was drawn from two therapy groups. In this preliminary and exploratory study, a number of measures were used to assess each man’s mental representation of childhood attachment and his adult intimate attachment patterns, intimate conflict tactics and interpersonal jealousy and anger problems. The associations between insecure preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful attachment pattern ratings and male conflict tactic and relationship problems were then analyzed. The findings indicated that men who assault their wives had a high proportion of insecure adult intimate attachment patterns. These assaultive men were also found to be predominantly insecure in both their mental representations of childhood attachment and adult intimate attachment pattern ratings, with the greatest continuity
occurring with the insecure preoccupied and fearful pattern ratings.

Three patterns of relationship problems corresponding to the three insecure adult intimate attachment pattern rating were found. Preoccupied attachment pattern ratings were positively correlated with interpersonal jealousy scores and the reported use of the reasoning, verbal/symbolic abuse, physical abuse and severe physical abuse conflict tactics. Dismissing attachment pattern ratings were positively correlated with interpersonal anger scores and negatively correlated with the reasoning, verbal, physical and severe physical abuse conflict tactics. Fearful attachment pattern ratings were similar to the dismissing pattern in the positive correlation with interpersonal anger scores. The importance of considering insecure adult intimate attachment pattern ratings when providing group therapy to men who assault their wives was considered. Men with high insecure dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings seem to require a distinctly different therapeutic approach than those with high insecure preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings and ideas in this regard are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

Wife assault in North America is a major societal problem that drastically effects marital and family life (Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; Dutton, 1988a; Statistics Canada, 1993). It is estimated that every year 10% of Canadian women in marital or common-law relationships experience wife assault (Kennedy & Dutton, 1987; Statistics Canada, 1993) and almost 20,000 divorce applications per year filed by Canadian women are due to physical cruelty (MacLeod, 1980). The physical, psychological and emotional trauma experienced by family members due to wife assault is substantial. Marital breakdown, child abuse, depression, suicide, psychoses, drug abuse and alcohol abuse (Stark, Flitcraft & Frazier, 1979; Douglas & Der Ovanesian, 1983; Hughes & Rau, 1984; Rosewater, 1984; Telch & Lindquist, 1984; Walker, 1984) have all been linked to this social problem. It is also clear that the societal costs of wife assault do not stop at the individual or family level. Wife assault demands a significant proportion of the medical, criminal justice, mental health and social services resources of Canada and United States. It is estimated that over 1/4 of all the injuries presented by women at emergency rooms of hospitals in North America are caused by wife assault (Stark et al., 1979). On a yearly basis in Canada an estimated 1/8 of all calls to police are due to wife assault (Levens & Dutton, 1980); 40,000-50,000 women suffer sufficient physical and mental abuse to seek outside help (MacLeod, 1980); and over 24,000 women require the residential services of a transition house (MacLeod, 1980).
Domestic violence against women has been recorded throughout history, but society and researchers virtually ignored the problem until the early 1970s (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980). During the past two decades, there has been a flurry of research activity examining the prevalence of wife assault in North America and the characteristics of the men who assault their wives. Wife assault occurs in over 1/4 of marriages (Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980) and severe wife assault, including the threat and/or use of knife or gun, takes place in almost 10% of spousal relationships (Schulman, 1979; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; Straus & Gelles, 1985; Kennedy & Dutton, 1987). The men who assault their wives have been found to have a number of characteristics that separate them from the general male population. These characteristics include intimacy anxiety (Rounsaville, 1978), increased power needs (Browning, 1983; Dutton & Strachan, 1987), lack of spouse specific assertiveness (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Dutton & Strachan, 1987), insecurity (Walker, 1984), impulsiveness (Hilberman & Munson, 1977-78; Rounsaville, 1978), intense jealousy (Hilberman & Munson, 1977-78; Dobash & Dobash, 1977-78; Rounsaville, 1978; Walker, 1984), possessiveness (Dobash & Dobash, 1977-78; Rounsaville, 1978; Walker, 1984), exposure to violence in family of origin (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Walker, 1984) and alcohol problems (Hilberman & Munson, 1977-78; Walker, 1984).

Although wife assaultive men can be differentiated from non-assaultive men, they do not form a homogeneous group. Research has shown that there are many different types of men who assault

Men labeled as undercontrolled-dependent have been described as dependent, suspicious, emotionally volatile, passive-dependent/compulsives and exposed rescuers. They have been characterized as exhibiting poor impulse control, exaggerated dependency, extreme jealousy sometimes approaching delusional levels, extreme possessiveness and depression. They appear to have great difficulty in modulating their affective states and experience significant distress in intimate relationships (Faulk, 1974; Elbow, 1977; Hilberman & Munson, 1977-1978; Rounsaville, 1978; Ganley, 1981; Sonkin & Durphy, 1982; Walker, 1984; Caesar, 1986; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Browne, 1987; Saunders, 1987, 1992; Dutton, 1988a).

In contrast, men labeled as overcontrolled-dominant have been described as asocial, avoidant, self-centered, antisocial, narcissistic, dominant, generally unassertive, hostile and paranoid (Faulk, 1974; Bland & Orn, 1986; Caesar, 1986; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Saunders, 1987, 1992). The third category of men labeled overcontrolled-dependent have been portrayed as dependent, passive and approval-seekers. They are characterized as being unassertive and excessively trying to please their wives.
Although there have been various efforts to develop and understand the different typologies, the research has lacked a consistent theoretical basis. Attachment theory, which focuses on interpersonal relationships and the identification of various attachment patterns, may offer a useful orientation from which to understand wife assaultive behaviour. Proponents of attachment theory (Crittenden & Ainsworth, 1989) have identified insecure "attachment disorders" in adults that bear striking resemblance to the relational disorders found with males who assault their wives. Adults with insecure attachment disorders have been described as having intense separation anxiety, jealousy, chronic and dysfunctional anger and high levels of distrust of their spouses and these characteristics are equally descriptive of men who assault their wives.

Various attachment patterns have been identified that seem to correspond to the ability of the individual to develop a secure emotional relationship with their attachment figure. The term "pattern" found throughout this dissertation is used in a similar manner to that described in the attachment literature. Pattern is the individual’s mental representations of significant relationships which organize the individual’s feelings, needs, attitudes, understandings, expectations, cognitions and behaviours regarding relationships. If an individual experiences insecure attachment, there seem to be three predominant ways in which this insecurity is expressed yielding the insecure preoccupied, dismissing and fearful patterns (Bartholomew, 1989).
These three insecure attachment patterns correspond to the wife assaultive categories in the following manner. In intimate adult relationships, males with the preoccupied pattern tend to experience high levels of dependence, jealousy, obsession, possessiveness, anger and emotional highs and lows and this description appears to resemble the undercontrolled-dependent typology within the wife assault literature. In contrast, males with the dismissing pattern experience a strong desire for self-reliance and exhibit a cool, aloof, emotionally controlling, impersonal and defensive manner and this appears to be descriptive of the overcontrolled-dominant typology. Finally, males with the fearful adult intimate attachment pattern experience high dependency and acceptance needs but inhibit these due to fears of rejection and vulnerability and this pattern appears to be similar to the overcontrolled-dependent typology.

Is there a link between insecure male attachment patterns and wife assault? What role does an insecure attachment paradigm play in understanding the intimate adult conflict behaviours of men who assault their wives? Is a typology based on insecure attachment pattern ratings useful in understanding the behaviours of these men? What clinical strategies flow from considerations of attachment theory in relationship to this population? These are the areas of inquiry that this thesis will attempt to unravel. Initially they will be addressed by examining the nature of the adult intimate attachment patterns of men who assault their wives. Next, the conflict tactics and levels of jealousy and anger associated with each of the three insecure adult
intimate and early attachment pattern ratings will be delineated. Then the continuity between adult recollection of childhood attachment and current intimate attachment will be explored followed by the presentation of a profile of an illustrative individual for each of the insecure attachment patterns based on the Family and Peer Attachment Interviews. Finally, the clinical implications for group therapy will be examined.

In Chapter One, the empirical literature on wife assault will be examined in an effort to identify the prevalence, general characteristics and typologies of men who assault their wives. In Chapter Two, the links between the attachment literature, wife assault typologies and the intimate adult conflict behaviours of men who assault their wives will be examined. Then the methodology and results will be delineated, followed by a discussion of the clinical implications of the findings.
CHAPTER ONE
Research on Men Who Assault Their Wives

Over the past two decades, the research regarding men who assault their wives has focused on two major questions: the incidence rates of wife assault and the characteristics of wife assaulters. The latter category derives data from two sources: wives who have been assaulted and self-reports by the assaultive men. This latter distinction between data sources is important as male self-reports may represent a wider range of "typical" assaulters than reports given by female partners to clinic or shelter house personnel. In regards to the incidence rates of wife assault, these have been established through surveys of the general public. As all three of the data sources provide different perspectives on male wife assaultive behaviour, each will be reviewed in turn.

Incidence of Wife Assault
Four large-scale surveys of the general public (Schulman, 1979; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; Straus & Gelles, 1985; Kennedy & Dutton, 1987) using the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) have produced incidence rates of wife assault. The first study by Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1980) was a United States nation-wide survey in which in-depth interviews were conducted with 2,143 couples in 1975-76. The results indicated that 28% of couples experienced violence, ranging from throwing something to the use of a gun, sometime within the marriage. Of these couples
12% experienced violence within the past year. The study also explored the incidence of "severe violence", that is kicking, biting, hitting with a fist, beating up, threatening to or using a knife or gun. The women indicated severe male violence rates of 5% sometime during the marriage and 4% within the past year. A striking multi-generational connection was also found in the survey. Men who witnessed spousal violence in their own families of origin were three times more likely to have hit their wives within the past year than those who had not experienced such violence. Those men who had lived with the most violent parents had a rate 1000% greater than those of non-violent parents.

The second survey utilizing the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) was conducted by Schulman (1979) in the State of Kentucky, United States with 1,793 women married or living with a male partner. The results indicated that spousal violence sometime in the marriage was experienced by approximately 21% of the respondents. The severe violence rates were 9% during the marriage and 4% within the past year.

The third study by Straus and Gelles (1985) was based on a United States nation-wide telephone interview survey with 6,002 households. Severe husband-to-wife violence sometime in the marriage was found to be 11% and within the past year was 3%.

The fourth study by Kennedy and Dutton (1987) was conducted in Alberta, Canada with 708 couples using both face-to-face and telephone interviewing. Husband-to-wife rates within the past year were 11% for violence and 2% for severe violence.

Overall, there seems to be a fair level of consistency in
the rates of male spousal violence found throughout these survey studies. The prevalence rate for male spousal violence in North America ranges from 21% to 28% and annual incidence rates range from 8% to 12%, with severe violence in the 2% to 4% range.

These reported incidence rates are probably lower than actual rates due to the likelihood of underreporting and utilization of selective sampling (Straus et al., 1980). Some underreporting is expected due to the reluctance of victims and perpetrators to report male spousal violence. Straus speculated that the actual rates may be as high as double the reported figures. The influence of selective sampling can be found in all four surveys, as the samples were only drawn from stable cohabitating couples. Separating and divorcing couples experience more spousal violence and their exclusion from the survey samples likely produced deflated results (Straus et al., 1980).

In summary, survey research into domestic violence has found that almost one-third of men use physical violence at some time in their marital relationship and over 8% resort to severe violence. This research has shown that wife assault in North America is a prevalent problem that requires further societal attention and empirical exploration.

Characteristics of Assaultive Men as Reported by Wives

Five major studies of women assaulted by their husbands have yielded data regarding the characteristics of these men (Hilberman & Munson, 1977-78; Dobash & Dobash, 1977-78; Rounsaville, 1978; Walker, 1984; Browne, 1987; Gondolf, 1988).
The first four studies reported general characteristics of the men, while Gondolf (1988) attempted to distinguish between various categorizations of men who have assaulted their wives. Each study will be described in turn in this next section.

Rounsaville's (1978) sample of 31 self-identified, mainly working class women who had been assaulted by their husbands was drawn from the emergency room of a urban United States hospital and a mental health centre. He conducted a two hour interview with a mixture of structured and unstructured questions. The women described their partners as highly possessive, sexually jealous and impulsive. These men, according to the women's reports, demanded intensive and exclusive involvement from their partners and often restricted the woman's contacts with family, friends and the outside world. They were so possessive that even when separation and divorce proceedings had taken place, they demanded repeated and continuous contact with the woman. The degree of sexual jealousy was frequently so extreme that it approached delusional levels. They were described as having high dependency needs, demanding compliance from their wives and exhibiting fear and sometimes paranoia that their wives would leave them. The first abuse often occurred either during the honeymoon, a time of increased intimacy, or around the birth of the first child, a time of decreased intimacy due to the presence of a child.

Hilberman and Munson's (1977-78) study is based on a sample of 40 black and 20 white women who were battered by their husbands in North Carolina. The women came from families in which
there were high unemployment rates, poverty level incomes and severe stresses regarding basic survival needs, so the ability to generalize from this sample is somewhat limited. Their husbands were described as having morbid and pathological jealousy, low frustration tolerance, poor impulse control and alcohol problems. These men, when not aggressive were described as "child-like, dependent and yearning for nurturance" from their wives (Hilberman & Munson, 1977-78, p. 466). Suicidal gestures, psychotic episodes and rages often accompanied the threatened dissolution of the relationship.

Dobash and Dobash (1977-78) conducted in-depth interviews with 109 women in Scotland "who had been systematically and violently beaten on numerous occasions by their husbands" (Dobash & Dobash, 1977-78, p. 438). These women reported that their husbands were possessive and sexually jealous and it was the real or imagined threat to the man's possession, authority and control which resulted in most of the wife assault incidents.

Walker's (1984) study, based on 403 American women who had been assaulted by their husbands, found that the men were reported to have problems with insecurity, jealousy, possessiveness and alcohol abuse. The women also reported that many of these men had recollections of witnessing or experiencing physical abuse as a child and a history of past violent behaviour and temper tantrums. The women indicated that over 50% of the assaultive men were still emotionally dependent on their mothers and 30% on their fathers. These dependency figures were twice the rates found with a non-assaultive control group. The extreme
dependency, possessiveness and irrational jealousy of many of these men has been interpreted as an indication of the male’s intense fear of losing exclusive access to ‘their’ woman and hence the loss of intimacy.

Browne (1987) conducted in-depth interviews with 42 women who had been battered by their husbands and who were charged with homicide or the attempted homicide of their mates. She found that these women described the stages of the relationship as the following. Initially, their male partners were the most romantic and attentive lovers. They developed an early and intense interest in them, a constant concern regarding their whereabouts and activities, and a desire to be with them all the time. The women took this behaviour along with the man’s intense awareness of their moods and needs, to be evidence of love and sensitivity. Once married, the early interest became intense overt dependency mixed with suspicion and distrust and resulted in attempts to cut their partners off from outside relationships and activities. The initial jealousy frequently changed from gentle but persistent persuasion, to forceful possession with no regard for the woman’s desires or well-being. Violence by these men was typically triggered by the man’s jealousy or perceived rejection by his wife.

Gondolf’s (1988) sample was based on 550 American women who had been battered by their male partner and were presently shelter residents. He cluster analyzed reports on their partner’s background and history of violence and identified four typology categories which he labeled: sociopath, antisocial, chronic and
sporadic. The men in the "sociopath" category were the most violent and had the greatest substance abuse. They had high arrest records, used violence outside the home, and tended to be sexually abusive towards their wives and physically abusive towards their children. Those in the "antisocial" category were extremely abusive, were likely to use weapons and had low education levels. Men characterized as "chronic" exhibited severe verbal and physical abuse and tended to threaten and blame their partner after the violence. The "sporadic" type had the lowest levels of verbal, physical and sexual abuse, apologized after the abuse and had the least alcohol problems and arrest records. According to Gondolf, a consistent factor throughout all the categories was the immense efforts these males made to compensate for not living up to the prescriptions of male sex-role stereotypes.

In summary, men who assault their wives are reported by their female partners as being highly dependent, possessive, controlling, sexually jealous, insecure, impulsive, alcohol abusive, unassertive and physically aggressive. They have low frustration tolerance, a history of temper tantrums and violent behaviour, and are more likely than other males to have witnessed or experienced physical abuse as a child. There are also indications of different categories of men who assault their wives and these categories range in the extent and frequency of the violence and the kind of violence exhibited, that is mainly physical, sexual and/or verbal.
Self-Reported Characteristics of Men Who Assault Their Wives

Direct research on men who assault their wives has been very limited over the past twenty years due to the reluctance of these men to participate. Browning (1983), in a review of the literature prior to 1983, found only four studies (Faulk, 1974; Scott, 1974; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Subotnik, 1983) that used men who had assaulted their wives as the subjects. Since that time, a number of studies (Browning, 1983; LaViolette, Barnett & Miller, 1984; Bland & Orn, 1986; Caesar, 1986; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Neidig, Friedman & Collins, 1986; Dutton & Browning, 1987; Dutton & Strachan, 1987; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989; Saunders, 1987, 1992) have been completed, but this area of research is still fairly limited. In the following section, the male self-report studies will be reviewed under two general headings: comparison studies and typology studies. The comparison studies attempt to identify the distinguishing characteristics of wife assaultive men by comparing them to groups of non-assaultive men. These findings provide a general description of the characteristics and relationship issues of men who assault their wives. In contrast, the typology studies attempt to develop distinctive categories of men within the wife assaultive population along with descriptions of the characteristics associated with each category.

Comparative Studies

The comparison studies attempt to identify the distinguishing characteristics and relationship issues of men who
assault their wives by matching groups of wife assaultive men with non-assaultive male comparison groups. Six studies have yielded data in this regard (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Browning, 1983; LaViolette, Barnett & Miller, 1984; Neidig, Friedman & Collins, 1986; Dutton & Browning, 1987; Dutton & Strachan, 1987) and each will be examined in turn.

Rosenbaum and O'Leary (1981) conducted a study based on a sample of 52 self-identified women in treatment for wife assault along with 20 of their abusive husbands, who were then compared to 20 couples with satisfactory marriages and 20 maritally dysfunctional nonviolent couples. They found that the men who assaulted their wives were less assertive, both in general and with their wives, more likely to have been abused as children and more likely to have witnessed parental spouse abuse in their families of origin.

Neidig, Friedman and Collins (1986) explored attitudes with a sample of 119 men who had assaulted their wives and 99 males who were non-assaultive drawn from a military population. They found very few differences except that the men who assaulted their wives reported lower self-esteem.

LaViolette, Barnett and Miller (1984) explored the sex-role stereotypic responses of a sample of 100 men who had assaulted their wives and a comparative "normative group" of college students. They found that the men who assaulted their wives lacked both strong masculine and feminine characteristics. As the groups were not matched on age and education level, some of the differences found may have been due to these variables.
Browning (1983) used a number of paper and pencil tests along with videotape analogues on demographically matched groups (n=18 each) of physically assaultive, maritally conflicted non-assaultive, and maritally satisfied, non-assaultive males. There were no differences found regarding attitudes towards women, traditional sex-role expectations, assertiveness, experience of family violence as a child, social desirability, expressiveness or need for power, and dominance. When presented with videotaped male-female conflicts, males who had assaulted their wives differed in their perception of greater fear of abandonment in the female-initiated independence sequence and in their greater anger to this scenario. This finding seems to bear further exploration. Is the fear of abandonment the result of previous relationship attachment experiences? Is the separation anxiety connected to childhood attachment? Understanding the development and pervasiveness of the intimacy anxiety experienced by these males in spousal relationships may be important in identifying the factors that lead to wife assault.

In an extension of Browning’s (1983) study using a larger sample, Dutton and Browning (1987) compared four groups of men: Wife Assaultive (n=24), Generally Assaultive (n=18), Maritally Conflicted (n=24), and Happily Married (n=24), who were shown videotaped male-female conflicts and then given paper-and-pencil measures. They found that the Wife Assaultive group indicated greater abandonment anxiety and anger to the female-initiated independence sequence.

Dutton and Strachan (1987) explored power needs and spouse
specific assertiveness with three groups of males (n=25 each): men who had assaulted their wives, maritally conflicted non-assaultive males and maritally satisfied, non-assaultive males. The group of men who had assaulted their wives were the least assertive with their spouses and had power needs that were greater than non-assaultive males and equivalent to maritally conflicted non-assaultive males.

Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) conducted a secondary analysis of 608 male respondents of the National Family Violence Study (Straus et al., 1980). On the basis of responses to the Conflict Tactics Scale, four mutually exclusive groups were developed: no violence (n=153), verbal aggression (n=369), minor physical violence (n=62) and severe physical violence (n=24). A varimax-rotated factor analysis was conducted with fourteen "risk markers" encompassing husband and wife socioeconomic status, religious participation, self-esteem, the witnessing or experiencing of physical violence in family of origin, marital conflict and alcohol abuse. High levels of marital conflict, lower socioeconomic status and greater exposure to physical violence in family of origin emerged as the primary correlates of levels of violence between intimates.

In summary, men who assault their wives are profiled as unassertive, both in general and with their wives, with high power needs, low self-esteem, and anxiety and anger regarding intimacy issues of abandonment. Many of the studies suggest these men are more likely than men who are non-violent to have experienced abuse as children and to have witnessed spousal abuse.
Typology Studies

Descriptions from the wife assault literature (Ganley, 1981; Dutton, 1988b) indicated the presence of more than one type of male who was physically assaultive with his wife. The typology studies attempted to identify distinctive categories of men who assault their wives along with their corresponding characteristics. Six studies (Faulk, 1974; Elbow, 1977; Bland & Orn, 1986; Caesar, 1986; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Saunders, 1987, 1992) have categorized wife assaultive men into various typologies and these will be reviewed in this section. It is important to recognize that Faulk (1974), Elbow (1977) and Caesar (1986) based their categories on very small non-random samples from which they develop somewhat anecdotal and impressionistic categories. In contrast, Bland and Orn (1986), Hamberger and Hastings (1986) and Saunders (1987, 1992) used fairly large samples, standardized measures or diagnostic interviews and factor-analyzed or cluster-analyzed the data to develop appropriate categories. The latter studies are therefore considered more sound from a methodological point of view.

Faulk (1974), with a sample of 23 men charged with assaulting their wives, found five major categories based on the dimension of dependency. The two dependent categories were termed the "dependent suspicious" group and the "dependent passive" group. The dependent suspicious group had a long history of being extremely jealous and controlling, while the dependent passive
group tried to please and pacify their wives. Two other categories emerged that showed very little dependency on their wives: the "dominating" group and the "violent and bullying" group. The dominating group were quiet, reasonable and successful in other aspects of their lives but accepted no insubordination from their female partners. The violent and bullying group attempted to solve problems in many aspects of their lives through violence and intimidation with little or no consideration of the needs of others. The fifth category, the stable and affectionate group, had long-standing, stable relationships but recently exhibited violence during an episode of mental disturbance such as depression or mental illness.

Elbow (1977), on the basis of four sets of clinical observations of wife assaulters, described four identifiable groups based on the dimensions of control and dependency: the controller, the defender, the approval-seeker and the incorporator. The "controller" was described as confident and rigidly in control of his emotions and his wife. The "defender" was portrayed as self-righteous, controlling and overprotective of his wife due to his dependency on her. The "approval-seeker" was reported to be excessively trying to please his wife in order to gain her acceptance and approval. The "incorporator" was described as unable to control his emotions, extremely jealous and desperately wanting to have an emotionally intense relationship with his wife.

Caesar (1986), in a study of 26 men who had assaulted their wives and 18 non-violent men in therapy, also found support for a
dominant-dependent dichotomy. The dominant men, termed "tyrant" by Caesar, were self-centered, hostile and paranoid, used fear to control their partner, showed little remorse and wanted 'their' wife to care for and nurture them. The dependent type, termed "exposed rescuers", had what was labeled as a hysterical personality, alternating between sociability and hostility. They exhibited chronic resentment, abused alcohol, wanted a wife who was inadequate and dependent on them, and felt remorse for their violence. The third category, termed "nonexposed altruist", were unassertive and constantly tried to please their wives. They minimized their problems, inhibited their anger and had strong ambivalence over dependency. The fourth category, termed "psychotic wife assaulter", were those men who had experienced a recent psychotic episode.

On the basis of the findings of the studies reviewed thus far (Faulk, 1974; Elbow, 1977; Caesar, 1986), categorical distinctions appear to be emerging between men who assault their wives on the dimensions of dependence, dominance, control and emotionality. Elements of these distinctions also appear to be evident in the psychopathology classifications of Bland and Orn (1986) and Hamberger and Hastings (1986), and in the three categories identified by Saunders (1987, 1992). Each of these studies are reviewed below.

Bland and Orn (1986) with a urban random sample of 1,200 subjects found three D.S.M. III diagnostic categories that were related to wife assault: antisocial personality disorder, major recurrent depression and alcohol dependence or abuse.
Hamberger and Hastings (1986) conducted a study based on clinical assessments of 105 men attending a wife assault treatment program using the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory. When they factor-analyzed the protocols, they found indications for three categories: schizoidal/borderline, narcissistic/antisocial and passive-dependent/compulsive, although most men showed a mixture of all three factors. The most depressed groups were submissive, negativistic, asocial and avoidant with high anger scores. They also noted the great difficulty that these men had in modulating affective states and feeling comfortable in intimate relationships.

Saunders (1987, 1992) based his research on 182 men referred to treatment due to wife assault. After giving an extensive test battery, he cluster-analyzed the data, found distinct multimodal differences in alcohol use and anger at partner, and identified three categories: generally violent, emotionally volatile and family only. The generally violent type used the most severe violence and had high alcohol abuse. The emotionally volatile type had high scores on depression, jealousy and anger. The family only type restricted their violence to the home, had high marital satisfaction, were generally unassertive and scored high on social desirability.

In summary, categorical distinctions based on the dimensions of dependence, dominance, control and emotionality appear to be evident throughout the typology studies. Indications are also evident (Faulk, 1974; Elbow, 1977; Caesar, 1986) that these dimensions may be usefully combined to produce a dependence-
dominance dichotomy and an emotional overcontrol-undercontrol dichotomy. On the basis of these distinctions and the findings of the typology studies, this author identifies three general categories: the overcontrolled-dominant, the overcontrolled-dependent and the undercontrolled-dependent. The fourth possible category, the undercontrolled-dominant group, did not seem to be evident in the wife assault literature.


In contrast, the overcontrolled-dominant typology encompasses those men labeled antisocial (Bland & Orn, 1986), narcissistic/antisocial (Hamberger & Hastings, 1986), dominant (Faulk, 1974; Caesar, 1986) and family only (Saunders, 1987, 1992). They are characterized as being self-centered, hostile and paranoid (Caesar, 1986), asocial and avoidant (Hamberger & Hastings, 1986), antisocial (Bland & Orn, 1986) and generally
Finally, the overcontrolled-dependent category describes those men labeled dependent passive (Faulk, 1974), approval-seekers (Elbow, 1977), non-exposed altruist (Caesar, 1986) and sporadic (Gondolf, 1988). They are characterized as being unassertive and excessively trying to please their female partners (Faulk, 1974; Elbow, 1977; Caesar, 1986).

On the basis of the studies reviewed in this chapter, wife assaultive behaviours appear to occur in over 1/4 of marriages due to the personality and background characteristics of the men. The men tend to have backgrounds in which violence was experienced as a child and some have a history of temper tantrums and violent behaviour. These men lack socioemotional maturity in their intimate relationships and this is evident in their anxiety and anger regarding intimacy issues, high dependency and power needs, possessiveness, sexual jealousy, insecurity, impulsiveness and low frustration tolerance.

It is also clear that men who assault their wives do not form a homogeneous group. Research has shown that there are many different types of men who assault their wives and three distinctive categories of men appear to be evident: the undercontrolled-dependent, the overcontrolled-dominant and the overcontrolled-dependent. Each of these categories seem to be describing a different group of men with particular intimacy, relationship and conflict issues. How these differences develop is still unknown, but different patterns of dependence, dominance, control and emotionality are evident. Attachment
theory with its focus on patterns of dependency and emotionality within interpersonal relationships may have something to offer in this regard. Within the attachment field, three insecure attachment patterns have been identified which resemble the undercontrolled-dependent, the overcontrolled-dominant and the overcontrolled-dependent categories and these connections will be explored further in Chapter Two.
CHAPTER TWO
Review of the Attachment Literature

Proponents of attachment theory (Crittenden & Ainsworth, 1989) have identified insecure "attachment disorders" in adults that seem to be very similar to the relational disorders found with males who assault their wives. Attachment theory with its focus on the predominant influence of early interpersonal relationships on psychological, emotional and social development, may offer a useful theoretical basis for understanding the conflict behaviours of men who assault their wives. In this chapter the theoretical and empirical literature in the attachment area will be reviewed and examined for connections with the wife assault literature. Initially, this review will examine attachment theory and then describe the assessment techniques pertinent to the identification of adult attachment patterns. Next the findings regarding attachment and adult relationships will be outlined, followed by a description of the different attachment patterns. Then the conflict behaviours associated with insecure attachments will be examined.

Attachment Theory

The origins and principles of attachment theory developed out of the psychoanalytic and early childhood orientations of British psychoanalyst John Bowlby and his colleague Mary Ainsworth (Bowlby, 1958, 1969, 1973, 1977; Ainsworth, 1982) and focused on the predominate influence of the caregiver-infant relationship in
human development. Over the years, attachment theory has been applied to various stages of human development and the theoretical principles appear to be applicable to a wide variety of relationships including caregiver, teacher, peer, family and adult intimate ones. At this point, the relative contribution of each attachment experience towards the resulting male attachment pattern found in adult intimate relationships is unknown.

Bowlby defines attachment as a bond developed with "some other differentiated and preferred individual, who is usually conceived as stronger and/or wiser" (1977, p. 203). Most human infants appear to become attached to their central caregivers regardless of whether the attachment figure provides direct and continuous reinforcement. The attachments that develop are directed toward specific individuals and are characterized by their long duration. Attachment behaviour is controlled by a specific set of conditions for activation such as threat, anxiety or fear, and termination such as proximity or reassurance from caregiver. There is a strong positive emotional component while the bonds are being formed, maintained or renewed, and a strong negative one when they are threatened or lost.

Bowlby, in line with his psychoanalytic orientation originally emphasized the paramount importance of the relationship in the first years of life between the infant and the primary caretaker in the development of the self and of later social behaviour (Bowlby, 1958). There appeared to be an underlying assumption that this early experience then predetermined the emotional life cycle development of the
individual. In Bowlby's more recent writings (1980, 1982, 1984, 1988), he appears to be recognizing the importance of taking a social developmental perspective towards the development of attachment patterns and ideas in this regard will be emphasized throughout this section. It seems likely that early attachment experiences initiate a pattern of relating that organizes the individual's feelings, needs, attitudes, understandings, expectations, cognitions, and behaviour about relationships. The assurance of a secure base to which the child can return after exploring his or her surroundings encourages self-reliance and autonomy, while instilling a sense of sympathy and helpfulness to others in distress. This then promotes a "mental representation" (Bowlby, 1958) of relationships that influences and shapes the directions of future attachment relationships.

Attachment behaviour depends upon the balance between the child's perceived physical or psychological danger and the physical and psychological availability of the attachment figure. It is activated when the child is frightened, fatigued, sick or under stress or when he or she is unwillingly separated from the caregiver. When the child feels secure, the need for the attachment figure weakens and the child is free to explore his or her environment, but when the environment becomes alarming the child will desire, focus on and promote the closer proximity of the attachment figure. When the attachment behavioural systems are activated for a long time without reaching termination, angry behaviour has been regularly observed in the infant (Bowlby 1969, 1973; Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978).
Within the attachment framework, a number of typologies of secure and insecure attachment patterns have developed. Initially these were empirically identified by Ainsworth (Ainsworth et al., 1978) based on the caregiver-infant relationship. The caregiver can permit ready access which is thought to result in the secure pattern; block access resulting in the insecure-avoidant pattern; or permit access only unpredictably resulting in the insecure-resistant pattern. These patterns can be seen as the child's particular pattern of adaptation to his or her caregiver, and the insecure patterns may develop in the following manner. If, when the child seeks proximity, the attachment figure is unresponsive or negative, the child's need for proximity will increase until his or her attachment needs are satiated or they abandon efforts in this regard. Each caretaker rebuff activates the attachment systems more intensely and when they are intensely activated, only physical contact with the attachment figure will serve to terminate them. The resultant conflict within the infant can produce intense, serious and nonverbal reactions leaving these infants anxious and fearful, or apathetic and unresponsive.

Bowlby (1982) states that in the context of developing relationships with their primary caregivers and through repeated transactions in which the consistency and adequacy of the primary caregiver's responses are crucial, infants form "internal working models" of the self and others. Internal working models of attachment have been defined "as a set of conscious and/or unconscious rules for the organization of information relevant to attachment and for obtaining or limiting access to that
information regarding attachment-related experiences, feelings and ideations" (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985; p. 66-67). Particular internal working models of relationships direct not only feelings and behaviour in relationship to attachment but also attention, memory and cognition. Individual differences in the functioning of the attachment system appear to be closely related to the individual’s working model of self, others and the world. Individuals build representational models of their attachment figures and these models are complementary to the representational model they build of themselves. These models concerning the self as worthy or unworthy of care, provide a basic context for subsequent transactions with the environment, most particularly social relationships. These models influence what the individual perceives and ignores, how a situation is construed, how it is responded to, and what sorts of people and situations are sought or avoided (Bowlby, 1973, p. 369).

It appears that the individual moves from dyadic organization with the caregiver to an organization regarding the self. The young child’s expectations for self and other seem to influence and shape the initial direction of his or her future relationships. Once the infant has been involved in an attachment relationship, most of his or her inherent dispositions tend to become subsumed and transformed by the relationship. The child brings forward an organization of feelings, needs, attitudes, understandings, expectations, cognitions, and behaviour; that is a relationship pattern as processed and integrated by the developing individual. It is this person with characteristic ways
of coping with arousal, preferred modes of dealing with impulses and feelings, and a particular organization of needs, attitudes, and beliefs about self and the environment, who constructs and interacts in future relationships with others. One's orientation concerning others, one's expectations concerning their availability and their likely responses, and what in general terms one can, or cannot, do to increase the likelihood and experience of positive responses are all strongly shaped by previous relationships.

From a social developmental perspective, each important attachment relationship, whether it be a caregiver, teacher, peer, family, or romantic relationship has the possibility of confirming or disconfirming the individual's current relationship organization. If the individual encounters disconfirming relationship experiences, he or she can either assume relationship or situation specificity, or reorganize his or her attachment pattern based on the new experience. If the individual in his or her transactions with social relationships experiences confirmation of his or her internal working model of relationships, the model becomes firmer and influences relational, cognitive and socioemotional functioning. Once a particular attachment pattern develops, it often is reinforced in interactions with the social environment and becomes the pervasive orientation. These patterns are active constructions and can be restructured, but drastic change in attachment patterns is difficult since once they are organized and consistently reinforced by the social environment they tend to
operate outside of conscious awareness (Bowlby, 1980).

Assessment Techniques

The proliferation of research and ideas in the attachment area over the past twenty years has been greatly facilitated by the development of a number of assessment techniques. Recent techniques developed to assess the intimate adult-to-adult attachment patterns (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Bartholomew, 1989) have led to the active application of attachment principles to adult intimate relationships. It is therefore important that the evolution of the semi-structured adult interview techniques utilized in the current study be properly understood. As each technique developed out of empirical research and principles based on the Strange Situation, the Strange Situation technique will initially be presented, followed by information on the Adult Attachment Interview, the self-report romantic attachment questionnaire and then the Family Attachment Interview and Peer Attachment Interview.

The first technique, called the Strange Situation, was developed by Mary Ainsworth and her associates in order to categorize early infant-caregiver attachment patterns (Ainsworth, Bell & Stayton, 1972). The Strange Situation technique exposes the infant to a series of episodes of maternal absence and reunion. The procedure involves seven episodes, each lasting three minutes, arranged to create increasing amounts of stress for the infant. Initially the parent and infant are left alone (episode 1). Then they are joined by a female stranger (episode
2) who engages the infant, which allows the parent to eventually leave the room (episode 3). When the parent returns, the stranger leaves (episode 4), followed, three minutes later, by the parent (episode 5). The stranger then joins the infant (episode 6), but leaves once the parent rejoins the infant (episode 7). This assesses the infant's reaction to environmental stress and the corresponding "attachment pattern" of the primary caregiver-child relationship. These attachment patterns were found to be highly correlated with the typical infant-mother behaviour in the home throughout the first year of life. Three different attachment patterns, that is secure, insecure-resistant and insecure-avoidant, were identified in research with thirty infant-mother pairs.

A second technique referred to as the Adult Attachment Interview was developed by Mary Main and her associates (Main & Goldwyn, 1988; George, Kaplan & Main, 1988) in order to assess the mental representations of early attachment patterns in adults. This technique is a semi-structured interview that explores retrospective descriptions of child-parent relationships. The adult is requested to provide general memories and then probed for specific supportive or contradictory examples. The interview explores a person's mental representation of early attachment to his or her primary caregivers through a series of questions including caregiver availability, quality of relationship, and acceptance and rejection of the subject during childhood. On the basis of this interview, adult participants are assigned to one of three attachment patterns, that is secure,
insecure-preoccupied or insecure-dismissing. These adult patterns were initially defined by their correspondence to the attachment patterns assigned to their infants through the Strange Situation procedure (George, Kaplan & Main, 1988; Main & Goldwyn, 1988; Grossmann, Fremmer-Bombik, Rudolf & Grossman, 1988). Many aspects of this technique are still being refined by Main and her colleagues, but the current form of the interview and coding methods appear to be receiving favourable acceptance. Main and her associates have used this interview schedule in conjunction with the Strange Situation technique to explore caregiver-infant relationships.

A third technique was developed by Hazan and Shaver (1987) in an attempt to explore adult-to-adult romantic attachment patterns. These researchers translated Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall’s (1978) descriptions of the three infant-mother attachment patterns into terms appropriate to adult-to-adult love relationships. The resulting self-report questionnaire provides single-item prototypic descriptions of the three attachment patterns. Hazan and Shaver found that their subjects chose the three attachment patterns in roughly the same proportions as that found in infancy, that is 56% were secure, 25% were avoidant and 19% were resistant.

A fourth technique involved the development by Bartholomew (1989) of two semi-structured interviews, the Family Attachment Interview and the Peer Attachment Interview and the corresponding attachment prototypes for each pattern. The Family Attachment Interview explores the adult’s mental representations of early
attachment and the Peer Attachment Interview examines adult-to-adult intimate attachment patterns. The interviews were modeled after the Adult Attachment Interview and extended the work of Mary Main and associates (George, Kaplan & Main, 1988; Main & Goldwyn, 1988) and Hazan and Shaver (1987). In contrast to Main's focus on three adult attachment subcategories, Bartholomew (1989, 1990) developed a theoretical rationale and found supportive empirical evidence for differentiating the insecure-avoidant attachment pattern into two forms of adult avoidance of intimacy labeled Fearful and Dismissing. Then through the application of semi-structured adult attachment interviews, adult relationship questionnaires (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and other psychological measures, Bartholomew (1989, 1990) explored the usefulness of her newly developed fearful category in identifying adult attachment patterns. In two studies, she found indications for the fearful category defining a distinct attachment pattern. The fearful pattern is "characterized by a conscious desire for social contact which is inhibited by fears of its consequences" (Bartholomew, 1990, p. 148). Bartholomew (1989) also questioned the usefulness of classifying adults according to one particular attachment pattern as adults were reporting conflicting attachment pattern tendencies within themselves according to situations and social relationships. A nine-point scale was therefore devised and used to classify participants on each of the four attachment patterns.

In most aspects, the Family Attachment Interview (Bartholomew, 1989) corresponds quite closely to the Adult
Attachment Interview developed by Mary Main and associates (George, Kaplan & Main, 1988; Main & Goldwyn, 1988). A number of the subscales are drawn directly from the Adult Attachment Interview rating subscales and others are refinements of ideas embedded within that interview with a few additions. The Family Attachment Interview provides information on the subject's mental representation of early attachment to his or her parents. In the interview, participants are asked to describe their family backgrounds, their relationship with each parent, the emotional supports provided when they were upset, separated from their parents or feeling rejected, the extent and impact of loss during childhood and the quality of their current relationship with their parents. Participants are then requested to provide a general evaluation of their childhood experiences in the family. This information allows for the rating of individuals on secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment patterns based on similarities to prototypic descriptions of each of these four attachment patterns developed by Bartholomew (1989).

In contrast, the Peer Attachment Interview was developed by Bartholomew (1989) based on prototypes of each of the four attachment patterns drawn from "the work of Bowlby (1980), Main and Goldwyn (1988), Hazan and Shaver (1987), and relevant personality disorders in D.S.M. III-R (American Psychiatric Association, 1987)" (Bartholomew, 1989, p. 25). The work of Hazan and Shaver (1987) had shown that the development of attachment pattern prototypes, from which measures could then be drawn, was methodologically useful in characterizing romantic love
relationships. They had also developed pertinent aspects of intimate attachment prototypes for the secure, preoccupied and dismissing patterns. The work of Main (George, Kaplan & Main, 1988; Main & Goldwyn, 1988) had shown that a semi-structured interview based on attachment pattern prototypes was an effective way of gathering attachment related information, and Bowlby (1980) had offered a number of useful speculations regarding adult attachment.

The Peer Attachment Interview provides information on the subject’s attachment pattern with his or her intimate partner, that is spouse, common-law spouse or romantic relationship. In the interview, participants are asked to describe their relationship history, the quality of their current relationship including communication patterns, levels of emotional support, trust, love-worthiness, decision-making, conflict resolution patterns, separations, sexual relationship, mutuality, their involvement with friends and their outside interests. Participants are then requested to provide a general evaluation of their current intimate relationship. This information allows for the rating of individuals on secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment patterns based on the similarity to prototypic descriptions of each attachment pattern developed by Bartholomew (1989) specifically for intimate adult relationships.

The construct validation for the four prototype model and the Peer Attachment Interview was established by comparing adult intimate interview ratings with adult early interview ratings, peer ratings and a set of self-report measures of self-concept.
and interpersonal orientation. The self-report measures included the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory (Rosenberg, 1965), the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (Horowitz, Rosenberg, Baer, Ureno & Villasenor, 1988), the Relationship Questionnaire (Hazan & Shaver, 1987), the Interpersonal Dependency Inventory (Hirschfeld, Klerman, Gough, Barrett, Korchin & Chodoff, 1977) and the Sociability Scale (Cheek & Buss, 1981). These measures all yielded comparable results suggesting that the four prototype model and the Peer Attachment Interview had adequate construct validity.

**Attachment and Adult Relationships**

Attachment theory over the past twenty years has mainly focused on infant-caregiver and child-parent relationships but recent efforts have been made to apply the theory to adult relationships. A number of authors (Brown, Felton, Whiteman & Manela, 1980; Kitson, 1982; Weiss, 1982; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) argue that romantic love is a biosocial attachment process in which affectional bonds are formed between adult lovers. Weiss (1982) indicates that romantic relationships seem to satisfy the requirements of attachment bonds: the individual is motivated to remain within the range of the attachment figure, the presence of the figure is accompanied by increased comfort and security, and separations or threats to access to the figure may be perceived as threats to the individual's own well-being and may be met with protest. In this manner the defining features of caregiver-infant attachment characterize love relationships: a desire for
closeness to the attachment figure especially under stress, a sense of security from contact, and distress or protest when threatened with loss or separation. It may be that attachment patterns developed in childhood continue into adult behaviours and relationships, and a number of studies have begun to test this hypothesis (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Collins & Read, 1990; Bartholomew, 1989, 1990).

In two studies, Hazan and Shaver (1987), based on a broad ranging sample of 620 respondents to a newspaper questionnaire and 108 college undergraduates, found that the prevalence and proportions of the three attachment patterns in adult intimate relationships roughly corresponded to those found in infancy. In adult relationships, 56% reported secure attachment, 24% identified dismissing attachment and 20% indicated preoccupied attachment. In infancy, as calculated in a review paper by Campos, Barnett, Lamb, Goldsmith and Stenberg (1983), 62% were securely attached, 23% were insecure-avoidant attached and 15% were insecure-resistant attached. Hazan and Shaver also found that adults within the three attachment patterns differed predictably in their experience of romantic love. Secure lovers described their love experiences as especially happy, friendly and trusting and indicated that they were able to accept and support their partner in spite of their partner’s faults. Avoidant lovers were characterized by fear of intimacy, lack of trust and dependency, and desire for self-reliance. Anxious/resistant lovers experienced love as involving obsession, desire for reciprocation and union, emotional highs and lows and
extreme sexual attraction and jealousy. Crittenden and Ainsworth (1989) and Delozier (1982) indicate that these insecure attachment disorders in adults bear striking resemblance to attachment disorders in infancy. They are characterized by intense separation anxiety, dysfunctional and chronic anger, distrust of the attachment figure and the environment, and restraints on the development of self-reliant behaviour.

Collins and Read (1990), in their study based on 118 college undergraduates, found evidence for a relationship between the attachment model of the individual and the caregiving patterns of their parents. They found that individuals who perceived their parents as warm and responsive were more likely to have positive views of themselves and of human behaviour, whereas unresponsive or inconsistent parenting was associated with a more negative self-image and more negative views of others. They also found that individuals tended to be in relationships with partners who shared similar beliefs and feelings about becoming close and intimate with others. Descriptions of the attachment behaviours of the opposite-sex parent were also reported to be predictive of the attachment dimensions of their partner.

Bartholomew (1989, 1990) studied the relationship between family attachment patterns and adult intimate attachment patterns among 146 college students. Two studies were reported that utilized the Family Attachment and Peer Attachment Interviews developed by Bartholomew (1989). Initially, Bartholomew theoretically differentiated the insecure-avoidant attachment pattern into two forms of adult avoidance of intimacy labeled
Fearful and Dismissing, and then found indications of the Secure, Preoccupied, Dismissing and Fearful patterns in both family and adult intimate relationships. Bartholomew also found a significant relationship ($\chi^2(9) = 53.1, p < .001$) between the mental representations of early attachment patterns and current adult attachment patterns, indicating the possibility of continuity between early and adult attachment patterns.

Bartholomew reported proportions of the family attachment patterns and adult intimate attachment patterns that appear to correspond to those previously found in infancy and romantic adult relationships. The family attachment pattern proportions were 64% secure, 9% preoccupied, 16% dismissing and 11% fearful, whereas in infancy Campos and associates (1983) had calculated that 62% were securely attached, 15% were insecure-resistant attached and 23% were insecure-avoidant attached. The adult intimate pattern proportions were 47% secure, 14% preoccupied, 14% dismissing and 25% fearful compared to Hazan and Shaver’s study (1987) which reported proportion of 56% secure, 20% preoccupied and 24% dismissing. The similarity in these proportions may be due to links between childhood and adult attachment patterns.

In adult intimate relationships, Bartholomew (1989) described the preoccupied attachment pattern as being characterized by a preoccupation with the relationship, high levels of dependency on the partner, a desire for an extreme level of intimacy at all times, an insatiable need for attention and approval, a fear of being alone or losing the partner, a romantic idealization of the
partner and the relationship yet feeling that the partner does not value them sufficiently, a strong desire to take care of the partner and high separation anxiety. These individuals tend to be extreme in both their positive and negative affects with high levels of anger, jealousy and possessiveness intermixed with being very affectionate and positively expressive. These individuals tend to be highly conflict engaging, emotionally expressive and demanding yet in the final analysis willing to submit to their partner's wishes in order to avoid rejection. The relationship clearly takes priority over friendships and outside interests and they tend to be very jealous of partner's friends, family connections and interests.

The description of the preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern bears a great deal of similarity to the characteristics of men who assault their wives categorized as undercontrolled-dependent. These men have exaggerated and compulsive dependency, extreme jealousy, possessiveness, emotional volatility and poor impulse control (Faulk, 1974; Elbow, 1977; Hilberman & Munson, 1977-1978; Rounsaville, 1978; Walker, 1984; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Browne, 1987; Saunders, 1987, 1992).

In contrast, the dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern is described by Bartholomew (1989) as characterized by an emphasis on self-sufficiency and the maintenance of emotional distance from the partner. These individuals tend to value independence, minimize the importance of intimate relationships, become uncomfortable with too much intimacy, feel trapped in relationships, prefer considerable time apart from the partner.
and complain that their partners are overly dependent and demanding. These individuals prefer to deal with problems on their own and tend to present themselves in a cool, aloof, matter-of-fact, defensive, rational and confident manner. They tend to be passively conflict avoidant and endeavour to withdraw from conflict situations. They are uncomfortable with emotional vulnerability, expressions of affection and all highly charged positive and negative affects and attempt to maintain a high level of control over these situations. They tend to focus on the impersonal aspects of life such as work and hobbies.

These characteristics of the dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern appear to resemble those of wife assaultive men categorized as overcontrolled-dominant. These men are self-centered, narcissistic, asocial, avoidant and generally unassertive (Faulk, 1974; Bland & Orn, 1986; Caesar, 1986; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Saunders, 1987, 1992).

The fearful adult intimate attachment pattern (Bartholomew, 1989) is characterized by a desire for acceptance from the partner but extreme sensitivity to signs of rejection. These individuals feel generally unlovable, undervalued and not good enough. They tend to be highly dependent on the relationship and willingly submit to their partner's wishes in order to please them. They are extremely conflict avoidant and sensitive to partner's anger. They tend not to open up or trust their partner and fear alienating or imposing on their partner with their expressions of vulnerability. Friends and outside interests are important, but the relationship takes priority.
The description of the fearful adult intimate attachment pattern is similar to that of wife assaultive men categorized as overcontrolled-dependent. They are characterized as being passive, dependent, unassertive and excessively trying to please their wives (Faulk, 1974; Elbow, 1977; Caesar, 1986; Gondolf, 1987).

In summary, it appears that adults with insecure attachment patterns experience many emotional and behavioural difficulties in intimate relationships and the descriptions of these problems bear a striking similarity to those found with men who commit wife assault. Adults with preoccupied intimate attachment patterns (Bartholomew, 1989; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) experience high levels of possessive dependency, obsessive jealousy, and emotional highs and lows in love relationships. These individuals appear to resemble the male undercontrolled-dependent category within the wife assault literature. In contrast, adults with dismissing intimate attachment patterns experience a strong desire for self-reliance and exhibit a cool, aloof and emotionally controlling manner (Bartholomew, 1989). These individuals appear to resemble the male overcontrolled-dominant category within the wife assault literature. Adults with fearful intimate attachment patterns (Bartholomew, 1989; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) experience high dependency and acceptance needs but fear rejection and appear to be similar to descriptions of the male overcontrolled-dependent wife assault category. If links do exist between the three insecure attachment patterns and the specific relationship problems and conflict tactics associated with the
three wife assault categories, then attachment theory may provide a useful way of understanding the development of the violent behaviours of men who assault their wives. This link will be explored in detail in this study.

**Attachment Patterns**

In this section the empirical and descriptive literature on secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment patterns throughout the life cycle are presented. This provides a sense of the interpersonal dilemmas, problems and issues that individuals with particular attachment patterns are faced with during various stages of development. Speculations will also be made regarding the male relationship problems and conflict behaviours in intimate relationship likely associated with each of the four attachment patterns.

The three attachment patterns originally identified by Ainsworth and her associates (Ainsworth et al., 1978) were securely attached (group B), insecure-resistant (group C) and insecure-avoidant (group A). In adult early and adult intimate relationships, four attachment patterns have been described labeled secure (B), preoccupied (C), dismissing and fearful. The dismissing and fearful patterns are thought to represent two distinct categories of insecure-avoidance in adults and will be presented in separate subheadings under the Insecure-Avoidant or Dismissing and Fearful Pattern heading. Each of these patterns will be explored in detail in this next section.
Secure Attachment Pattern (B)

The proportion of infants with secure attachment patterns (B) to their caregivers in the United States tends to range between 55% and 75% (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Maslin, 1983; Egeland & Farber, 1984; Belsky, Gilstrap & Rovine, 1984; Lyons-Ruth, Connell, Grunebaum, Botein & Zoll, 1984; Weber, Levitt & Clark, 1986; Spieker & Booth, 1988). Infants who are securely attached are distinct in the frequency in which they seek engagement in affective sharing with the caregiver and their ability to seek comfort and be calmed by the attachment figure when distressed. They have primary caregivers who readily perceive, accurately interpret, and promptly and appropriately respond to their infants. These caregivers, predominantly mothers, provide a predictable and controllable environment which promotes the infant's regulation of arousal and sense of efficacy.

The proportion of individuals with secure adult intimate attachment patterns ranged from 40% to 56% (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Bartholomew, 1989), while the proportion with secure adult early attachment patterns was found to range between 64% and 72% (Bartholomew, 1989). When males were classified separately 40% had secure adult intimate attachment patterns and 72% had secure adult early attachment patterns (Bartholomew, 1989).

Secure adult early attachment patterns are described by Bartholomew (1989) as being characterized by a realistic appraisal of the past and a valuing of attachment relationships. These individuals generally remember their parents as being supportive, warm and accepting. They tend to be self-confident,
thoughtful, mature and balanced in their intellect and emotionality.

Individuals with secure adult intimate attachment are described by Bartholomew (1989) as tending to value and feel secure in their relationships. They are able to realistically evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of their partner and the relationship. In interpersonal conflicts they tend to be assertive and have good conflict resolution skills. They appropriately express both negative and positive feelings and expect mutuality in outcomes. They tend to maintain close friendships and family relationships and are not threatened by partner’s friendships and interests. Hazan and Shaver (1987) described secure lovers as having especially happy, friendly and trusting experiences in which they were able to accept and support their partner in spite of their partner’s faults.

The descriptions of the characteristics of men with secure attachment pattern indicate that they should have few long-standing relationship problems and no propensity for wife assault.

Insecure-Resistant or Preoccupied Pattern (C)

The proportion of infants with insecure-resistant attachment pattern (C) ranges from 4% to 22% (Bell, 1970; Ainsworth et al., 1978; Egeland & Sroufe, 1981; Main & Weston, 1981; Belsky et al., 1984; Egeland & Farber, 1984; Lyons-Ruth et al., 1984). These infants are characterized by their high proximity seeking and contact maintenance, mixed with their resistance or angry rejection of the attachment figure. They seem unable to direct
attention to the environment or to play independently, due to their constant focus on their caregiver. They express strong and sometimes continual distress and fear of the environment and of their primary relationships.

The insecure-resistant attachment pattern (C) is thought to represent the infant's adaptation to a primary caregiver who is inconsistent in his or her response to the needs of the infant. Ainsworth and associates (1978) found that the exhibition of resistant attachment at one year of age was strongly associated with inconsistent primary caregivers and Spieker and Booth (1988) found that these caregivers were the least confident in coping with early caregiving tasks. Main and associates (1985) found that these parents were preoccupied with meeting their own strong dependency needs from their own parents and were still actively struggling to please them.

The proportion of individuals with insecure preoccupied adult intimate attachment patterns ranged from 8% to 20% (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Bartholomew, 1989), while the proportion with preoccupied adult early attachment patterns was found to be 3% - 9% (Bartholomew, 1989). When males were classified separately, 8% had insecure preoccupied adult intimate attachment patterns and 3% had preoccupied adult early attachment patterns (Bartholomew, 1989).

Preoccupied adult early attachment patterns are described by Bartholomew (1989) as being characterized by emotional enmeshment with parents and lack of independent identity. These individuals tend to be very emotional, conflicted and overly sensitive to the
opinion of others. They remember their parents as being inept, very inconsistent or enmeshed, yet they would go to them when upset. They tend to have low self-esteem, experience high separation anxiety and feel conflicted emotions including anger towards their parents.

In current intimate relationships, adults with preoccupied attachment experience possessive dependency, obsessive jealousy and emotional highs and lows in their love relationships (Bartholomew, 1989; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). These characteristics are similar to those found with the undercontrolled-dependent category of wife assaulters who exhibit poor impulse control, exaggerated dependency, extreme jealousy and possessiveness (Faulk, 1974; Elbow, 1977; Caesar, 1986; Saunders, 1992). The connections between preoccupied adult intimate attachment patterns and the characteristics of the undercontrolled-dependent wife assault category are areas that require further investigation and will be pursued in this study.

The high levels of jealousy and anger are common features for both men with preoccupied adult intimate attachment patterns (Bartholomew, 1989; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and men who assault their wives (Gayford, 1975; Roy, 1977; Hilberman & Munson, 1977-78; Rounsaville, 1978; Walker, 1984; Browne, 1987) and in the wife assault literature, sexual jealousy is frequently a topic that incites violence (Roy, 1977; Rounsaville, 1978; Walker, 1984; Browne, 1987; Dutton, 1988a). Dutton (1988a) remarks that sexual jealousy to the extent that it involves delusions, distortions and irrational jealousy may represent a form of
chronic abandonment anxiety. Anger and jealousy were therefore chosen as variables for further exploration.

The descriptions of the characteristics of men with the insecure-preoccupied attachment pattern indicate that they should have long-standing anxiety, jealousy and anger problems and may utilize conflict tactics in an indiscriminate manner.

**Insecure-Avoidant or Dismissing and Fearful Patterns (A)**

The proportion of infants with the insecure-avoidant attachment pattern (A) ranges from 15% to 32% (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Main & Weston, 1981; Belsky et al., 1984). Infants with insecure-avoidant attachment show minimal displays of affect or distress in the presence of the caregiver and an avoidance of the attachment figure under conditions that usually elicit proximity seeking and interaction. They attend to the environment while actively directing attention away from the parent. Grossmann and associates (1988) in a study of 48 infants found that infants who exhibited avoidant attachment, communicated directly with their primary caregiver only when they were feeling well. When distressed, these infants tended not to signal the primary caregiver nor seek bodily contact. Main and associates (1985), in a study of 40 children drawn from predominantly upper middle-class, White or Asian families, found that at 6 years, children with the insecure-avoidant attachment pattern directed attention away from their mother upon reunion, attended to their toys or other activities, responded politely but minimally when addressed and sometimes subtly moved away from their mother. When
interviewed, they seemed ill at ease about discussing their feelings regarding separation, "did not know" what a child might do in response to a two week separation from the parents and actively avoided, refused or turned around and away from a photograph of their family.

The avoidant attachment pattern (A) is thought to represent the infant's adaptation to the insensitive understimulation and unresponsiveness of the primary caregiver. This idea is supported by a number of empirical studies. Ainsworth and associates (1978) found that infants' exhibition of avoidant attachment at one year of age was strongly associated with their mother's aversion to physical contact, nonresponsiveness to infant signals such as crying and lack of emotional expressiveness. These mothers verbally and behaviourally stated a dislike of physical contact with their infants during the first quarter. Main and Weston (1982) in a study of 61 infants found that this dislike of contact remained stable over the first year. It was not unusual for the infants to show unpredictable episodes of anger and aggression towards their caregivers. These caregivers were generally low in emotional expressiveness even in response to the highly aggressive behaviour of their infants (Main, Tomasini & Tolan, 1979; Main & Stadtman, 1981).

Main and associates (1985) found that parental dislike of physical contact with their infant was associated with parents who could not remember the details of their childhood or who had idealized their past relationships with their own parents, even though they could recall specific contradictory rejecting
memories.

The insecure-avoidant pattern identified in childhood attachment studies has been differentiated by Bartholomew (1989, 1990) into two forms of adult avoidance: the dismissing pattern and the fearful pattern. These two avoidant patterns will be reviewed separately in this section.

**Dismissing intimate attachment.**

The proportion of individuals with insecure dismissing adult intimate attachment patterns ranged from 14% to 30% (Bartholomew, 1989), while the proportion with dismissing adult early attachment patterns was found to be 16% – 17% (Bartholomew, 1989). When males were classified separately 30% had insecure dismissing adult intimate attachment patterns and 17% had dismissing adult early attachment patterns (Bartholomew, 1989).

Dismissing adult early attachment patterns are described by Bartholomew (1989) as being characterized by emotional detachment and the minimization of important attachment relations. They tend to over-emphasize independence, emotional control and achievement. These individuals generally remember their parents as being either rejecting, or cool and unemotional. They tend to be distant, self-confident, overly rational, unemotional and sometimes arrogant. They rarely get overtly upset and tend to have highly idealized memories of their parents.

In intimate adult relationships, individuals with dismissing attachment experience a strong desire for self-reliance and a lack of trust. They tend to minimize the importance of their intimate adult relationship, be conflict avoidant and come across
in an impersonal, cool, aloof, matter-of-fact, emotionally controlling and defensive manner (Bartholomew, 1989). These characteristics of the dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern appear to resemble those of wife assaultive men categorized as overcontrolled-dominant. These men are self-centered, narcissistic, asocial, avoidant and generally unassertive. The connections between dismissing adult intimate attachment patterns and the characteristics of the overcontrolled-dominant wife assault category are areas that require further investigation and will be pursued in this study.

The descriptions of the characteristics of men with the insecure dismissing attachment pattern indicate that they should have intimacy and control problems and seldom utilize conflict tactics due to their conflict avoidance.

**Fearful intimate attachment.**

The proportion of individuals with insecure fearful adult intimate attachment patterns ranged from 22% to 30% (Bartholomew, 1989; Hazan & Shaver, 1987), while the proportion with fearful adult early attachment patterns was found to be 8% - 11% (Bartholomew, 1989). When males were classified separately, 22% had insecure fearful adult intimate attachment patterns and 8% had fearful adult early attachment patterns (Bartholomew, 1989). Fearful adult early attachment patterns are described by Bartholomew (1989) as being characterized by a strong desire for closeness and acceptance but avoidance due to fear of rejection. They tend to be very shy, vulnerable and withdrawn as a child and exhibit low self-esteem. These individuals generally remember
their parents as being either rejecting, overly critical, harsh and abusive, or so unavailable and cold that they appeared uncaring. They have continued emotional involvements with their parents and blame themselves for parental rejection.

In current intimate relationships, adults with fearful attachment experience a strong desire for acceptance from the partner which is inhibited by fears of rejection (Bartholomew, 1989; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). They tend to be highly dependent on the relationship and willingly submit to partner’s wishes in order to please them. They are extremely conflict avoidant and sensitive to partner’s anger. These characteristics of the fearful adult intimate attachment pattern appear to resemble those of wife assaultive men categorized as overcontrolled-dependent. They are characterized as being passive, dependent, unassertive and excessively trying to please their wives (Faulk, 1974; Elbow, 1977; Caesar, 1986).

The descriptions of the characteristics of men with the insecure fearful adult attachment pattern indicate that they should have intimacy, dependency, trust and assertiveness problems, and seldom utilize any of the behavioural strategies identified on the Conflict Tactics Scale with their spouse.

The Conflict Behaviours Associated with Insecure Attachment

In this section, the behavioural correlates of insecure attachment suggesting that insecure attachment patterns could be precursors to violent behaviours are explored. It is important to remember that the studies in this section are all correlational,
so the associations must be interpreted with caution. In many of these studies, factors other than attachment, such as temperament or child abuse, could be the determining variables that are influencing both the patterns of attachment and the conflict behaviours.

Within the socioemotional realm, Main and Stadtman (1981) speculated that if an attachment figure rejects close body contact with an infant, the infant is placed in a conflict situation in which aggression, conflict behaviour and avoidance are expected outcomes. In their study of 38, 9-12 month old infants and their mothers from white middle-class families, they found that the primary caregiver’s aversion to contact with the infant was associated with infant conflict behaviour including the infant’s angry moods and acts of aggression. They found that many infants responded immediately with conflict behaviour when rejected by the primary caregiver including facial grimacing, engaging in odd and empty laughter and kicking their feet in sudden peculiar tension movements. Maslin and Bates (1982) who assessed 26 children at 13 months and 24 months found that children with the avoidant attachment pattern (A) showed particularly high conflict in interaction patterns that involved caregiver physical restraint/contact. Relationships with peers for children with insecure attachment patterns were reported to be more shallow and more likely tinged with hostility (Pancake, 1985), and boys with insecure attachment were more likely to develop behaviour problems at school (Lewis et al., 1984).

In a series of victimization studies with a sample of 38
poor, urban children from 4 to 5 years of age, children who were securely attached (B) were found to be neither victimizers nor victimized when assigned to a play partner. Victimization was defined as the active exploitation of the other child and either the physical or emotional abuse of them. Children with the avoidant attachment pattern (A) were quite likely to victimize, and children with the avoidant or resistant attachment patterns were often targeted for victimization (Troy & Sroufe, 1987). In general, children with the avoidant attachment pattern (A) were observed to be more hostile, antisocial, socially and emotionally isolated and aggressive than others (Main, 1973; Pastor, 1981; Sroufe, 1983), while children with the resistant attachment pattern (C) were more socially inept (Erickson et al., 1985; Sroufe, 1983).

In adult relationships, insecurity of attachment within the marital relationship has been found to be related to less constructive approaches to problem solving (Kobak & Hazan, 1991) and less effective conflict resolution (Levy & Davis, 1988; Howes, Markham & Lindahl, 1991; Senchak & Leonard, 1992; Feeney, Noller & Callan, 1993). Individuals with anxious attachment appear to have more coercive communication patterns and higher levels of intimate conflict than individuals with secure attachment. Individuals with ambivalent attachment tend to endorse a dominating conflict style (Levy & Davis, 1988).

On the basis of these findings, it appears that individuals with insecure attachment experience a great deal of anger and have difficulties resolving conflicts in interpersonal
relationships. Individuals with insecure-avoidant attachment patterns tend to be more withdrawn, socially and emotionally isolated and in interpersonal relationships can be highly conflictual, hostile, angry, aggressive and victimizing. Individuals with insecure-resistant attachment patterns can be impulsive, easily frustrated, socially inept and can exhibit angry moods and acts of aggression towards others. Early attachment patterns appear to be related to socioemotional, interpersonal and behavioural problems and the insecure patterns established in childhood may be influential in the kinds of interpersonal problems experienced in adulthood. Insecurity in adult intimate relationships appears to be related to ineffective conflict resolution, poor problem solving, coercive communication patterns and high levels of relationship conflict. The extent of continuity between early attachment patterns and adult behavioural and attachment patterns appears to be a useful area of inquiry in the present study.

Questions

This preliminary and exploratory study will investigate the links between insecure male attachment patterns and wife assault by examining the concurrence of adult early and current intimate attachment patterns and the adult anger, jealousy and conflict tactics associated with the insecure attachment patterns. The specific questions are the following:

(1) What is the nature of the adult intimate attachment patterns
(2) What conflict tactics are associated with insecure adult intimate attachment patterns?

(3) Are the men with the insecure preoccupied, dismissing and fearful adult intimate attachment patterns different in terms of self-reported jealousy and anger?

(4) Are insecure early attachment patterns associated with insecure adult intimate attachment patterns?

(5) What conflict tactics are associated with insecure early attachment patterns?

(6) Are the men with the insecure preoccupied, dismissing and fearful early attachment patterns different in terms of self-reported jealousy and anger?
CHAPTER THREE

Method

The purpose of this preliminary and exploratory research was to explore the links between insecure male attachment patterns and wife assault with a population of men seeking treatment for assaultive behaviours against their wives.

Study Sample

Study participants were men solicited from the wife assault therapy groups of the Assaultive Husband’s Project (Vancouver) and the Family Violence Project (Victoria) during 1991/92. The men were participants in a larger research project conducted by Dutton and his associates (1993). Their agreement to participate in this research was obtained in a consent form, to be found in Appendix A, and only those men who returned the completed consent form were contacted. On the same consent form, participants indicated their willingness to have their female partners involved in the project. The female partners were then contacted by telephone and upon their agreement to participate were sent a questionnaire. A sample of fifty participants was obtained from a pool of 116 men, representing a 40% involvement rate.

The sample was comprised of fifty men who had assaulted their wives. Fifty-four percent of the men had been court referred to a treatment group, while forty-six percent were self-referred. The mean age of the men was 35 years with a range of 17 to 65 years, although the vast majority, that is 91%, of the men were between
24 and 45 years old. Sixty-three percent of the men were blue collar workers and thirty-seven percent were white collar workers and their annual incomes ranged from $10,000 to over $60,000, with the mean income being $34,285.00. The men had a mean educational level of Grade 12 with a range of Grade 8 to Masters Degree. Most of the men who participated in the research, that is 91%, were Canadian born white males. At the time of the interviews, 56% of the men were living with their female partners, while 44% were separated. All the men identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual and indicated an average of 6.8 years of involvement in their most intimate adult relationship with a range of 1 to 25 years.

The Straus Conflict Tactics Scale (1979) revealed that 100% of the men reported they had used violence against their female partners at some time during the relationship. During the past year, self-reports indicated that 94% of the men had used violence tactics ranging from throwing objects to using a knife or a gun, and 83% had used severe violence tactics such as kicking, biting, hitting with a fist, beating up, and threatening to or using a knife or a gun. The men reported a mean Conflict Tactic Scale score of 11.5 (SD=9.2) acts of physical violence against their wives. In a demographic comparison group, Dutton and Ryan (1993) found the mean self-reported Conflict Tactic Scale score was 1.34 (SD=3.4) for physical assaultiveness in the past year. This comparison group was made up of men who worked for a local union in Vancouver, British Columbia. The average age was 35 years with a range of 19 to 45 years, and the average
education level was Grade 12. Mean annual income was $55,000 with a mode of $35,000 and 65% of the men were married.

Potential Dangers

In working with these men there is always the potential of further violence especially towards their female partners. In an effort to reduce the potential danger for the women, the following procedures were developed and implemented.

1. Only men who were in weekly group therapy for wife assault and had the therapeutic supports of the counsellors within these programs were contacted to participate in this research project.

2. The standardized self-report measures were handed out in the third week of the group therapy by which time the men had an opportunity to internalize more responsibility for their own anger/violence and been taught and practiced time-out techniques.

3. The men were informed that they might find some of the questions in the self-report measures emotionally disturbing. If this occurred they were advised to leave the self-report measure, take a walk and immediately contact this researcher to ensure that these disturbing issues didn't result in further wife assault.

4. The men initiated the involvement of their female partners in the research project by giving their written permission for her to be contacted, at which point she decided whether or not to give her consent to be involved.
General Procedure

Participants completed a set of standardized self-report measures in their own homes and returned the completed package within a two week period to the investigator. Completion of these measures required between one and two hours. Upon return of the questionnaires, two semi-structured attachment interviews were scheduled, either at the participant's home or at the university. Participants were paid a stipend of $10.00 for the completion of the paper and pencil measures and $10.00 for the interviews. Participants also received a follow-up feedback session regarding their scores on the completed measures. Female participants, who were the marital partners of the male participants, completed the Conflict Tactic Scale measure in the privacy of their own home and then returned the completed measure. The completion of this measure took fifteen to twenty minutes.

Measures

There were three self-report measures and two semi-structured interviews which will be described below.

The Straus Conflict Tactics Scale (C.T.S.) (Straus, 1979).

The C.T.S. is an eighteen item scale describing various ways of handling interpersonal conflict. The items range from those subscales involving reasoning (items a to c) to verbal and symbolic aggression (items e to k) to physical aggression (items l to s). The term "reasoning" as it will be used throughout this dissertation will refer to the three reasoning items of the
Conflict Tactics Scale (i.e. discussing the issue calmly, getting information to back up your side of things, and bringing in or trying to bring in someone else to help settle things). Responses can range in frequency for each item from never (a) to more than 20 times (g). Item scores are then determined by calculating a numeric mid-point for each letter. In other words, a (never) was calculated as 0 times, b (once) as 1 time, c (twice) as 2 times, d (3-5) as 4 times, e (6-10) as 8 times, f (11-20) as 16 times and g (21+) as 25 times. Total scores for each subscale were developed by adding the appropriate raw scores. Straus (1979) assessed the psychometric properties of the C.T.S. during a United States nationwide survey of 2,143 households. Factor analysis of these data found factors that roughly coincided with the three subscales described above. Internal consistency was found to be good for the verbal/symbolic aggression (alpha coefficient = .80) and physical aggression subscales (alpha coefficient = .83), but somewhat poorer for the reasoning scale (alpha coefficient = .50), perhaps due to the smaller number of items. This measure was used to gather information regarding the various conflict resolution strategies in the participant’s intimate relationship. This information was used to verify that the male participants in this study were physically and emotionally aggressive with their intimate partners and to assess the level and type of abusive conflict resolution strategies utilized. The C.T.S. was administered separately to the men who participated in this study and their female partners in an effort to achieve reliable and valid results. In the field of wife
assault, the C.T.S. scores for the men as reported by their female partners are considered to be more comprehensive and valid measures than that reported by the men (Szinovacz, 1983; Dutton & Browning, 1986). Men have been found to report as little as 54% as much abuse as their victims (Dutton & Browning, 1986). The Conflict Tactics Scale can be found in Appendix B.

The Interpersonal Jealousy Scale (Mathes & Severa, 1981; Mathes, Phillips, Skowran & Dick, 1982).

This is a 28 item scale that measures romantic jealousy reported by the respondent to hypothetical situations. Jealousy is defined by Mathes and Severa (1981) as the negative emotion resulting from actual or threatened loss of love to a rival. Each item is scaled from 1, indicating Always False, to 9, indicating Always True. The total jealousy score is established by reverse scoring specified items and then adding the 28 item scores. Tests of the construct validity of this measure have shown it to be correlated with dependency. The validity of the scale for men was supported by significant correlations with two behavioural measures: threat when one is confronted with a rival ($r=.44; p<.01$) and expressions of possessiveness toward the partner ($r=.40; p<.01$). The scale has also been shown to have high internal reliability ($r=.86$) and low correlation with social desirability response bias (Mathes et al., 1982). The Interpersonal Jealousy Scale can be found in Appendix C.
The Multidimensional Anger Inventory (Siegel, 1986).

This is a modified version of the Novaco Anger Index (Novaco, 1975) used to measure the level of anger arousal reported by the respondent to 38 statements. The scale assesses six dimensions of anger response and these are frequency (5 items), duration (2 items), magnitude (4 items reversed scored), mode of expression (12 items), hostile outlook (6 items) and range of anger-eliciting situations (9 items). The mode of expression dimension contains separate anger-in and anger-out measures. Each item is scaled from 1 to 5, with 1 indicating the statement is Completely Undescriptive of the person and 5 indicating the statement is Completely Descriptive. The dimensional scores are established by reverse scoring specified items and then adding the appropriate item scores. A total anger score results from adding all six dimensional scores. Psychometric analyses of the scale showed that it possessed adequate test-retest reliability ($r = .75$) and high internal consistency (alpha for two samples = .84 and .89), although less than the .96 found when Novaco used the original 80 item scale. The validity of the scale was supported by the expected pattern of relations with other inventories designed to assess anger or hostility such as the Buss-Durkee Hostility-Guilt Inventory (Buss & Durkee, 1957) and the Novaco Anger Inventory (Novaco, 1975). The Multidimensional Anger Inventory can be found in Appendix D.

The Family Attachment Interview (Bartholomew, 1989).

This is a semi-structured interview that provides information
on the subject’s mental representation of early attachment to his or her parents. This interview takes an average of one and one half hours to complete although the time may range from one hour to two hours. In the interview, participants are asked to describe their family backgrounds; their relationship with each parent; the emotional supports provided when they were upset, separated from their parents or feeling rejected; the extent and impact of loss during childhood; and the quality of their current relationship with their parents. Participants are then requested to provide a general evaluation of their childhood experiences in the family. This information allows for the rating of individuals on 20 rating scales. These are parental acceptance, parental rejection, parental involvement, parental consistency, emotional expressivity, child pushed to achievement, role reversal, adult’s expression of anger towards parents, adult’s idealization, depth of portrait of parents, child’s use of parents as secure base, parent-to-child dominance, adult-to-parent closeness, elaboration, coherence, lack of resolution of mourning, lack of resolution of trauma, separation anxiety, adolescent rebellion and self-esteem. On the basis of audio tape-recordings of the interview, participants are then rated on a nine-point scale according to their similarities to prototypic descriptions developed by Bartholomew (1989) of the secure, fearful, dismissing and preoccupied patterns. A low rating indicates little evidence of a given attachment pattern and a high rating indicates a good fit with that particular attachment pattern. A copy of the interview schedule, Rating Scales, Family Attachment
Rating Specifications and Attachment Prototypes can be found in Appendix E.

The two individuals who rated the Family Attachment Interview were a 25 year old female psychology graduate student who specialized in developmental psychology and attachment issues, and this 40 year old male investigator. The final interview ratings were the mean scores of the two independent raters. Table G-1 found in Appendix G shows the range, median and mean scores and interrater reliabilities on the Family Attachment Interview for each of the four patterns. Interrater reliabilities on the attachment ratings ranged from .79 to .91.

The means and standard deviations of the scores given by each of the two raters identified above on the Family Attachment Interview for the four patterns are presented in Table G-2 found in Appendix G. In an effort to address the potential problem of bias with Rater 1 also being the interviewer, Rater 1 did not rate the Family Attachment Interview audiotape until six months after the completion of the interview. This promoted the rating of only the Family Attachment Interview portion of the tape and reduced the likelihood that Rater 1 would remember other details of the interview (e.g. the non-verbal clues, the Peer Attachment Interview portion, the difficulties in setting up appointments). In a further effort to discover whether there were any inherent biases in the ratings, the ratings given by each rater were analyzed. The results indicate no statistically significant differences between the ratings given by Rater 1 and Rater 2 on the attachment patterns with the exception of a marginally
significant difference for the fearful pattern (Rater 1 > Rater 2; \( t(1)=1.85, p<.10 \)). Thus there was a trend for Rater 1 to consider the men to be more fearful than Rater 2.

The Peer Attachment Interview (Bartholomew, 1989).

This is a semi-structured interview developed by Bartholomew (1989) in a similar manner to the Family Attachment Interview. It provides information on the participant’s attachment pattern with his or her intimate partner, that is spouse, common-law spouse or romantic relationship. In the interview, participants are asked to describe their relationship history, the quality of their current relationship including communication patterns, levels of emotional support, trust, love-worthiness, decision-making, conflict resolution patterns, separations, sexual relationship and mutuality, their involvement with friends and their outside interests. Participants are then requested to provide a general evaluation of their current intimate relationship. This information allows for the rating of individuals on 19 rating scales. These are frequency of crying, crying situation, use of others as a secure base, reciprocity, idealization of partner, intimacy, dominance, emotional expressivity, capacity to rely on partner, caregiving of partner, self-disclosure, jealousy, physical abuse, warmth, self-esteem, elaboration, coherence, separation anxiety and trust. On the basis of audio tape-recordings of the interview, participants are then rated according to their similarities to prototypic descriptions of the secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful patterns developed by
Bartholomew (1989) specifically for intimate adult relationships. A copy of the interview schedule, Rating Scales, Peer Attachment Rating Specifications and Attachment Prototypes can be found in Appendix F. Each participant receives a rating from one to nine for each of the four attachment patterns. A low rating indicates little evidence of a given attachment pattern and a high rating indicates a good fit to the given attachment pattern.

The interview was rated by two different raters from those of the Family Attachment Interview. The raters selected to rate this interview were fourth year undergraduate psychology students specializing in developmental psychology and adult relationships. The first rating was conducted by a 37 year old female, while the second rating required the selection of three raters, that is a 21 year old male, a 24 year old female and a 26 year old male, due to attrition problems. The final interview ratings were the mean scores of the two independent ratings. Table G-3 found in Appendix G shows the range, median and mean scores and the interrater reliabilities on the Peer Attachment Interview for each of the four patterns. Interrater reliabilities on the attachment ratings ranged from .75 to .89.

The means and standard deviations of the scores given by each of the two raters identified above on the Peer Attachment Interview for the four patterns are presented in Table G-4 found in Appendix G. The results indicate that even though the mean scores given by Rater 3 and Rater 4 on each attachment subcategory appear to be fairly similar, there was a low but significant difference on the secure subcategory (Rater 3 < Rater...
4; t(1)=-2.13, p<.05) and a marginally significant difference for
the preoccupied subcategory (Rater 3 > Rater 4; t(1)=1.76, 
p<.10). Thus, Rater 3 considered the men to be more preoccupied
and less secure than did Rater 4.

Training of Raters

Each interview was rated by four independent raters, that is
two for the Family Attachment Interview and two for the Peer
Attachment Interview, who had received extensive training by Dr.
Kim Bartholomew on interview tapes during a one year seminar. In
1987-88, Bartholomew, as part of her doctoral dissertation,
developed the two interview schedules used in this study, that is
the Family Attachment Interview and the Peer Attachment
Interview. Bartholomew also initiated a one year training seminar
for students interested in understanding and rating attachment
interviews. The main focus of the training had been to thoroughly
examine the theoretical/empirical literature regarding attachment
and to conduct extensive ratings of interview transcripts and
practice tapes using the Rating Scales, Attachment Prototypes and
Rating Specifications found in Appendices E and F. The interview
transcripts and tapes for this training were drawn from a variety
of sources and the specific ratings had been established by
respected researchers in the attachment field (Kobak, Sceery,
Shaver, Main, Bartholomew). The interviews were initially rated
independently by each student and then reviewed and discussed in
weekly group seminars. The correspondence between each student’s
rating and the established rating for each interview was tested
throughout the training. In the final stages of the training, interrater reliability was also calculated.

In the past three years, thirteen students completed their training with Dr. Bartholomew and these individuals provided the pool of raters for the current study. The raters were then selected based on their abilities to provide valid and reliable ratings on training tapes using the rating scales and the rating specifications. The interviewer was chosen as one of the raters partly due to his superior abilities to provide valid and reliable ratings on the Family Attachment Interview and partly due to fiscal concerns as the cost of paying each rater was approximately $40.00 per interview.

Attachment Profiles

The attachment profiles were chosen based on the individual receiving the highest score of all fifty men on a particular insecure attachment pattern for both interviews and low scores on the other patterns. In other words, the individual chosen to illustrate the preoccupied profile had high scores, that is greater than 7, on preoccupied attachment and low scores, that is less than 3, on the secure, dismissing and fearful attachment patterns. The Family Attachment Interview and Peer Attachment Interview were then transcribed and organized to produce a narrative account of the individual’s memories regarding his attachment experiences. This process resulted in three illustrative attachment profiles being developed: one for preoccupied identified as "Pedro", one for dismissing identified
as "Brian" and one for fearful identified as "Sam".

Data Analysis

As this was a preliminary and exploratory study, a raised alpha (probability level) of .10 was utilized in testing significance. This is a conservative alpha value for a preliminary study in social science research. B. J. Winer (Winer, 1962), Past President of the American Statistical Association and Cohen (1988) have both argued for a raised alpha as high as 0.30 for social science research. With an alpha level of .10 and a sample size of 50, Cohen's (1988) tables indicate that the probability of detecting a medium effect size ($r=.30; x^2=.30$) is greater than .97 if using a Pearson r statistic, and greater than .92 if using a chi-square statistic. Thus, as a medium effect was anticipated, a raised alpha of .10 was considered satisfactory in detecting whether or not such an association was indeed present.

Use of the Bonferroni inequality principle (Snedecor & Cochran, 1980, p.115-117) was considered due to the large number of correlations conducted in this study and the possibility of significance occurring by chance. The advantage of applying the Bonferroni inequality is that it promotes fewer type-I errors being made, that is rejecting the null hypothesis when it is actually true. The disadvantage is that the alpha level calculated to satisfy the Bonferroni inequality is often so stringent that it greatly increases the likelihood of type-II errors, that is failing to reject the null hypothesis when it is indeed false. As this was a preliminary and exploratory study and
the purpose was to explore possible links between male attachment patterns and wife assault, type-II errors were considered more crucial than type-I errors. It was therefore decided that the Bonferroni inequality principle would not be applied in this study.

The six questions explored in this study were analyzed differently, so each question will be discussed in turn.

To determine the nature of the adult intimate attachment patterns of the men who assault their wives, the Peer Attachment Interview was administered, rated to determine each man’s adult intimate attachment pattern and then the proportion of insecure attachment was calculated.

To determine the conflict tactics associated with the preoccupied, dismissing and fearful adult attachment patterns, the Peer Attachment Interview was administered to the men, and the Conflict Tactics Scale was filled out by both the men and their female partners and scored. The interview was then assessed by two independent raters and every man received a rating on the four attachment patterns, that is secure, dismissing, preoccupied and fearful. Pearson product-moment correlations were then calculated to examine the relationship between the preoccupied, dismissing and fearful ratings on the Peer Attachment Interview and the subscale scores on the Conflict Tactics Scale.

To determine if the men with preoccupied, dismissing and fearful adult intimate attachment were different in terms of self-reported jealousy and anger, the Peer Attachment Interview, the Interpersonal Jealousy Scale, and the Multidimensional Anger
Inventory were administered to the men and scored. The interview was assessed by two independent raters and every man received a rating on the secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment patterns. Pearson product-moment correlations were then calculated to examine the relationship between the preoccupied, dismissing and fearful ratings on the Peer Attachment Interview and scores on the Interpersonal Jealousy Scale and the Novaco Multidimensional Anger Inventory.

To determine if insecure early attachment patterns were associated with insecure adult intimate attachment patterns, the Family Attachment Interview and Peer Attachment Interview were administered and assessed by independent raters. Every man then received a rating from 1 to 9 on the secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment patterns for each interview. Initially the patterns were collapsed into two dichotomous categories, that is Secure and Insecure, for each interview and then the percentage agreement of insecure attachment patterns in both interviews was determined. Cohen's (1968) Kappa was then calculated to determine the stability of the insecure categorization. Then the relationship between the insecure pattern ratings on early attachment and adult intimate attachment was examined utilizing the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient.

To determine the conflict tactics associated with the insecure early attachment patterns, the Family Attachment Interview was administered to the men and the Conflict Tactics Scale was filled out by both the men and their female partners and scored. The
interview was then assessed by two independent raters and every man received a 1 to 9 rating on the secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment patterns. Pearson product-moment correlations were then calculated to examine the relationship between the preoccupied, dismissing and fearful ratings on the Family Attachment Interview and scores on the Conflict Tactics Scale.

To determine if the men with preoccupied, dismissing and fearful early attachment were different in terms of self-reported jealousy and anger, the Family Attachment Interview was administered and the Interpersonal Jealousy Scale and Novaco Multidimensional Anger Inventory were administered to the men and scored. Pearson product-moment correlations were then calculated to examine the relationship between the preoccupied, dismissing and fearful ratings on the Family Attachment Interview and scores on the Interpersonal Jealousy Scale and the Multidimensional Anger Inventory.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

(1) What is the nature of the adult intimate attachment patterns reported by men who assault their wives?

The proportion of insecure attachment found in the study sample of men who had assaulted their wives is displayed in Table I.

Insert Table I about here

With regard to the population of men who assault their wives, ninety-two percent of the men were found to have an insecure adult intimate attachment pattern (48% Preoccupied; 22% Fearful; 22% Dismissing). Within the attachment field, the proportion of insecure adult intimate attachment patterns has been reported to range from 44% to 60% (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Bartholomew, 1989; Scharfe & Bartholomew, 1993). In Hazan and Shaver's (1987) sample of male and female adults, a 44% proportion of insecure adult intimate attachment was reported (24% Dismissing; 20% Preoccupied). In Bartholomew's (1989) sample of male Stanford University students, a proportion of 60% was found (8% Preoccupied; 22% Fearful; 30% Dismissing). In Scharfe and Bartholomew's (1993) sample of married men, a 51% proportion of insecure attachment was reported (6% Preoccupied; 24% Fearful; 19% Dismissing).
Table I
Proportion of Adult Intimate Patterns of Attachment Reported by Men who have Assaulted their Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Insecure</th>
<th>Secure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Sample of Men who Assault their Wives</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, a high proportion of the men who had been violent with their wives reported insecure adult intimate attachment patterns.

(2) What conflict tactics are associated with the insecure adult intimate attachment patterns?

The correlations found between the adult intimate attachment pattern ratings and the conflict tactics for the men reported by both the men and their female partners are shown in Table II.

The findings indicated that insecure preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings were significantly correlated with the reasoning ($r = .27; p < .05$), verbal/symbolic aggression ($r = .25; p < .05$), physical abuse ($r = .27; p < .05$) and severe physical abuse ($r = .23; p < .10$) conflict tactic scores when reported for the men by their female partners but not when self-reported. The insecure dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings were negatively correlated with the reasoning ($r = -.42; p < .001$), verbal/symbolic aggression ($r = -.53; p < .001$), physical abuse ($r = -.32; p < .025$) and severe physical abuse ($r = -.36; p < .01$) conflict tactic scores when reported for the men by their female partners. Self-reports by the men confirmed these negative correlations for the reasoning ($r = -.36; p < .01$), verbal/symbolic aggression ($r = -.52; p < .001$), physical abuse ($r = -.27; p < .05$) and severe physical abuse ($r = -.38; p < .01$) conflict tactics and
Table II

Correlations between Adult Intimate Patterns of Attachment
Reported by Men who have Assaulted their Wives and Conflict
Tactic Scores Reported for the Men by both the Men and their
Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Intimate Attachment Pattern Ratings</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Preoccupied</th>
<th>Dismissing</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male Conflict Tactics</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Verbal/Symbolic</th>
<th>Aggression</th>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>Severe Physical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Female reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal/Symbolic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Physical</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male Conflict Tactics</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Verbal/Symbolic</th>
<th>Aggression</th>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>Severe Physical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Self reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal/Symbolic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Physical</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=50

* p < .10; ** p < .05; *** p < .025; **** p < .010; ***** p < .001
dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings. **Fearful** adult intimate attachment ratings were not significantly correlated with any of the conflict tactics.

In analyzing the self-reported male Conflict Tactics Scale (C.T.S.) frequency scores and the male C.T.S. scores reported by their female partners, there appeared to be a great deal of overall similarity. The annual mean frequencies and correlations for each subscale are reported below. The reasoning subscale had an annual mean frequency of 6.9 (SD=5.0) when self-reported and 6.6 (SD=5.1) when female partner reported. The verbal symbolic aggression subscale had an annual mean frequency of 16.9 (SD=12.4) when self-reported and 16.1 (SD=12.5) when female partner reported. The physical abuse subscale had an annual mean frequency of 5.2 (SD=5.6) when self-reported and 4.0 (SD=6.6) when female partner reported. The severe physical abuse subscale had an annual mean frequency of 1.6 (SD=2.1) when self-reported and 1.3 (SD=2.6) when female partner reported. The C.T.S. correlations indicated significant relationships between self-reports and female partner reports of male conflict tactics for all four subscales: reasoning ($r=.82$, $p<.001$), verbal/symbolic aggression ($r=.82$, $p<.001$), physical abuse ($r=.57$, $p<.001$) and severe physical abuse ($r=.63$, $p<.001$).

When male C.T.S. frequency scores were then correlated with each of the four adult intimate attachment patterns, the secure, dismissing and fearful attachment pattern ratings all showed a strong similarity between self-reported and female partner reported C.T.S. subscale scores for the men. In contrast, when
male preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings were correlated with male C.T.S. subscale scores, a significant relationship was found when female partner reported, but not when self-reported. As C.T.S. scores for the men reported by their female partners are considered to be more comprehensive and valid measures than that reported by the men (Szinovacz, 1983; Dutton & Browning, 1986), the self-reported C.T.S. frequency scores are likely inaccurate. This may be due to a tendency for the male preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings being related to the underreporting of male conflict tactics in intimate relationships. As mentioned in Chapter Three, men have been found to report as little as 54% as much abuse as their victims (Dutton & Browning, 1986).

Thus, the data indicate that the dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings are negatively correlated with the use of reasoning, verbal/symbolic aggression, physical abuse and severe physical abuse subscales of the Conflict Tactic Scale. The preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings are correlated with the reported use of the reasoning, verbal/symbolic aggression, physical abuse and severe physical abuse conflict tactics with their wives and the inaccurate male reporting of conflict tactics in intimate relationships.

(3) Are the men with the insecure preoccupied, dismissing and fearful adult intimate attachment patterns different in terms of self-reported jealousy and anger?

The correlations found between adult intimate attachment
ratings and self-reported anger and jealousy scores are found in Table III.

Insert Table III about here

The findings indicated that insecure preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings had a low but statistically significantly correlation with the jealousy scale scores (r = .24; p < .05), but not with the anger scale scores. The insecure dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings had a low but statistically significant correlation with the anger scale scores (r = .25; p < .05) and a negative correlation with the jealousy scale scores (r = -.26; p < .05). The insecure fearful adult intimate attachment pattern ratings had a low but statistically significant correlation with the anger scale scores (r = .22; p < .10), but not with the jealousy scale scores. Secure adult intimate attachment pattern ratings had a statistically significant negative correlation with anger scale scores (r = -.31; p < .025) and a low but statistically significant negative correlation with jealousy scale scores (r = -.19; p < .10).

Thus for the insecure adult intimate attachment patterns, the data indicate that the preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings correlate with interpersonal jealousy, the dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings correlate with interpersonal anger and negatively correlated with interpersonal jealousy, and the fearful intimate attachment
Table III

Correlations between Adult Intimate Patterns of Attachment
Reported by Men who have Assaulted their Wives and Self-Reported Jealousy and Anger Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Intimate Attachment Pattern Ratings</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Preoccupied</th>
<th>Dismissing</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .10; ** p < .05; *** p < .025

Note. N=50
pattern ratings correlate with interpersonal anger.

(4) Are insecure early attachment patterns associated with insecure adult intimate attachment patterns?

The findings indicated that 90% of the men who assaulted their wives \( (k=.84) \) reported adult mental representation of insecure early attachment patterns and insecure adult intimate attachment patterns. Specifically, forty-five of the fifty men in the sample were rated as having both insecure early and adult intimate attachment patterns. In the other five cases, one man reported a secure pattern in both early and adult intimate attachment patterns; two men reported an insecure early attachment pattern and a secure adult intimate attachment pattern; and two men reported a secure early attachment pattern and an insecure adult intimate attachment pattern.

Table IV shows the correlations found between the early patterns of insecure attachment and the adult intimate patterns of insecure attachment.

__________________________

Insert Table IV about here

__________________________

With regard to the insecure early attachment and insecure adult intimate attachment patterns, two out of the three patterns of attachment were significantly correlated. Preoccupied adult intimate attachment ratings were significantly correlated with preoccupied early attachment ratings \( (r=.43; p<.001) \), and fearful
Table IV

Correlations between Early Patterns of Insecure Attachment and Adult Intimate Patterns of Insecure Attachment Reported by Men who have Assaulted their Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Attachment Pattern Ratings</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Preoccupied</th>
<th>Dismissing</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.43****</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.35****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=50
* p < .10; ** p < .05; *** p < .025; **** p < .010; ***** p < .001
adult intimate attachment ratings were significantly correlated with fearful early attachment ratings ($r=.35; \ p<.001$). **Dismissing** adult intimate attachment ratings were not significantly correlated with dismissing early attachment ratings ($r=.11$). There was also a low but significant **negative** correlation between dismissing early attachment ratings and preoccupied adult intimate attachment ratings ($r=-.23; \ p<.05$), and preoccupied early attachment ratings and fearful adult intimate attachment ratings ($r=-.22; \ p<.10$). Secure adult intimate attachment ratings had a low but statistically significant correlation with secure early attachment pattern ratings ($r=.23; \ p<.05$).

Thus for the insecure attachment patterns, the strongest degree of association was found between the preoccupied and fearful pattern ratings for reports of childhood and those reported for adulthood. Dismissing adult intimate attachment ratings did not appear to be related to dismissing early attachment ratings.

(5) What conflict tactics are associated with insecure early attachment patterns?

The correlations found between the insecure adult early attachment ratings and the conflict tactics utilized by the men as reported by both the men and their female partners are presented in Table V.
The findings indicated very little relationship between insecure preoccupied, dismissing and fearful early attachment pattern ratings and conflict tactics. The only significant findings were the correlation found between fearful early attachment pattern ratings and the conflict tactics reasoning subscale scores ($r=.31; \ p<.025$), and the negative correlation found between preoccupied early attachment pattern ratings and the reasoning conflict tactics subscale scores ($r=-.29; \ p<.025$) when self-reported by the men. This latter significant finding was not confirmed by the reasoning conflict tactics subscale scores reported for the men by their female partners.

Thus, there appears to be very little relationship between insecure preoccupied, dismissing and fearful early attachment pattern ratings and the conflict tactics utilized by the men, with the notable exception of the association between fearful early attachment pattern ratings and the reported use of reasoning in intimate relationship conflicts.

(6) Are men with insecure preoccupied, dismissing and fearful early attachment patterns different in terms of self-reported jealousy and anger?

The correlations found between the adult early attachment pattern ratings and self-reported anger and jealousy scores are
Table V

Correlations between Adult Early Patterns of Attachment Reported by Men who have Assaulted their Wives and Conflict Tactics Scores Reported for the Men by both the Men and their Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Early Attachment Pattern Ratings</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Preoccupied</th>
<th>Dismissing</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male Conflict Tactics (Female reported)</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Verbal/Symbolic</th>
<th>Aggression</th>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>Severe Physical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male Conflict Tactics (Self reported)</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Verbal/Symbolic</th>
<th>Aggression</th>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>Severe Physical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=50

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .025
The findings indicated that insecure **preoccupied** early attachment pattern ratings had a low but statistically significant correlation with the jealousy scale scores ($r=0.23; p<0.10$) but not with the anger scale scores. The insecure **dismissing** early attachment pattern ratings were not significantly correlated with the anger scale scores or the jealousy scale scores. The insecure **fearful** early attachment pattern ratings had a low but statistically significant negative correlation with the jealousy scale scores ($r=-0.23; p<0.10$). The secure early attachment pattern ratings had low but statistically significant negative correlations with both jealousy scale scores ($r=-0.20; p<0.10$) and anger scale scores ($r=-0.24; p<0.05$).

Thus for the insecure early attachment patterns, the data indicate that with regard to jealousy scores, insecure early preoccupied attachment pattern ratings may be somewhat positively associated, whereas insecure fearful early attachment pattern ratings may be somewhat negatively related.

**Attachment Profiles**

The following profiles are drawn from the study sample in an effort to illustrate the potential differences between the relationship experiences of men with high ratings on the three
Table VI
Correlations between Adult Early Patterns of Attachment Reported by Men who have Assaulted their Wives and Self-Reported Jealousy and Anger Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Early Attachment Pattern Ratings</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Preoccupied</th>
<th>Dismissing</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=50
*P < .10; **P < .05
insecure attachment patterns.

**Insecure Preoccupied Attachment**

This attachment pattern is illustrated by a man identified as Pedro who received Family Attachment Interview ratings of Preoccupied - 7, Dismissing - 1, Fearful - 3, and Secure - 2. Pedro’s Peer Attachment Interview ratings were Preoccupied - 7, Dismissing - 2, Fearful - 2, and Secure - 1.5.

Pedro was a 34 year old male at the time of the attachment interviews who worked as a general labourer and house painter. His ethnic background was Mayan Indian and he was a first generation refugee from Central America. His father had been employed as a mechanic and his mother was employed part-time as a bookkeeper and also took care of the family home. Pedro had one older and two younger brothers and two younger sisters who all lived in the family home. They also had a large extended family including grandparents, aunts and uncles who lived within a five mile radius of the home. His family was very poor, often surviving on a steady diet of beans and rice but the extended family always helped out if the situation became desperate.

Throughout the interviews, Pedro wanted to elaborate at length on each question and often provided contradictory information regarding his parents. It is not unusual for individuals within the insecure-resistant attachment style to provide conflicting stories regarding their parents as an aspect of their continuing efforts to perceive them in the best light and to please them.

Pedro described his relationship with his mother as being
difficult. He had been emotionally close to her during infancy and childhood but "she was very unpredictable". At times she would be "caring and helpful" and at other times "very stubborn and tough". Pedro remembered occasions on which his mother was unwilling to take care of his cuts and bruises, "would swear at (him) and berate (him) in order to smarten (him) up" and "hit (him) with anything at hand" for minor acts of disobedience. Pedro also remembered his mother hitting his father on a number of occasions but stated that his father was never physical with his wife.

Pedro initially described his father as the "smardest guy in the world", "a great father" and a "best friend" although later stating that his father had been "tough, rigid and vehement". It appears that his father had two sides to his personality. On the one hand, his father "never forgave anything that the kids did", "refused to talk to (Pedro) for months at a time" and threatened to "never talk to (Pedro) again". He was also very abusive in his punishment, for example strapping Pedro with a wet belt on his back until he drew blood, although Pedro was quick to point out that he "deserved it". On the other hand, his father appeared to be "a very affectionate man". He would often kiss and hug the children and would respond in a compassionate manner when Pedro was upset about something. Pedro remembered a number of occasions in which his father even "cried with (him)" and this meant a great deal to Pedro.

Pedro indicated that he was generally "the favorite of mom and dad" during infancy and childhood but that he had later become
"the black sheep of the family". His father had never had an opportunity to attend school beyond Grade 6 and felt that his employment opportunities were very limited due to his lack of schooling. He wanted all of his children to do well at school and get professional jobs and Pedro was the only one who failed to achieve beyond Grade 12. Pedro had "liked (his) teachers at school but ended up getting into a lot of trouble" and "received the strap at least once a month". He was always "showing off" and getting into "fights with the other kids". "Initially, the bullies in the school picked on (him) for many years until (he) couldn't stand it anymore and (he) went into a rage. They had much more respect for (him) after that although (he) still had to prove (himself) periodically". Pedro had a "quick temper which often got (him) into trouble" but he tended to be violent only when he felt "pushed around, blamed for something or made to feel bad about (himself)".

Pedro loved to play soccer and "beat the other team at any cost". He would "do almost anything to win". This attitude seemed to have more to do with his acceptance and glorification by other team members than the achievement of winning the game. He was always trying to please his parents by doing things for them and by offering to work around the house during childhood and adolescence. He eventually passed Grade 12 in school and was going on to further education when the civil war in his country broke out and the university was closed. He joined the ranks of the rebels and fought in the war for the next three years until he was captured and jailed. He was tortured in prison but
eventually escaped through the jungle and came to Canada as a refugee claimant.

Pedro although always having "lots of friends had never been satisfied with (his) friendships". He spent a great deal of time with his same-sex friends, but felt that "they never really understood (him)". When it came to relations with the opposite sex, Pedro described himself as a "charming guy, a real Casanova". His first sexual relationship took place at ten years of age and he had his first child by fifteen years of age. He was always "hyper when it came to sex and often had two or three girlfriends at the same time". He would "fall in love so easily and feel compelled to go with (his) infatuations". Sex was a very important aspect of the relationship and "if she didn't provide sex, within two days (he) would be with another woman". Pedro felt that he "loved them when with them but not when away".

In late adolescence, Pedro had met his first wife Maria and was immediately attracted to her because "she was so beautiful, so classy, humble and so honest". He initially boasted to a male friend that he was "going to have sex with her" and leave her but he soon became totally infatuated with her. Within weeks they were living together and were married within the first year. Throughout the marriage, Pedro "wanted sex all the time" and "couldn't live without it". At the same time he continued to have other girlfriends as "that is what the men in our family do". When Maria became jealous and resentful, Pedro felt that she was "being mean to (him)" and should "understand that (he) just likes women too much". He had "always been a hard worker and always
took care of (his) family, especially (his) two kids". In conflicts with Maria, she would "be jealous and yell and scream and swear" and he would "try and calm her down". "When she was out of control (he) would sometimes swear at her, kick her out of the house or become physical". Pedro initially claimed that after twelve years of marriage, Maria had been "so bad to (him) that (he) had to eventually leave". Later in the interview he admitted that he had left after Maria "got another restraining order when he hit her".

When Pedro left Maria he immediately moved in with Doreen. He had already been having an affair with Doreen for the past month and "knew that she would always accept (him)". He had "fallen immediately in love with her", "spent three days in paradise with her" and had the "ultimate sexual experience with her". During the next year he "went back and forth between Doreen and Maria" and this lasted until Doreen "forced (him) to chose between them". As Maria kept oscillating between wanting him home and kicking him out, Pedro decided he was going to live with Doreen. Within a year, "Doreen had become pregnant" and he "had to stay with her" in order to satisfy his dad.

Pedro "was very ashamed that (he) had not lived up to (his) father’s expectations" around his first marriage and was determined "to live up to (his) responsibilities this time". Problems soon arose when Doreen didn’t want to continue their daily sex habits due to the pregnancy, and Pedro found himself "attracted to other women and to (his) former wife Maria". There was "much more conflict" in the relationship, with Pedro
threatening "to leave or have sex with someone else, if Doreen continued to refuse (him)". One time they "didn't have sex for a week and (Pedro) was so mad and cranky". Eventually these daily conflicts "became verbally explosive" and "physical violence occurred on a number of occasions". Doreen "had him arrested twice and the last time she had (him) move out". Pedro found this separation to be very difficult and "was obsessed with Doreen forgiving (him)". "What was (he) going to do without her, perish? For the first three or four weeks (he) only had one hour of sleep per night". Within a month Doreen had forgiven him and they were once again living together although "the relationship was still somewhat rocky". The relationship has had "a lot of ups and downs" since that time, but they have stayed together.

With regard to employment, Pedro reported a great many problems. He stated that he was always "an excellent worker" but felt that (his) "employers seldom recognized it". He has had a lot of trouble with other "workers who have criticized (his) work or (his) height or (his) nationality". He has had seven employers over the past year and tends to "leave when they start picking" on him. In one recent incident he took "a two-by-four and hit" his foreman after being called a "puny spick" but couldn't "understand why they had fired" him.

Overall, Pedro perceived that he had tried his best throughout his life but had "a string of bad luck". His brothers and sisters all received advanced education and professional employment, while he "had to settle for work as a labourer". He had also been very "unlucky with women". "Maria and Doreen did not really
appreciate how good (he) has been to them. They have always been so selfish; always wanting something more”. The greatest shame of Pedro’s life has been disappointing his father and he remained "uncertain whether (his) father would ever really forgive (him) for all the dumb things (he) has done".

In this study, 21 of the 50 abusive men were categorized as having the preoccupied pattern as their predominant mental representation of childhood attachment and 24 were categorized as having the preoccupied pattern as their predominant mental representation of adult intimate attachment.

**Insecure Dismissing Attachment**

This attachment pattern is illustrated by a man identified as Brian who received Family Attachment Interview ratings of Dismissing - 7, Preoccupied - 1, Fearful - 1.5, and Secure - 2.5. Brian’s Peer Attachment Interview ratings were Dismissing - 7.5, Preoccupied - 1.5, Fearful - 2.5, and Secure - 2.5.

Brian was a 32 year old male at the time of the attachment style interviews who worked in the auto mechanic and trucking industry. His family was second generation Canadian of German and Irish decent. His father was employed as a truck driver or auto mechanic throughout his career and often worked nights and "slept most of the day". His mother was employed as a substitute teacher, took primary responsibility for the care of the children and the home, and "was generally more available" for Brian. The family was composed of four siblings: one half-brother and one half-sister from mother’s previous marriage, an older brother and
Brian. The half-brother and half-sister, who were quite a bit older than Brian, never really connected with their stepfather after the death of their own father and ended up moving out when Brian was two or three years of age. The older brother (i.e. seven years older) was born blind and lived in a residential school with periodic visits home. Brian indicated that he had a very distant relationship with his brother.

Throughout the interviews, Brian, although seeming to trust the interviewer, exhibited an underlying anger and hostility regarding questions related to emotionally laden issues. He often responded with one word answers and seemed annoyed, critical and disgusted when the interviewer probed for further information. He tended to resort to stating that he or his family were "normal", "average" or "nothing strange" when asked to elaborate and on three occasions demanded to know "what the interviewer was after".

Brian described his parents and himself during the childhood and adolescent years as "the average family". His parents were seldom demonstrative in their affection towards each other or to Brian although he "knew they cared". His parents were never physically abusive towards each other and seldom utilized verbally abusive tactics. Brian stated that his mother was generally "there for him" and "concerned about his well-being" but he could not identify examples of her emotional availability. If he was upset as a child he would "go off by himself" and "be unhappy until it went away". His parents tended to focus on "eliminating the problem" when they found him crying or upset.
Although both of his paternal grandparents died during his childhood he couldn't remember his parents or himself being "very upset about it". He was "somewhat upset when a cat died" when he was seven or eight years of age, but his parents "replaced the cat the very next day".

In school Brian did "fairly okay", completing his Grade 12. He had a "difficult time learning in the early grades" and was "kicked out of school a number of times for fighting or disobedience". In the higher grades he "learned to keep to himself" and received a "C+ average". He liked the auto mechanics courses the best as he was given "an opportunity to work on his car". He was driving at sixteen years of age and had a "string of speeding tickets and other criminal offenses" during his adolescence. These offenses resulted in him being "kicked out of the house at eighteen" years of age. He played hockey and lacrosse as a child but "never really liked the sports that much" and preferred to be working on his car. He generally described himself as "a loner" and liked to "take care of most things" himself.

His parents only spanked him once that he could remember usually preferring to discipline him by "sending him to his room" or "taking something away". He wished he had lived a "quieter life growing up especially during the teen years" and "not get into as much trouble". He also regretted not going on to post secondary schooling. When asked about the changes he would have wanted with his parents, he "couldn't think of any" and didn't "perceive any setbacks" to his development "related to his
upbringing".

As an adult he perceived himself as an emotionally "average" individual. "Some people get really upset about things and show it and I'm not like that. When I get upset I wait for the feeling to pass. Most problems I can handle myself." The main things that he would cry about were the "tear jerker movies every now and then".

Brian indicated that he generally had a "few good friends and lots of acquaintances". There were very few people he felt he "could really trust a lot" and even those friends would not be told about "intimate matters". He "gets along with the guys at work", has worked with the same company for the past ten years and makes a reasonable, steady income.

With regard to romantic relationships, he has only had one intimate relationship and that has been with his wife Tammi. They met in high school, dated for close to two years, lived common-law for about one year and have been married for twelve years. At the time of their marriage Brian felt "that it was too soon and wanted to delay it until (they) were more comfortable with each other. Tammi insisted that (they) either get married or break-up". They married that same month and had two children: a boy born in 1984 and a girl born in 1986.

Brian perceived the marriage as "an emotional roller-coaster with lots of ups and downs". They had separated on two occasions, October 1987 and January 1989, at Tammi's insistence "when she realized she didn't love (him) or want to live with (him) anymore". This was a "real shock" to Brian as "things had been
going fine and then they weren’t. Eventually Tammi decided to "return to the marriage for the sake of the children". Brian described the relationship as oscillating between "very comfortable and highly explosive depending on Tammi’s moods". He perceived himself as being "very steady, predictable and reasonable" while Tammi was characterized as being "more spontaneous, fun loving and unpredictable with a quick and mean temper". "She gets angry very easily" and conflicts would readily escalate into "shouting, name calling, being mean to each other and occasionally physical violence". Brian’s "usual way was to state (his) point of view and then refuse to argue. Tammi would never leave it at that. If she didn’t get her own way she would threaten to leave the relationship and this caused most of the conflict".

Overall, Brian had no regrets about becoming involved with Tammi and perceived the relationship to be long-lasting. He perceived that they had a good understanding of each other and were generally supportive of one another. They could readily deal with and discuss most things, but major problems arose when Tammi "flirted with other men, threatened to leave the relationship or wouldn’t take no for an answer. Then (he) would get really angry."

In this study, 13 of the 50 abusive men were categorized as having the dismissing pattern as their predominant mental representation of childhood attachment and 11 were categorized as having the dismissing pattern as their predominant mental representation of adult intimate attachment.
Insecure Fearful Attachment

This attachment pattern is illustrated by a man identified as Sam who received Family Attachment Interview ratings of Fearful - 7.5, Preoccupied - 3, Dismissing - 1, and Secure - 1.5. Sam's Peer Attachment Interview ratings were Fearful - 7.0, Preoccupied - 3.5, Dismissing - 1.5, and Secure - 2.

Sam was a 36 year old male at the time of the interviews who worked as a firefighter. His family was fourth generation Canadian of English and German decent. His natural father, mother and stepfather all worked in the Armed Services during his childhood. He didn’t know his "real name" until he was 16 years of age although his natural father had left the family when he was 4 years old. This information was revealed by his mother a few days before her death and came as quite a shock. Sam was the oldest child of five with one natural brother, one stepbrother and two stepsisters.

Throughout the interview, Sam wanted to make sure he was being clear and that the interviewer understood "the real situation". He often responded angrily to questions which probed for more information about his family especially when his memories about his mother were being challenged. He seemed to really need to have had a good, thoughtful and caring mother although specific examples of her behaviour did not appear to confirm this perception.

Sam described the relationship between his mother and stepfather as having "problems from day one". "They were never
very affectionate with each other; all they seemed to express was anger”. Sam blamed his stepfather’s alcoholism for most of the marital problems. He indicated that his stepfather was a "mean and unpredictable drunk" who "often became physically and verbally abusive towards his wife" and Sam. Sam was "afraid of (his stepfather) all the time" and "constantly tried to hide from him". His stepfather "only cared about himself", was always "angry and resentful" and was "totally unpredictable".

Sam stated that he had a "very close" relationship with his mother. She was "generally thoughtful, understanding and self-sacrificing" and provided a "consistent day to day routine around the home". If he was upset as a child he would "sulk, cry or get angry" and "try to deal with it on (his) own". He knew his mother "would be there for him, but seldom talked to her about it". His stepfather’s reaction was to tell him to "stop (his) crying" and to "act like a man". Sam remembered his mom going away for a couple of weeks when he was seven years of age for the birth of his stepsister. He found this to be "very upsetting as she was the buffer between (stepfather) and the kids" and "now we had nobody". His stepfather told the children that "she had died and left them" and Sam remembered that there was "no contact from her for the two weeks although she must have missed them".

Sam generally described himself as "a shy and withdrawn child". He kept to himself and "tried to stay out of trouble". He had very few friends and didn’t like to participate in team sports. In school he was a fair student who "usually received a C average" but always passed. When Sam was 16 years of age his
mother died and home life with his stepfather "became intolerable". He quit school after only completing Grade 9 and felt that "this decision affected (his) entire life". He has had no further contact with his stepfather to this day and has "no intention of ever speaking to this man".

Sam felt that the experiences he had growing up left him "bitter, insecure and resentful and afraid to show (his) emotions". He is "constantly looking for approval" but this may "turn into anger at a moment’s notice". He wished his parents had been more "respectful" of him and that his mom had lived "a longer and happier life". He regrets that he couldn’t have been "more open, self-sacrificing and less aggressive" as a child.

As an adult, Sam described himself as an emotional person who "doesn’t know how to deal with it". He has had very few close friends and feels "most comfortable by (himself)". He sees himself as "always trying to control everyone" and having a "big chip on (his) shoulder which keeps everyone away".

With regard to romantic relationships, he only had one long-term intimate relationship (i.e. 13 years), and that was with his wife Kathy. He had two earlier relationships (one at 17 years of age and the other at 25 years) which each lasted about six months. In these love affairs, he always felt "unsure about (himself) and inadequate" and "didn’t trust that the relationship would last". Rather than enjoying the intimacy and the caring, he kept "waiting for the relationship to end".

In the relationship with Kathy, Sam "had very strong feelings for her" and "was comfortable in the relationship as long as (he)
was in control". He described his wife as "the same as (his) mother: thoughtful, caring and self-sacrificing". She "allowed (him) to dominate, while she carried the relationship financially, sexually and emotionally". She tried for years to get him to talk to her but (he) "just couldn't trust anyone that much". She would "do all the talking but (he) had to have the final word" and this created "lots of anger and fights". It was "mostly verbal abuse but occasionally it became physical". She "really wanted to be close" but as with all his romantic experiences, Sam "kept waiting for the relationship to end" even though they both cared deeply about their four children (three natural and one adopted). Eventually in the midst of his "immense doubts and insecurities", he tried to "lock her up in the house" and "make her do things (his) way". This turned out to be "the final straw" and "Kathy gave up on (him) and found another man".

Overall, Sam had no regrets or doubts about becoming involved with Kathy and still perceived the marriage as lasting once "Kathy starts thinking straight and leaves this other guy". Sam would like to "create an intimate partnership with her" in which he is "non-controlling, respectful and able to communicate". If the relationship didn't last Sam states that he "will find it very hard to accept but (he) doubts that he will go after the other guy although it will be very hard to control his anger".

In this study, 13 of the 50 abusive men were categorized as having the fearful pattern as their predominant mental representation of childhood attachment and 11 were categorized as having the fearful pattern as their predominant mental
representation of adult intimate attachment.
CHAPTER FIVE
Discussion

It seems important at this juncture to state clearly that the findings of this preliminary and exploratory study should not be construed as indicating that all men or even the majority of men with insecure attachment patterns are violent with their wives. Males express their insecure attachment patterns in a wide variety of ways and most of these are non-violent. Insecure attachment and wife assault are not two sides of the same coin. Insecure attachment is likely only one element in the multiple factor development of male domestic violence.

Insecure Male Attachment Patterns and Wife Assault

The findings indicated that men who had assaulted their wives were predominantly insecure in their romantic attachment patterns. Indeed, 92% of the men in the study sample were rated as insecure in terms of their adult intimate attachment. It would be expected, therefore, that these men would tend to experience more anxiety and interpersonal problems in their spousal relationships. This, in and of itself, would tend to produce more conflict in their adult intimate relationships and a greater likelihood that they would use various conflict tactics, including those of an abusive nature (Straus, 1979).

The findings also indicated that a relatively high proportion of the study sample men (48%) were categorized as preoccupied in their romantic attachment patterns. This figure is dramatically
higher than the 6-8% figure reported in the adult attachment field (Bartholomew, 1989; Scharfe & Bartholomew, 1993). A number of explanations seem plausible. Men with high ratings on the preoccupied pattern may be so dependent, obsessively jealous and impulsive that they willingly use any conflict tactics, including those of an abusive nature, to meet their intimate emotional needs. In other words, the general population of men with high ratings on the preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern may have a greater propensity for abuse in intimate relationships than men with low ratings. This would be an interesting area for further exploration. Another possibility is that due to the high levels of conflict and abuse in adult intimate relationships that appears to be characteristic of these men, they may be considered by the criminal justice system and their spouses to be more violent and out of control than are the other insecure patterns. This could lead to higher arrest and conviction rates and a greater likelihood of being in a wife assault therapy group.

The findings also provide an indication that the three insecure attachment pattern ratings may be describing different male relationship problems and conflict tactics in intimate adult relationships. Differences were found between the preoccupied, dismissing and fearful adult intimate attachment pattern ratings on interpersonal jealousy and anger and the reported use of conflict tactics. Preoccupied adult intimate pattern ratings tended to be correlated with interpersonal jealousy scale scores and to the reported use of the reasoning, verbal/symbolic aggression, physical abuse and severe physical abuse conflict
tactics. Dismissing adult intimate pattern ratings tended to be correlated with anger scale scores and negatively correlated with the reported use of all four subscales of the Conflict Tactics Scale (i.e. reasoning, verbal/symbolic aggression, physical abuse and severe physical abuse). The fearful adult intimate pattern ratings tended to be correlated with anger scale scores. These findings seem to indicate that the identification of the three insecure adult intimate attachment pattern ratings may play an important role in understanding the adult intimate conflict behaviours of men who assault their wives.

In contrast, the insecure pattern ratings on the Family Attachment Interview did not yield major distinctions amongst the three insecure attachment pattern ratings regarding anger and jealousy problems and the reported use of male conflict tactics. The only findings of note were the trends towards fearful early attachment pattern ratings being positively related to scores on the use of the reasoning conflict tactics subscale in intimate conflicts and negatively related to the interpersonal jealousy scale scores, and the preoccupied early attachment ratings being positively related to interpersonal jealousy scores. These findings seem to indicate that in attempting to understand the male relationship problems and spousal conflict behaviours of men who assault their wives, clinicians and researchers should focus on the insecure adult intimate attachment pattern ratings. The three insecure adult intimate attachment patterns will be discussed separately and in more detail in the next sections.

In many ways the findings indicating that insecure adult
intimate attachment pattern ratings distinguish more relationship and male conflict tactic differences than do insecure early attachment pattern ratings seem appropriate. The current adult intimate attachment pattern ratings are based mainly on the adult male’s mental representations of his feelings, needs, attitudes, understandings, expectations, cognitions and attachment behaviours towards his intimate female partner. In relating these adult intimate attachment pattern ratings to his appraisal of his jealousy and anger problems and the conflict tactics he reports using in his spousal relationship, there is a logical connection between his adult intimate attachment pattern ratings on the one hand and his adult intimate relationship problem scores on the other. In contrast, his adult early attachment pattern ratings are based on his mental representations as an adult of his attachment patterns towards his parents or primary caregivers during infancy, childhood and adolescence and not on his current intimate adult relationship. These attachment pattern ratings towards his parents are then related to his appraisal of his intimate adult relationship regarding his jealousy, anger, reasoning and abusive conflict tactics. The connections between these early attachment pattern ratings and intimate adult relationship problems are logically and practically more tenuous.

The Male Insecure Preoccupied Intimate Attachment Pattern Ratings and Wife Assault

There appear to be trends in the data towards preoccupied adult intimate attachment ratings being related to interpersonal
jealousy scores and the reported use of conflict tactics in intimate relationships. Preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings were positively correlated with jealousy scores and the reported use of the reasoning, verbal/symbolic abuse, physical abuse and severe physical abuse conflict tactics. Preoccupied adult intimate attachment ratings also appeared to be associated with the inaccurate reporting of the frequency of conflict tactics used with intimate adult female partners. It is hard to know whether this inaccurate reporting is particular to the conflict tactics used or whether this is a pervasive interpersonal pattern. Clinicians and researchers should therefore be cautious as to the credibility of the information gathered from these men and, when possible, seek corroborative information (e.g. from their female partners).

It appears that the preoccupied adult intimate attachment ratings may be related to male issues of marital jealousy, dependency, possessiveness and separation anxiety. High preoccupied ratings may be positively related to the expressivity of both positive and negative emotions and the use of the reasoning, verbal abuse, physical abuse and severe physical abuse conflict tactics in an escalating and somewhat indiscriminate fashion. Spousal acceptance and compliance to the every changing needs of men with high preoccupied attachment ratings may be crucial. This pattern of relationship problems seemed evident in the attachment profile of Pedro, a man who had received a preoccupied intimate attachment rating of 7 out of 9. He would fall in love at first sight, be extremely possessive, jealous and
infatuated with his many female partners and demand an intense sexual relationship. His relationships had "lots of ups and downs" and he often utilized verbally and physically abusive behaviours to get what he wanted, yet expected the constant adoration and appreciation of his partner.

One could speculate that wife assaultive men with high preoccupied intimate attachment ratings may be the men described by Walker (1984) and Browne (1987) as having an ability to be charming, manipulative and seductive in order to achieve their goals, yet hostile, nasty and mean when frustrated. They tend to exhibit extreme dependency, possessiveness, irrational jealousy that sometimes reaches paranoid levels and an intense fear of losing exclusive access to 'their' wives and hence the loss of intimacy (Walker, 1984). The intense dependency of these men on their spouse can take many different forms throughout the relationship. Initially, they could be the most romantic and attentive lovers; unusually open and expressive of their fears of being hurt within the relationship and desirous for an early commitment (Browne, 1987). Once married, they may constantly inquire about their wife’s whereabouts, follow them to work, make constant telephone calls to check up on them, restrict their access to family and friends and treat the woman’s desire for independent activities as a personal affront. When they spend time away from their wives, many of these men experience obsessive thoughts and fantasies about her possible infidelities or closeness with others. By the time they bring their fears home, any imagined "signs" become "proof" of their suspicions and
"justify" their demands for further restrictions (Browne, 1987). Dutton (1988a) remarks that sexual jealousy, to the extent that it involves delusions or distortions, may represent a form of chronic abandonment anxiety and this may be descriptive of the men with high preoccupied intimate attachment ratings. Verbal and physically abusive tactics will often be used to convince the woman to meet the male's emotional needs with little regard for her desires or well-being. During separation or divorce proceedings initiated by the woman, extreme depression, suicide attempts, psychotic episodes, rages and threats of homicide towards the woman are not uncommon (Hilberman & Munson, 1977-78; Rounsaville, 1978; Walker, 1984).

The Male Insecure Dismissing Attachment Pattern Ratings and Wife Assault

There appear to be trends in the data towards dismissing adult intimate attachment ratings being related to interpersonal anger and negatively related to the use of conflict tactics in intimate adult relationships. Dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings were negatively associated with the reported use of the reasoning, verbal abuse, physical abuse and severe physical abuse conflict tactics. Interpersonal jealousy scores were not reported to be associated, but interpersonal anger scores were positively associated with dismissing adult intimate attachment ratings. Dismissing adult intimate attachment ratings may be related to male issues of emotional distance, control, anger and self-reliance. High dismissing adult intimate attachment ratings may
be related to a tendency to take a hostile outlook on interpersonal relationships, harbour grudges, be highly but secretly critical of others, experience high levels of anger and to be passively conflict avoidant. This pattern of relationship problems seemed evident in the attachment profile of Brian, a man who had received a dismissing intimate attachment pattern rating of 7 out of 9. He was basically a loner with only one sexual relationship and few friends, liked to resolve emotional issues on his own and didn’t trust anyone. He maintained sufficient emotional distance that he even thought his marriage was fine until the day his female partner left him. Brian described himself as very steady, predictable and reasonable and described his partner as emotionally unstable. Brian did not like heated discussions or arguments and felt that once he had stated his opinion all further discussion was unnecessary.

One could speculate that wife assaultive men with high dismissing intimate attachment ratings may be the men described by Saunders (1987, 1992) as restricting their violence to the home, having high marital satisfaction, being generally unassertive and scoring high on social desirability. They have also been described as overcontrolled, self-centered, avoidant and asocial or antisocial (Faulk, 1974; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Caesar, 1986; Bland & Orn, 1986). These men would tend to be afraid of closeness and to experience extreme discomfort if their spouse attempted to become too emotionally intimate (Dutton, 1988a). Control over the amount and type of intimacy expressed in the relationship protects the stability of the
emotions of these men. Just the normal variations of intimacy and affiliation found in every relationship can produce exaggerated levels of arousal and anxiety in these men (Browne, 1987; Browning, 1983). When the arousal of closeness becomes too threatening, these men have a strong need for emotional distance, which can take the form of leaving the home, denigrating the partner or violence (Ganley, 1981). Violence would often be first reported when socioemotional distance was decreasing, such as the first year of marriage or during a first pregnancy (Gelles, 1972; Eisenberg & Micklow, 1974; Martin, 1976; Rounsaville, 1978; Browne, 1987).

The Male Insecure Fearful Attachment Pattern Ratings and Wife Assault

There appear to be trends in the data towards insecure fearful adult intimate attachment ratings only being related to interpersonal anger. Fearful adult intimate attachment pattern ratings were found to be positively associated with interpersonal anger scores but no distinct interpersonal jealousy or conflict tactic scores were found with ratings of this particular attachment pattern. It may be that the interpersonal anger is related to internal conflicts over the high dependency and acceptance needs of the male in intimate adult relationships which are seldom expressed due to fears of rejection and vulnerability. Men with high ratings on the fearful adult intimate attachment pattern have been described as having conflicting needs with both a high dependency on their spousal
relationship and an avoidance of social relations and intimacy (Bartholomew, 1989). They may depend upon their spousal relationship in a wide variety of ways yet suppress the expression of these feelings due to a conviction that they are virtually unlovable. The result may be intense efforts to inhibit anger which frequently spills out.

It appears that the fearful adult intimate attachment pattern ratings may be related to male issues of interpersonal vulnerability, anger and spousal acceptance. This pattern of relationship problems seemed evident in the attachment profile of Sam, an assaultive man who had received a fearful intimate attachment pattern rating of 7.5 out of 9. In his intimate adult relationship, Sam was unsure, felt inadequate, constantly looked for approval and didn’t trust that the relationship would last. He allowed his female partner to take care of the relationship in financial, sexual and emotional ways but always had to have the final word and feel in control. Sam had very strong feelings for his spouse yet these feelings were seldom expressed appropriately. Any signs of disapproval by his female partner quickly resulted in Sam’s expression of anger and numerous fights.

One could speculate that wife assaultive men with high fearful intimate attachment pattern ratings may be the men that Faulk (1974) described as being extremely passive and dependent on their wives. They appear to lack the skills and self-confidence to affirmatively ask for what they want in a non-threatening manner (Faulk, 1974; Walker, 1984) and to say "no" to their
partners (Sonkin & Durphy, 1982), thus limiting their ability to resolve adult intimacy issues through verbal communication (Rosenbaum & O’Leary, 1981; Browning, 1983; Ferraro, 1984; LaViolette et al., 1984; Dutton & Strachan, 1987). These men may also have the most unresolved psychological problems. In a recent study, Dutton, Saunders and Bartholomew (1993) reported that fearful adult intimate attachment scores were highly correlated with trauma symptoms such as depression, anxiety, dissociation and sleep problems, and Borderline Personality Organization. This would be a fruitful area for further exploration.

The Relevance of Early Attachment Patterns

There does appear to be a significant association between the interview ratings of the mental representations of insecure early attachment patterns reported by men who have assaulted their wives and the interview ratings of their reports of insecure adult intimate attachment patterns. For 45 of the 50 men these rating were positively related. This result provides an indication of continuity between the man’s mental representation of insecure early attachment patterns and insecure adult intimate attachment patterns. In other words, if a man who assaulted his wife understands his childhood attachment relationships so as to be rated as being insecure, then he was highly likely to represent his involvement in romantic relationships as being insecure. Whether the individual actually exhibited insecure attachment pattern behaviours during infancy, childhood, adolescence and/or adulthood cannot be determined through the
measures employed in this study. Future longitudinal studies utilizing various early attachment measures administered during childhood (e.g. Strange Situation, Hansberg Adolescent Technique) and then during adulthood (e.g. Family Attachment Interview, Peer Attachment Interview) with multiple sources (e.g. self, parents, teachers, female partners) would be beneficial in this regard. It is also important to recognize that the obtained continuity in attachment may be partly due to common method variance based on the adult early and adult intimate attachment being assessed by two similar interviews. The extent of this influence could also be addressed through the multiple measures and sources discussed above.

In the further exploration of the relationship between adult early attachment patterns and adult intimate attachment patterns, two out of the three insecure attachment pattern ratings were found to be associated. As predicted, preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings were significantly correlated with preoccupied early attachment pattern ratings ($r = .43; p < .001$). In other words, if a man who assaulted his wife described his childhood attachment relationships so as to be rated as being highly preoccupied, then he was likely to maintain high levels of the preoccupied pattern of relating in his adult romantic relationships. Also as predicted, fearful adult intimate attachment pattern ratings were significantly related to fearful early attachment pattern ratings ($r = .35; p < .001$). No significant association was found between dismissing early attachment pattern ratings and dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings.
On the basis of these findings, the preoccupied and fearful attachment patterns seem to exhibit the strongest continuity between the man’s mental representation of early insecure attachment pattern ratings and insecure adult intimate attachment pattern ratings.

The non-significant finding regarding dismissing attachment pattern ratings was surprising as men with high dismissing ratings on mental representations of early attachment patterns are characterized by emotional control, detachment, independence and self-confidence and these are the same features that characterize men with high ratings on dismissing adult intimate attachment patterns. In contrast, men with high ratings on preoccupied and fearful attachment patterns are characterized by their emotional dependence, low self-esteem and sensitivity to the opinion of others and men with high ratings on secure attachment patterns are characterized as trusting and valuing attachment relationships and being balanced in their intellect and emotionality. The dissimilarity between the characteristics associated with dismissing attachment patterns and the preoccupied, fearful and secure attachment patterns would tend to promote continuity in dismissing early and adult intimate attachment pattern ratings. This dissimilarity idea is further supported by the dismissing attachment pattern ratings not being found to be positively correlated at a significant level with any of the preoccupied, fearful and secure attachment pattern ratings. It therefore may be that the non-significant finding regarding dismissing attachment pattern ratings was simply the
result of a sampling error. This would be an important area to explore and address in future research.

It appears that men who have assaulted their wives predominantly represent both their early and adult intimate attachment patterns as being insecure. On the basis of ratings of the two semi-structured attachment interviews, the attachment insecurity that originated during childhood appears to continue to influence the man's orientation to attachment relationships in adulthood. It is not that one particular insecure pattern predominates, although insecure preoccupied and insecure fearful ratings did show more continuity than insecure dismissing ratings, but that adult intimate attachment insecurity seldom relates to secure early attachment.

Themes found in the Attachment Profiles

In the sample profiles of the preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment patterns, three themes seemed to be evident. The first was the major influence, either positive or negative, that their father had in the lives of each of these men. In all three of the illustrative cases within this study, father seemed to play a rather central role in their lives. The second theme was the lack of criticism or regrets these men had regarding parental behaviour during their childhood even though there were clear incidents of parental rejection, inappropriate punishments and lack of acceptance and encouragement. The third theme was the strong dependency that each of these men had on their wives or long-term girlfriends and their need for power and control in
intimate relationships.

Attachment theory has traditionally focused on mother as the primary attachment figure while fathers were seen as having a secondary or peripheral influence (Bowlby, 1958, 1969, 1982; Ainsworth et al., 1973). This orientation led many feminist scholars to reject attachment as just another mother-blaming theory (Penfold, 1992). There are indications in this study that support a number of feminist criticisms. Fathers as well as mothers appear to play a rather central role in the attachment patterns that children develop. It is the individual’s lack of recognition, memory and/or resolution of negative parental behaviour that likely maintains insecure attachment patterns. The individual needs to emotionally resolve his or her relationship with both parents, not just with his or her mother. Attachment theory and societal orientations to parenting should be re-examined and updated with this in mind.

**Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

Prior to discussing the clinical implications of this study, the strengths and limitations will be commented on. It is important to recognize that the sample for this study was not randomly selected but was drawn from men who attended treatment groups for wife assault. The men were self-selected and voluntary although efforts were made to encourage all participants to be involved in the study. In the groups, a number of the men perceived language and literacy barriers that prevented them from participating. Other men did not participate due to low
motivation or minimal involvement in the group activities. Some men were only participating in the group treatment as a condition of a probation order or due to threats of separation and divorce by their wives and were not open to "doing anything extra". These factors resulted in the study sample being predominantly, that is 91%, made up of motivated Canadian-born white males. This reduces the generalizability of the results to literate white men who attend group therapy for the treatment of wife assault.

Another limitation of this research concerns the participation of only fifty men who assaulted their wives in the study. This small sample size produced a number of limitations especially regarding the utilization of the discrete patterns of insecure attachment, methods of statistical analysis, generalizability and the possibility of sampling errors. This was not considered a serious drawback overall as this was a preliminary and exploratory study and with a sample size of fifty and an alpha of .10, the probability of detecting a medium effect was greater than 90%.

The design of the study also produced some limitations. The measures were administered and scored through one application of three paper and pencil measures and two interviews to the men and one paper and pencil measure to the women during the second and third week of treatment. These measures were then used in an effort to understand the attachment patterns of the sample men throughout their life cycle, that is childhood through to adulthood. As the findings were based exclusively on one application of the measures and interviews, and one source, that
is the perspective of each man except for the Conflict Tactics Scale, the results may not truly reflect their childhood and adult attachment experiences. The findings regarding attachment only represent the man's mental representations of his early attachment patterns and his representations of his adult intimate attachment patterns.

The major strengths of this study were the active involvement and voluntary participation of fifty men who assaulted their wives which produced a sample size large enough to detect a medium effect, and the use of in-depth attachment interviews rather than paper and pencil measures alone. The five hour commitment required to complete the interviews and paper and pencil measures filtered out many men who may have been more likely to provide inaccurate and/or unreliable information due to a low or marginal motivation level. As a group, men who have assaulted their wives are noted for their high power needs along with a tendency to deny and minimize their character flaws and personal responsibilities. It is therefore questionable whether one application of paper and pencil measures, which was the design of the majority of the wife assault studies reviewed in Chapter One, produces reliable and valid information. In the current study, audiotapes of the in-depth early and adult intimate attachment interviews were rated by independent raters to promote the accuracy and validity of the attachment pattern ratings assigned. In this manner and with a sample size of fifty, the links between men who commit wife assault and insecure preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment pattern ratings
could be properly assessed.

Clinical Implications for Group Therapy

In North America over the past twenty years, group therapy has become the major treatment of choice for men who have assaulted their wives. In this section the possible manifestations of the dismissing and the preoccupied adult intimate attachment patterns within a group treatment context will be explored. The third pattern, that is insecure fearful attachment, will not be addressed in this section for three reasons. First, ten of the eleven illustrative men with this pattern were from the Victoria group and this investigator never had an opportunity to experience them in group therapy. Second, the one man from Vancouver only completed three of twelve group sessions and did not actively participate in the group discussions. Third, many of the men with this pattern also had moderately high ratings on the dismissing pattern and this investigator finds it hard to decipher the relative contributions of each of these patterns to the behaviours reported for these men by the Victoria counsellors. Rather than mislead readers through tenuous speculations, this pattern will be left to future clinicians and researchers to examine.

Men who have assaulted their female partners often come to group therapy as a condition of a probation order or at the insistence of their partner. In the initial stage the focus is on challenging the man's belief mechanisms of self-justification for the violence. These include any indications that his female
partner's injuries were minimal, his partner was to blame for the conflict, or the use of violence was situational, that is being drunk, jealous or in a rage, or the result of an uncontrollable predisposition such as a bad temper or a jealous rage.

The minimization of the violence would be common for both men with high dismissing and high preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings although there may be a distinct difference in style. Men with high dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings such as Brian would likely attempt to minimize and avoid discussion of the violent incident(s). In the example of Brian, which was introduced in the Results section, he initially blamed his partner for the incident, could "not understand why everyone was making such a big deal about it" and thought that she was "already over it". He accepted that he would have to come to the weekly group meetings "in order to satisfy (his) probation officer", but really didn't think he needed it. He had "been drinking on the night of the incident, became jealous and hit her once or twice when she refused to leave the bar with (him). Any man would have done the same thing". Brian indicated that he "was a man of few words like (his) father" and this lack of communication was confirmed during group therapy sessions.

Men with high ratings on the preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern, such as Pedro, would likely tend to have a very different approach to treatment. They may want to talk about the circumstances that led to the violence and the reasons why they were "forced" into committing the violent act. They very
much want to be accepted by authority figures, that is group leaders, and group members alike. In the example of Pedro, which was introduced in the Results section, he always volunteered to talk in the group, although seldom staying on topic, and enjoyed the opportunity to tell about his past. He wanted everyone to understand the minute details of his life and why he "made a mistake and hit (his) girlfriend". He appeared remorseful about the consequences of his behaviour, that is spending time in jail, being on probation and no longer living with his girlfriend, but not about his violence. In the group he readily agreed with the group leaders that he should become non-violent, but then attempted to make his violence contingent on the behaviour of his girlfriend. He "hoped that she would never make (him) mad like that again".

It often takes many weeks of group therapy to try and move through the denial, minimization and externalization of the violence and for the men to accept that they chose to commit violent acts and therefore must take full personal responsibility for the violence. In many cases it is very difficult to know whether the men with high dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings really accept these ideas due to their minimal verbalizations in the group. The task is somewhat easier regarding the men with high ratings on the preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern due to their expressive natures. The difficulty with these men is they want acceptance so badly that they may be indicating agreement in order to please the group leaders while still harbouring the same old negative attitudes.
In the middle stage, the focus is on generating new perceptual and behavioural possibilities (Dutton, 1988a). An aspect of this is usually the identification and management of anger and other emotions and the separation between feeling angry and committing violent acts. Anger diaries are often used in this regard in order to assist the men in improving their abilities to detect warning signs of violence and developing a more elaborate set of behaviours for managing situations in which they might be violent. Other aspects of therapy during this stage may include the exploration of male socialization, the use of time-outs, alternative conflict resolution techniques, control versus equality in relationships, the influence of family of origin, assertiveness skills and communication.

Men with high ratings on the dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern have a tendency to drop out of treatment during this stage. They often find the closeness that develops between group members, the focus on emotions and emotional expression, the emphasis on the changes required in their behaviour and the confrontational nature of the group treatment program to be very uncomfortable. They have spent their lives reducing, denying and controlling emotions and actively avoiding conflicts. In Brian's case it was about halfway through the treatment group that he started missing sessions. He failed to attend two weeks in a row "due to work", came for one week and then "was sick" the next week. This avoidance pattern would have likely continued had he not been once again arrested for wife assault. The judge strongly recommended that Brian return to
group therapy and he maintained regular attendance for all sixteen weeks of the next group.

In contrast, men with high ratings on the preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern usually have a high attendance rate in therapy and like to participate in the group discussions. They tend to tell long and involved stories about themselves, their lives and their families when given free reign in the group. No topic area is too personal to discuss as long as they can answer in their own way. Once they are confronted by the group leaders regarding contradictions in the stories, especially those related to their parents, they often become quite angry and hostile. In the group they readily indicate acceptance of time-outs and conflict resolution, assertiveness and communication techniques, but seldom use these skills in their daily lives. They generally have difficulty completing anger diaries and any other weekly tasks assigned as part of the group therapy although indicating that these assignments would be very beneficial to them.

In the case of Pedro, he was usually the first person to arrive at the group therapy site and often had something to ask or tell group leaders at break and after the sessions. There were times in the early stages of the group when Pedro attempted to dominate the group discussions with his stories. He was always looking for approval and acceptance from the group leaders and readily talked about the various aspects of his life, especially his life while growing up in his country. Pedro enthusiastically endorsed the ideas and skills presented by the group leaders, but often "forgot" to bring the assigned task to the next group
meeting although claiming to have completed it. He reported that in interactions with his girlfriend he rarely used the skills presented in group as he felt too emotionally "overwhelmed at the time".

In the ending stage of group therapy, the primary focus is on terminating in a manner that encourages the continued non-violence of group members. This is usually accomplished during a group session by having the men review their strengths and weaknesses regarding the ideas and skills presented in the group and exploring their future plans for non-violence and self-development. Each man in turn presents his perceptions of the progress made and then receives feedback from the group members and leaders. A second focus during this stage is to terminate the group in a manner that respects the separation and attachment needs of group members. This is usually accomplished over many weeks through discussions regarding termination and loss, and the progressive ways that the men can deal with these experiences.

Men with high ratings on the dismissing and preoccupied adult intimate attachment patterns tend to have problems with the ending stage, especially if the group therapy has stimulated attachment experiences. In some therapy groups the focus is mainly on learning male resocialization, problem-solving and skill building with no major emotional or attachment emphasis. Other therapy groups promote a great deal of family of origin work and emotional expressivity. Groups such as the latter will likely have stimulated attachment behaviours and will need to pay far more attention to termination issues in order to ensure that
the men leave with a secure attachment experience from the group.

Directions for Future Research

There are a number of directions for future research. First, as this study was preliminary and exploratory, a sample size of fifty was adequate in exploring the male relationship problems and conflict behaviours in adult intimate relationships of men who assault their wives. Future studies will need to utilize a larger sample size (N=100+) in order to verify if the trends found in the current data regarding the three insecure attachment patterns are truly significant and to reduce the possibility of sampling errors. It would also be important to develop a male comparison group that closely fits the profile of men who attend treatment groups for wife assault, that is blue collar workers between 24 and 45 years of age with mainly Grade 8 to Grade 12 education, as this would allow more precise comparisons.

Second, the three insecure adult intimate attachment patterns seem to be identified with different male conflict tactic behaviours. As there are a number of verbal and physical abuse scales (Straus, 1979; Hudson & McIntosh, 1981; Tolman, 1989) that could be administered to both the men who assault their wives and men in general, it would be interesting to examine the male conflict tactic behaviours associated with the three adult insecure intimate attachment patterns in more detail. Each one of these scales examines a different aspect of abusive attitudes and behaviours in adult intimate relationships and the combined results would provide an exceedingly rich data base from which to
understand the abuse patterns of these men. In addition, as mentioned in the method section, in order to achieve valid and reliable results, abusive male attitude and behavioural scales need to be administered separately to both the men and their female partners.

Third, there appear to be different male relationship problems associated with high ratings on the three insecure adult intimate attachment patterns. High ratings on preoccupied adult intimate attachment may be related to marital jealousy, dependency, possessiveness and separation anxiety, whereas high ratings on dismissing adult intimate attachment may be associated with anger, emotional distance, control and self-reliance, and high ratings on fearful adult intimate attachment with anger, interpersonal vulnerability and spousal acceptance. As there is a wide variety of standardized paper and pencil measures available to identify the presence and the extent of these relationship problems with the three insecure attachment pattern ratings, this would be a fruitful area for further research. It is important for clinicians and researchers to understand the influence of these individual male intimacy problems and how they affect the marital relationship and the intimate conflict tactics used by men who assault their female partners.

Fourth, there was an unusually large representation of the preoccupied attachment pattern in this study sample. Is this due to therapy groups for men who assault their wives having high proportions of men with the preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern? If so, what is the reason for these high proportions? Is
it the result of the general population of men with the preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern having a greater propensity for abuse in intimate adult relationships? If this is the case then preventive education and therapeutic intervention programs with males with the preoccupied attachment pattern would be important. Or, is it that, due to the high levels of conflict and abuse in intimate adult relationships with these men, these men are arrested and convicted more often than are men with the other insecure patterns?

Fifth, men with high preoccupied adult intimate attachment ratings appear to respond to group therapy in a distinctly different manner than do men with high ratings on dismissing adult intimate attachment patterns. As indicated in the clinical implications section, men with high ratings on the preoccupied adult intimate pattern tend to physically and emotionally participate more in group therapy sessions than do those with high ratings on the dismissing adult intimate pattern. How different are these men in their attendance rates and levels of self-disclosure in group therapy? Are there different therapeutic approaches that would be more appropriate for men with high dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings as opposed to high preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern ratings? For instance, is individual therapy more appropriate for men with high dismissing adult intimate attachment ratings due to their discomfort with self-disclosure? How do men with high fearful adult intimate attachment pattern ratings tend to respond to group therapy? These questions need to be examined in more detail
through further research. It would also be useful to identify the adult intimate attachment pattern ratings found at the end of therapy to see if they have shifted.

Sixth, if through further research the insecure attachment paradigm appears to play an important role in understanding the conflict behaviours of men who assault their wives, then longitudinal studies should be considered. Longitudinal studies using various attachment measures such as the Strange Situation, Hansberg Adolescent Technique, Family Attachment Interview and Peer Attachment Interview, violence scales such as the Conflict Tactics Scale, Tolman’s Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory, Hudson’s Index of Spouse Abuse Scale and multiple sources such as self, parents, peers, teachers and female partners could be useful in addressing the following questions. Does a man’s mental representation of his early attachment pattern actually correspond to his early attachment pattern behaviours? What factors influence the continuity between insecure adult early attachment pattern ratings and insecure adult intimate attachment pattern ratings? What factors along with the insecure attachment patterns appear to result in a male child becoming violent with his intimate female partner in adulthood?

Conclusion

Overall, the results provided indications for links between the insecure male adult intimate attachment pattern ratings of men who assault their wives and male relationship problems and
conflict tactics. The men who had assaulted their wives were predominantly insecure in both their mental representations of early and adult intimate attachment patterns, although the particular insecure pattern often fluctuated. The greatest continuity between the early and adult intimate attachment patterns was found with the insecure preoccupied and fearful pattern ratings.

Three patterns of relationship problems corresponding to the three insecure adult intimate attachment pattern ratings emerged in examination of the data. It appears that the high preoccupied ratings on the adult intimate attachment interview may be related to issues of male jealousy, dependency, possessiveness and separation anxiety. High preoccupied ratings may be related to the expression of both positive and negative emotions including male anger towards his spouse, and the reported use of the reasoning, verbal abuse, physical abuse and severe physical abuse conflict tactics towards his spouse. Dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern ratings may be related to issues of male control, anger and self-reliance. High dismissing intimate attachment pattern ratings may be related to being inexpressive, taking a hostile outlook on interpersonal relationships, harbouring grudges and suppressing anger and negatively related to the use of conflict tactics. Fearful adult intimate attachment pattern ratings may be related to issues of male anger, interpersonal vulnerability and spousal acceptance. High fearful intimate attachment pattern ratings may be related to feelings of dependency, loneliness and being virtually unlovable.
The identification of insecure adult intimate attachment pattern ratings also appears to be important when providing group therapy to men who assault their wives. Men with high ratings on the insecure dismissing adult intimate attachment pattern seem to require a distinctly different therapeutic approach than those with high ratings on the insecure preoccupied adult intimate attachment pattern. Further research that critically examines and extends the ideas explored in this preliminary study is warranted.

It is also important to remember that there are many societal changes that could greatly impact on the incidence of wife assault. These include the active promotion of a non-violent society through public education programs and legislation that clearly condemns and deals with all forms of family violence from child abuse to wife assault to elder abuse and promotes more equitable power relations between men and women.
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Consent & Information Forms

- General Consent Form
- Information on Relationship Questionnaires and Attachment Interviews
- Interview Information Form
This project is being carried out under the direction of Dr. Donald G. Dutton, in the Department of Psychology, University of B.C. Participation involves up to three activities: filling out self-report questionnaires, taking part in a 1 to 2 hour general interview as a follow-up to the questionnaires, and/or a 1 to 2 hour interview to specifically discuss your relationships. For each activity you will be paid $10.00. It is your option to participate in none, some, or all of the activities. Our research experience indicates that many participants find the process interesting and helpful to them.

In certain cases, the questionnaires and interviews will be used for diagnostic purposes. However, data from these questionnaires and interviews may also be used for research purposes which will further our knowledge of family violence and may help to improve treatment for this problem. The study assesses a broad spectrum of background experiences in a group of men who have sought treatment for wife assault or have been directed to such treatment by the courts.

Your participation in this assessment is completely voluntary and does not constitute a term of probation. Your decision to not participate in the project, or to withdraw from the project after agreeing to do so and/or initial participation, will in no way jeopardize your treatment.

Your name will be assigned an identification number so that your identity will be protected. This consent form will be removed from this package and kept separate from the questionnaires. All published reports of any research will refer only to group data. No individual will be identified.

Your signature below indicates your consent to participate in this project. Any questions about this research should be directed to Dr. Don Dutton at (604) 228-2151 or Mr. Keith Saunders at (604) 228-3582.

Yes, I will participate in the (please tick):

___ Questionnaire study
___ General Interview
___ Relationships Interview

Name: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
(please print)

Signature: ___________________________ Continued next page
Address: __________________________

_______________________________

Telephone number: ______________

We would also like your wife/partner to take part in this study, as it would further help us develop an understanding of family violence dynamics. If you are willing to have us contact her, please indicate so below and provide her name and telephone number.

Her name is: ________________________

Telephone Number ____________________
INTERVIEW INFORMATION

Name: ____________________________________________

Address: ____________________________________________

Telephone Number:
(Home) _____________________________
(Work) _____________________________

Most convenient times available:
Weekdays: ____________________________________________
Weekends: ____________________________________________
Appendix B

Straus Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)
No matter how well two people get along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed about something the other person does, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood or tired, or for some other reason. They also use different ways of trying to settle their differences. Below are listed a number of behaviours that people use to settle differences. Please read each one and write in the letter noted below which best represents how often you and your partner have used these behaviours when dealing with each other during the past year. For example, if you 'discussed the issue calmly' eight times, you would write in an 'e'. If neither you nor your partner have used one of the behaviours during the last year, but have used it during your relationship, write in an 'h'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>6-10 times</th>
<th>11-20 times</th>
<th>21+ times</th>
<th>ever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= a</td>
<td>= e</td>
<td>= f</td>
<td>= g</td>
<td>= h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Discussed the issue calmly</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Got information to back up (your/their) side of things</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Argued heatedly but short of yelling</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Insulted, yelled or swore at the other one</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Sulked and/or refused to talk about it</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Cried</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Did or said something to spite the other one</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Threatened to hit or throw something at the other one</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Threw something at the other one</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other one</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Slapped the other one</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Kicked, bit or hit with a fist</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Hit or tried to hit with something</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Beat up the other one</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Threatened with a knife or gun</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Used a knife or gun</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Other</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Interpersonal Jealousy Scale (IJS)
These questions ask you about your relationship with your partner. Please use the scale below to express your feelings concerning the truth of each item. For example, if you feel the item is "always true" of you, place a "9" in the blank before the item number. If it is "generally true" then place an "8" in the blank, etc.

9 = ALWAYS TRUE
8 = GENERALLY TRUE
7 = OFTEN TRUE
6 = SLIGHTLY TRUE
5 = NEITHER TRUE NOR FALSE
4 = SLIGHTLY FALSE
3 = OFTEN FALSE
2 = GENERALLY FALSE
1 = ALWAYS FALSE

1. If my partner were to see an old friend of the opposite sex and respond with a great deal of happiness, I would be annoyed.

2. If my partner went out with same sex friends, I would feel compelled to know what she did.

3. If my partner admired someone of the opposite sex I would feel irritated.

4. If my partner were to help someone of the opposite sex with work outside of the office, I would feel suspicious.

5. When my partner likes one of my friends I am pleased.

6. If my partner were to go away for the weekend without me, my only concern would be whether she had a good time.

7. If my partner were helpful to someone of the opposite sex I would feel jealous.

8. When my partner talks of happy experiences in her past, I feel sad that I wasn't part of them.

9. If my partner were to become displeased about the time I spend with others, I would be flattered.

10. If my partner and I went to a party and I lost sight of her, I would become uncomfortable.

11. I want my partner to remain good friends with the people she used to date.
12. If my partner were to date others I would feel unhappy.

13. When I notice that my partner and a person of the opposite sex have something in common, I am envious.

14. If my partner were to become very close to someone of the opposite sex, I would feel very unhappy and/or angry.

15. I would like my partner to be faithful to me.

16. I don’t think it would bother me if my partner flirted with someone of the opposite sex.

17. If someone of the opposite sex were to compliment my partner I would feel that the person was trying to take her away from me.

18. I feel good when my partner makes a new friend.

19. If my partner were to spend the night comforting a friend of the opposite sex who had just had a tragic experience, her compassion would please me.

20. If someone of the opposite sex were to pay attention to my partner, I would become possessive of her.

21. If my partner were to become exuberant and hug someone of the opposite sex, it would make me feel good that she was expressing her feelings openly.

22. The thought of my partner kissing someone else drives me up the wall.

23. If someone of the opposite sex lit up at the sight of my partner, I would become uneasy.

24. I like to find fault with my partner’s old dates.

25. I feel possessive toward my partner.

26. If my partner had been previously married, I would feel resentment toward her ex-husband.

27. If I saw a picture of my partner and an old date I would feel unhappy.

28. If my partner were to accidently call me by the wrong name, I would become furious.
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Multidimensional Anger Inventory
Everybody gets angry from time to time. A number of statements that people have used to describe the times that they get angry are included below. Read each statement and circle the number to the right of the statement that best describes you. There are no right or wrong answers.

If the statement is **completely undescriptive** of you: circle the '1'

If the statement is **mostly undescriptive** of you: circle the '2'

If the statement is **partly undescriptive and partly descriptive** of you: circle the '3'

If the statement is **mostly descriptive** of you: circle the '4'

If the statement is **completely descriptive** of you: circle the '5'

1. I tend to get angry more frequently than most people. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Other people seem to get angrier than I do in similar circumstances. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I harbour grudges that I don’t tell anyone about. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I try to get even when I’m angry with someone. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I am secretly quite critical of others. 1 2 3 4 5
6. It is easy to make me angry. 1 2 3 4 5
7. When I am angry with someone, I let that person know. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I have met many people who are supposed to be experts who are no better than I. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Something makes me angry almost every day. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I often feel angrier than I think I should. 1 2 3 4 5
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel guilty about expressing my anger.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When I am angry with someone, I take it out on whoever is around.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Some of my friends have habits that annoy and bother me very much.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am surprised at how often I feel angry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Once I let people know that I am angry, I can put it out of my mind.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. People talk about me behind my back.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. At times, I feel angry for no specific reason.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I can make myself angry about something in the past just by thinking about it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Even after I have expressed my anger, I have trouble forgetting about it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. When I hide my anger from others, I think about it for a long time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. People can bother me just by being around.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. When I get angry, I stay angry for hours.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. When I hide my anger from others, I forget about it pretty quickly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I try to talk over problems with people without letting them know I'm angry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. When I get angry, I calm down faster than most people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I get so angry, I feel that I might lose control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. If I let people see the way I feel, I'd be considered a hard person to get along with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I am on my guard with people who are friendlier than I expected.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. It's difficult for me to let people know I'm angry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. I get angry when:
   a. someone lets me down 1 2 3 4 5
   b. people are unfair 1 2 3 4 5
   c. something blocks my plans 1 2 3 4 5
   d. I am delayed 1 2 3 4 5
   e. someone embarrasses me 1 2 3 4 5
   f. I have to take orders from someone less capable than I 1 2 3 4 5
   g. I have to work with incompetent people 1 2 3 4 5
   h. I do something stupid 1 2 3 4 5
   i. I am not given credit for something I have done 1 2 3 4 5
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Adult Early Attachment Interview

- Interview Schedule
- Rating Scales
- Attachment Prototypes
- Adult Early Attachment Rating Specifications
FAMILY INTERVIEW

Demographics
* Age; Current Marital Status; Ethnic Background; Occupation

Background
* Orientation: where you lived, how often moved, what parents did for a living?
* Who lived in the household? Where are the member of your immediate family now?
* What was the marital relationship of your parents like when you were growing up? How did they seem to get along to you? Was there much conflict? Were they affectionate with each other in front of you?
* Briefly describe what kind of child you were. When are your earliest memories.

Relationship with Parents
* who were the adults central in your upbringing?
* I'd like you to describe your relationship with each of your parents, going back as far as you can.
* Which parent were you closest to? Was each of your parents affectionate with you?

Adjectives
* Could you give me 4 or 5 adjectives that describe your mother? * Could you give me 4 or 5 adjectives that describe your father?
* Can you give me an example of that one? A specific memory or incident that illustrates that adjective.

Upsets
* If you were unhappy or upset as a child, what would you do? Can you give an example.
* Do you remember any upsetting incidents outside the family (eg. being teased, conflicts with friends, teacher's criticisms, etc.)?
* How did your parents respond when you were upset?
* Did you cry very often? How would your parents react?
  - {If Necessary}: When you were ill or physically hurt? When your were emotionally hurt?
* Why do you think your parents reacted to you in the way they did?

Separations
* Do you remember the first time you were separated from your parents for any length of time? (eg. camp, parent's holiday, hospitalization)
  - {If Necessary}: How about going to school for the first time?
* As a young child did you ever get lost? How did you react (feelings)? How did your parents react?
* Did you ever run away from home? How did your parents react?
Rejection
* As a child:
  * Were you ever afraid of either parent?
  * Could you predict the behaviours of your parents?
  * Did you ever feel rejected by your parents? Describe. How did it feel? What did you do?
  * Did your parent realize that she/he were rejecting you?
  * {If not} Did you ever feel that you disappointed your parents?
  * And what about the opposite: Did you feel loved and accepted? Were they proud of you?
  * Did you feel that they understood you?
  * Were your parents ever threatening towards you? What did they do for discipline?
  * Do you consider any of the discipline you received abusive?

Significant Losses
* Has anyone that you've been close to died? How emotionally close were you to this person?
  * {If So} What age were you?
  * Under what circumstances did they die?
  * How did the members of your family respond at the time? How did you respond?
  * Did this loss have any impact on your daily life?
  * Have your feelings over this loss changed over time?

Current Relationship with Parents
* Have there been any major changes in your relationship with your parents since childhood? Describe. What brought them about?
* Did you ever go through a period when there was more conflict than usual between you and your parents?
* Were you ever in any trouble with the law during your childhood?
* How did your parents react?
* What is your relationship with your parents like now?
* How often do you talk to them?
* Are there things that it would be hard to talk to them about?
* Do you feel that they understand you?

Effects
* Do you think your experiences growing up with your family influenced your relationship with people outside of the family in any way? How so?
* Is there anything that you consider a setback to your development?

Changes
* Do you have any thoughts about how your parents came to be the kind of parents they were?
* How would you have liked your parents to be different?
* How do you think your parents would have liked you to be different?

Other

* Is there anything else about your parents that needs to be added?
ADULT EARLY RELATIONSHIP RATING SCALE

SUBJECT # ____________________________  INTERVIEWER _______________
SEX ____________________________  CODER _______________
AGE ____________________________

Mother  |  Father
--- | ---
Acceptance (1-9) |  |  |
Rejection (1-9) |  |  |
Involvement (1-9) |  |  |
Consistency (1-none, 9-high) |  |  |
Emotional Expressivity  (1-extreme reserve, 5-balanced, 9-histrionic) |  |  |
Pushed to Achievement (1-9) |  |  |
Role Reversal (1-9) |  |  |
Expressed Anger Now (1-9) |  |  |
Idealization (1-9) |  |  |
Depth of Portrait (1-9) |  |  |
Use of as a Secure Base (1-9)  (1-never, 5-somewhat, 9-always) |  |  |
Dominance (1-9)  (1-child, 5-ideal, 9-parent) |  |  |
Current Closeness (1-9) |  |  |
Elaboration (1-9) |  |  |
Coherence (1-9) |  |  |
Lack of resolution of mourning (1-9) |  |  |
Lack of resolution of trauma (1-9) |  |  |
SUBJECT # __________

COUNTS

Insistence on not remembering
Inappropriate laughter
I don't know's

OTHER

Separation Anxiety (1-9)
(1-none, 5-average, 9-extreme)

"Adolescent" rebellion (1-9)
(1-none, 5-some/unclear, 9-lots)

Self-esteem (1-9)
(1-very low, 5-average, 9-exceptionally high)

STYLES (1-9)

Secure
Fearful
Preoccupied
Dismissing
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SUBJECT # ___________________  3

ADJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOSSES, MAJOR SEPARATIONS, AND/OR ILLNESSES:

________________________________________   Age ______
________________________________________   Age ______
________________________________________   Age ______

DISCIPLINE & ABUSE:

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

RESPONSE WHEN UPSET:

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

EFFECTS OF CHILDHOOD:

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

HOW WOULD LIKE PARENTS TO BE DIFFERENT:

________________________________________
________________________________________

CULTURAL INFLUENCES:

________________________________________

INTERPERSONAL STYLE:

________________________________________
FAMILY-ATTACHMENT GROUP PROTOTYPES

Secure
- most important: coherence, ability to evaluate, realistic appraisal of past, insightful, value attachment relationships (not necessarily with parents)
- parenting dimensions: supportive parents, low idealization and role reversal, high coherence, good memory, elaboration and depth of portrait
- general tone: self-confident, thoughtful, mature, capable of feeling
- two types: a) warm, accepting parents (and believable)
  b) difficult experiences but "worked through", intellectually and emotionally

Fearful
- most important: desire for closeness and acceptance, but avoidance due to fear of rejection; shy; feels fundamentally unloved; blamed self for parental rejection; difficulty trusting people
- general tone: shy, vulnerable, low self-esteem, continued emotional involvement with parents
- parenting dimensions: parental rejection, overly critical or harsh or so unavailable that it appeared uncaring; not necessarily any idealization or role reversal; good memory and elaboration (unless shyness overrules)
- common experiences: rejected for attachment behaviors (i.e., crying); abusive or extremely cold parents; very shy or withdrawn as child; withdraws when upset; high separation anxiety
**Preoccupied**

- most important: emotional enmeshment with parents, continued dependence, lack of coherence or resolution of separation

- general tone: very emotional, either positive (with idealization) or conflicted; lack of independent identity; low self-esteem; overly sensitive to others' opinions

- parenting dimensions: high idealization and role reversal, low coherence, good memory and elaboration

- common experiences: over-protective enmeshed mother, inept parents; very inconsistent parenting; high separation anxiety; go to parents if upset; divorce or complicated family history

- two types: a) passive, enmeshed, idealized or negative memories but in either case incoherent
  b) conflicted and ambivalent - ongoing struggle for independence, anger towards parents, maybe pseudo-analytic, egocentric

**Dismissing**

- most important: emotional detachment; downplays importance of attachment relations; over-emphasis on independence, emotional control and/or achievement; lack of evaluation of early experiences; limited awareness of effects from parents

- general tone: cool, self-confident, overly rational, unemotional, at extreme arrogant

- parenting dimensions: high idealization, poor memory and elaboration, low coherence

- types: a) rejecting parents, but subject downplays importance of rejection or even defends parents; detachment from or inability to evaluate effects of early experiences
  b) cool unemotional parents that passed on their style; may have emphasized independence and achievement; lack of any physical or expressed affection from parents although no evidence of rejection

- common experiences: no separation anxiety; rarely upset, or if so dealt with on own; use of distancers in speech, such as "you" for "I"
ADULT EARLY ATTACHMENT RATING SPECIFICATIONS

* ACCEPTANCE: (by parent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking in love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* REJECTION: (by parent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* INVOLVEMENT: (Neglect - physical absence/inaccessibility or psychological unresponsiveness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely inattentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for a certain period of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately inattentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologically responsive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically inattentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CONSISTENCY: (of parenting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIVITY: (general style of parent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PUSHED TO ACHIEVEMENT: (by parent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly pushed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately pushed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushed beyond cultural norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ROLE REVERSAL: (responsibility for parent) [Preoccupied - High]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent's well-being concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not role reversed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some role reversal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal of roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* EXPRESSED ANGER NOW: (towards parent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annoyance</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* IDEALIZATION: (their perception now)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Idealization</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* DEPTH OF PORTRAIT: (knowledge of parent's motives and feelings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* USE OF AS A SECURE BASE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* DOMINANCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CURRENT CLOSENESS: (with parent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ELABORATION: [Preoccupied - Lots; Dismissing - Little]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* COHERENCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly incoherent</td>
<td>Incoherent</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Coherent</td>
<td>Highly coherent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incoherent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* LACK OF RESOLUTION OF MOURNING: [greater than 5 = D category]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Largely resolved</td>
<td>Unsettled</td>
<td>Some speech or thought confusion</td>
<td>Confused thought process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thought process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\* LACK OF RESOLUTION OF TRAUMA: (extreme threats or violence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Largely resolved</td>
<td>Unsettled</td>
<td>Some speech or thought confusion</td>
<td>Confusedthought process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNTS

\* INSISTENCE ON NOT REMEMBERING  [Dismissing - Lots]
\* I DON'T KNOW'S

OTHER

\* SEPARATION ANXIETY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>A lot of</td>
<td>Extreme anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* "ADOLESCENT" REBELLION: (individuating rebellion against parent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Some/unclear</td>
<td>Rebellion</td>
<td>Lots of Rebellion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* SELF-ESTEEM: (sense of vulnerability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STYLES

\* SECURE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Slight evidence of this style</td>
<td>Somewhat consistent or noticeable theme</td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* FEARFUL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Slight evidence of this style</td>
<td>Somewhat consistent or noticeable theme</td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* PREOCCUPIED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Slight evidence of this style</td>
<td>Somewhat consistent or noticeable theme</td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DISMISSING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Slight evidence of this style</td>
<td>Somewhat consistent or noticeable theme</td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Adult Intimate Attachment Interview

- Interview Schedule
- Rating Scales
- Attachment Prototypes
- Adult Intimate Attachment Rating Specifications
MARITAL RELATIONSHIP

Personal Information

* Compared to other people you know, would you describe yourself as an emotional person? (Why do you say that? What kinds of emotions do you experience?)

* And do you feel like you have a lot of problems in your life?

* When you feel unhappy or upset about something, what are you likely to do? What kinds of things do you tend to get most upset about these days? Can you give an example.

* How often do you cry? What about? More often alone or with others?

Friendships

* What kinds of friends do you tend to have? a few close ones or a group? more male or female?

* How many people would you call close friends?

* What does it mean to you to say someone is a close friend?

* Choose one friend as a reference. Describe the friendship.

* Do you think that "F" really understands you?

* Do you discuss personal matters with "F"?

* Are there things you wouldn’t talk about or that would be difficult to talk about? Example. Why?

* Are you satisfied with your friendships?

Relationship History

* Can you give me a history of all your serious romantic/sexual involvements

* For all previous relationships: briefly describe,
  * how long together, what happened, reason for breakup, time alone before next relationship

* Do you see any similarities or patterns across your relationships?

Current Relationship

* Can you give me a history of your current relationship,
  * how you got together, how long, separations, other involvements since together

* What is the living arrangement in your household?
  * any children, any others in household

* Briefly describe your relationship.
* Choose some adjectives that best characterize the relationship, examples (eg, stormy, comfortable, warm, conflictual).

* What do you like most about the relationship?
  * Like least about it?

* Describe your partner. What do you like most about him/her?
* What don't you like about him/her? Do you talk to your partner about it?

* What do you think your partner likes most about you? And least?
Communication

* What kind of things do the two of you talk about?
* Do you discuss personal matters?
* Do you feel comfortable revealing personal worries and insecurities? How does your partner respond?
* Are there any things you wouldn’t talk about with your partner, or would be difficult to talk about? Why?
* Do you feel your partner really understands you?

Supportiveness

* To what extent do you use your partner as a source of support in times of stress?
* Do you cry in front of your partner? If not, why not? How do they respond?
* Do you ever feel that your partner is not responsive enough when you would like help or support?
* How do you feel about giving help or support to your partner?
* Do you ever feel taken advantage of by your partner? Or that you take advantage of your partner?

Trust

* To what extent do you feel you can trust your partner?
* How predictable is your partner’s behavior?
* And how about you, how trustworthy and predictable are you?

Jealousy

* Is jealousy ever an issue? When? How do you feel about?
* Do you ever feel that you are unreasonably jealous? And your partner?

Love-worthiness

* Do you ever doubt that your partner truly loves you?
* Do you ever felt rejected by your partner? Describe.

* How affectionate are the two of you within the relationship? Is one of you more so than the other? Ever an issue, in private or public?
* Do you ever feel that your partner is not warm or affectionate enough?

Decision Making

* How are major decisions made between you and your partner?
  * If there is a disagreement about an issue, who makes the final decision?
Conflict Resolution

* Do you ever get angry? Have fights?
  * What do the two of you tend to fight about?
  * How do the fights go? What do you do? What does your partner do? How does it end? How is it resolved?

* Do your conflicts often become physical? Have they ever become physical?
* Has your partner ever done anything that you consider to be abusive? And have you done anything they would consider to be abusive?

Separations

* How much time do you and your spend together on a daily and weekly basis?
  * What are your ideals regarding time together? Is it ever an issue?
* Have there ever been any major separations? How did you deal with it?

* If you and your partner break up in the future, how difficult do you think it would be for you? And for your partner?

Sexual Relationship

* How important is sex in your relationship?
* Do you generally feel satisfied with the sexual aspect of your relationship? If not, why not? How do you deal with it?
* How comfortable are you talking to your partner about sexual issues?
* Are you ever concerned that you are not sufficiently sexually interested in your partner? Or that your partner is not sufficiently sexually interested in you?

Friends and Outside Interests

* How much time do you and your partner spend with outside friends and interests? How much time together and separately?
  * Has time spent with friends and outside interests ever been a conflictual issue within your relationship? How was it resolved?
* If you think of your closest friend, how does the emotional closeness you have with them compare to your closeness with your partner?

Mutuality

* People in relationships commonly report that one partner wants to become closer than the other. Has this ever been the case in your relationship? If so, describe.
* Some people feel concerned about getting too dependent or too involved in a relationship. Is this a concern for you? For your partner?
* Do you feel that there is any inequality in how strongly each of you feels about the other?
* Do you or your partner ever attempt to control or possess the other person?
* Do you ever feel trapped in this relationship?
General Evaluation

* Are you generally happy in the relationship?
* What do you see as the major problems or issues that you have to work out as a couple?
  *Specifics: sex, time, communication, inlaws, children

* What changes would you like to see in the future? In particular, what changes would you like to see in the way you relate to your partner? Your partner relates to you?
* {If necessary}:
  * If you could have the ideal relationship, how would it differ?
  * What is a good relationship as you see it? How much of that have you attained?

* Do you ever have regrets or doubts about having become involved with your partner?
* How much faith do you have that your relationship will last in the long term? Do you ever worry about it ending? If it did, who do you think would be most likely to initiate a break up?
* Do you ever consider separating? When? Why?

* In general, how important is this relationship to you?

Other

* Are there any other aspects of your relationship that seem important to you that we haven’t talked about?
* How did you feel about talking about this material?
ADULT INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP RATING SCALE

SUBJECT # __________________________ INTERVIEWER ____________
SEX ____________________________
AGE ____________________________ CODER ____________

Response when upset: ____________________________________________

Things that are upsetting: __________________________________________

Crying pattern: Frequency (1-9) ________ Situation (1-9) ________

Use of others as a secure base (1-9) ________

FRIENDSHIPS

Number of close friends: __________

Kinds of friends (Close vs. Acquaintances; Male vs. Female): ____________________________

Meaning of Close Friend:
__________________________________________

ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Number serious relationships __________

Length longest relationship __________

Relationship patterns: ________________________________
__________________________________________________
__________________________________________________

Length current relationship __________

Length current marriage __________

Children: Sex Age Living where?

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

Others living in the household: ________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT #</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Current relationship:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reciprocity (1-9)</th>
<th>Intimacy (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealization (1-9)</td>
<td>Dominance (1-9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional expressivity (1-7)</th>
<th>SELF</th>
<th>PARTNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to rely on partner (1-7)</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>PARTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiving of partner (1-7)</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>PARTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disclosure (1-7)</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>PARTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy (1-9)</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>PARTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse (1-9)</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>PARTNER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abusive Behaviour? (specify)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self:</th>
<th>Partner:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conflict Resolution Patterns:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insistence on not remembering</td>
<td>SELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate laughter</td>
<td>SELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know’s</td>
<td>SELF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warmth (1-9)</th>
<th>Separation anxiety (1-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem (1-9)</td>
<td>Trust (1-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration (1-9)</td>
<td>Coherence (1-9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT # _____________

STYLES (1-9)
Secure ________
Fearful ________
Preoccupied ________
Dismissing ________
SUBJECT # 

RELATIONSHIP: (Describe) 

 Positives

 Negatives

PARTNER: (Describe) 

 Positives

 Negatives

MAJOR PROBLEMS OR ISSUES TO BE WORKED OUT:

 DESIRED CHANGES:

 PATTERNS:

 CULTURAL INFLUENCES:

INTERPERSONAL STYLE:
MARITAL ATTACHMENT GROUP PROTOTYPES

**Secure**
- general tone: confident, expressive, realistic, thoughtful
- themes: valuing of relationship; intimacy and mutuality; feels secure in relationship; able to realistically evaluate strengths and weaknesses of partner and the marital relationship; sense of personal autonomy; comfortable with separations
- support: comfortable using partner as a source of support, and vice versa; also able to cope with upsets on own where appropriate
- self-disclosure: high, comfortable with, but not intrusive or excessive
- conflict: good conflict resolution, assertive, can express negative feelings in relationship, mutuality in outcomes
- affective tone: genuine warmth and caring towards partner, comfortable with expressions of affection
- outside marriage: maintains close relationships and interests outside marriage; not threatened by partner's other relationships/interests

**Fearful**
- general tone: insecure, vulnerable
- themes: desires acceptance by partner, but extremely sensitive to any signs of rejection; doesn't feel valued by partner, feels unlovable, that not 'good enough'; high dependence on relationship, submission to partner's wishes to avoid conflict; difficulty opening up and trusting partner; extremely concerned about pleasing partner; fears of relationship ending
- support: hesitancy to rely on partner as a source of support; fear of alienating or imposing on partner by exposing vulnerabilities
- disclosure: low self-disclosure, but comfortable with partner's disclosure
- conflict: extremely conflict avoidant; overly sensitive to anger of partner; unable to express anger; plays submissive role in conflict situations
- affective tone: insecure in relationship
- outside marriage: priority of relationship over friends and outside interests
Preoccupied

- general tone: highly expressive, high elaboration, histrionic quality
- themes: preoccupation with marital relationship; high dependence on partner; desire for an extreme level of intimacy at all times, to "merge" with partner; sense that others can never give enough, of an insatiable need for attention and approval; fear of being alone or losing partner, feeling that not valued sufficiently; tendency to choose partners that require "saving" or looking after; romantic idealization of partner and the relationship; high separation anxiety
- support: excessive dependence on partner for support; unable to deal with even the smallest upset on own; desire to take care of partner whenever possible
- self-disclosure: very high levels, can be indiscriminate and intrusive
- conflict: highly conflict engaging; emotional extremes in conflict situations; highly demanding, but in the final analysis likely to submit to partner's wishes to avoid rejection
- affective tone: extremes of positive and negative affect; high levels of anger, jealousy, and possessiveness, but also very affectionate and positively expressive
- outside marriage: relationship takes priority over friendships and outside interests; jealous of partner's outside friends and interests

Dismissing

- general tone: cool, matter-of-fact, defensive, rational, poor elaboration, confident
- themes: prides self on self-sufficiency, valuing of independence; down plays importance of relationship; maintenance of emotional distance from partner, uncomfortable with too much intimacy, tendency to feel trapped in relationship; non-introspective, superficial evaluation of partner and relationship; feeling that partner is overly dependent, overly demanding; feels less involved than partner in relationship; prefers considerable time apart from partner
- support: prefers to deal with "problems" on own; unlikely to go to partner for support or admit any vulnerabilities to partner; uncomfortable with partner showing emotional vulnerability or asking for support
- self-disclosure: very low because "no need to"; uncomfortable with partner's disclosure
- conflict: passively conflict avoidant; maintains cool demeanor in conflict situations or withdraws from situation
- affective tone: cool, aloof, unexpressive, highly controlled, uncomfortable with expressions of affection
- outside marriage: focus on impersonal aspects of life, such as work or hobbies
### ADULT INTIMATE ATTACHMENT RATING SPECIFICATIONS

**CRYING PATTERN - Frequency:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost never (&lt;1/yr.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRYING PATTERN - Situation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only alone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USES OTHERS AS A SECURE BASE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECIPROCITY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self much more involved, very compromising, other in control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IDEALIZATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTIMACY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOMINANCE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self mostly involved, self more compromising, less in control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIVITY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Overly</td>
<td>Histrionic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-reserved</td>
<td>reserved</td>
<td>&amp; capable</td>
<td>emotional</td>
<td>of control</td>
<td>inhibited</td>
<td>inhibited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAPACITY TO RELY ON PARTNER:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excessively</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Readily</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Hesitant</td>
<td>Avoids</td>
<td>Can’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>relies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reliance</td>
<td>rely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAREGIVING OF PARTNER:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incapable</td>
<td>Avoids</td>
<td>Hesitant</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>Especially</td>
<td>Excessive</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caregiving</td>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>likes to</td>
<td>caregiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SELF-DISCLOSURE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Overly</td>
<td>Dumps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoids</td>
<td>inhibition</td>
<td>inhibition</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>disclosing</td>
<td>disclosing</td>
<td>discretion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JEALOUSY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot of</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jealousy</td>
<td>jealousy</td>
<td>jealousy</td>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHYSICAL ABUSE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot of</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abuse</td>
<td>abuse</td>
<td>abuse</td>
<td>abusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENUINE WARMTH:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cold,</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Especially</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEPARATION ANXIETY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SELF-ESTEEM:</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>TRUST:</em></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Trusting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trusting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>ELABORATION:</em> [Preoccupied - Lots; Dismissing - Little]</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>COHERENCE:</em></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly incoherent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highly coherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoherent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STYLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>SECURE:</em></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight evidence of this style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat consistent or noticeable theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>FEARFUL:</em></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight evidence of this style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat consistent or noticeable theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>PREOCCUPIED:</em></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight evidence of this style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat consistent or noticeable theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>DISMISSING:</em></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight evidence of this style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat consistent or noticeable theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good fit with some exceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near perfect fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Additional Tables

- Table G-1: Range, Median and Mean Scores on Attachment Styles and Interrater Reliabilities of Adult Early Attachment Interviews with Men who had Assaulted their Wives

- Table G-2: A Comparison of the Mean Score and Standard Deviation on Attachment Styles between Rater 1 and Rater 2 of the Adult Early Attachment Interviews with Men who had Assaulted their Wives

- Table G-3: Range, Median and Mean Scores on Attachment Styles and Interrater Reliabilities of Adult Intimate Attachment Interviews with Men who had Assaulted their Wives

- Table G-4: A Comparison of the Mean Score and Standard Deviation on Attachment Styles between Rater 3 and Rater 4 of the Adult Intimate Attachment Interviews with Men who had Assaulted their Wives
Table G-1

Range, Median and Mean Scores on Attachment Styles and Interrater Reliabilities of Adult Early Attachment Interviews with Men who had Assaulted their Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scales</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Interrater Reliabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>1.0-5.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>1.0-7.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>1.0-7.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>1.0-7.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=50

* Interrater reliabilities are coefficient alphas based on the Shrout and Fleiss (1979) guidelines.
Table G-2

A Comparison of the Mean Score and Standard Deviation on Attachment Styles between Rater 1 and Rater 2 of the Adult Early Attachment Interviews with Men who had Assaulted their Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>2.865</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>1.777</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>3.096</td>
<td>2.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>2.091</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>3.135</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>3.115</td>
<td>2.406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=50; Rater #1 was also the interviewer. * Probabilities were based on t-tests.
Table G-3

Range, Median and Mean Scores on Attachment Styles and Interrater Reliabilities of Adult Intimate Attachment Interviews with Men who had Assaulted their Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scales</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Interrater Reliabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>1.5-5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>1.0-6.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>1.0-7.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>1.0-7.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=50

* Interrater reliabilities are coefficient alphas based on the Shrout and Fleiss (1979) guidelines.
Table G-4

A Comparison of the Mean Score and Standard Deviation on Attachment Styles between Rater 3 and Rater 4 of the Adult Intimate Attachment Interviews with Men who had Assaulted their Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>2.712</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>2.981</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>2.808</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>2.865</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>4.096</td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>3.846</td>
<td>1.893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>3.096</td>
<td>1.612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=50
* Probabilities are based on t-tests.