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ATTACHMENT THEORY

-Bowlby (late 60’s through 80’s)

-Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (late 70’s)

-Bartholomow and Horowitz (early 90’s)
JOHN BOWLBY

- expresses the relationship between the amount of time and care a guardian supplies to a child and the self-image that child forms

- a lack of confidence may develop if a caregiver is inattentive and rejects the child and that absence may stay with the child throughout development causing negative effects

- attachment styles in childhood can serve as predictors for how a relationship may work later in life
Focus shifts to Adult Attachment

Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall

1978
Secure adults usually don’t worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close to them.

Avoidant adults are sometimes uncomfortable being close to others and find it hard to trust or depend on others.

Anxious / ambivalent adults feel that their partner won’t stay with them or doesn’t really love them so they try to completely fuse with another which may scare partners away.
secure attachment - positive sense of self-worth plus an expectation that others are trustworthy, reliable, and available

dismissing attachment - positive working model of self, but a highly negative model of others (protects self by avoiding intimacy)

preoccupied attachment - model of the self as unlovable or unworthy, but a positive model of others (show high dependency needs)

fearful attachment - sense of self-unworthiness and a view that others are rejecting, untrustworthy, or unavailable (avoids intimate relationships)
Bartholomew’s Model
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DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

- What is it?

- Why should we care?
  - our money:
    --costs the nation from $5 to $10 billion annually in medical expenses, police and court costs, shelters and foster care, sick leave, absenteeism, and non-productivity

  - hot topics to research:
    --same sex issues; affect on children (witnesses/abuse); policies/laws; teens in violent relationships; male victims; violence in the workplace; minority differences
STALKING

- How does it relate?
  - it is a continuation of intimate partner violence
  - cycle of violence

- Tjaden and Thoennes (1998)
  - first national study on stalking (16,000)
  - more females are stalked - 8.2 million/2 million
  - more males are stalkers
  - most victims are between 18-29 years old
  - occurs during and after a relationship
ATTACHMENT AND STALKING

Other studies:

-Kraaïj, Garnefski, Jan de Wilde, Dijkstra, Gebbhardt, Maes, and ter Doest (2003) -negative life events

-Mikulineer and Florian (1998) -stressful situations

-Roberts and Noller (1998) -communication
The Current Study

- Examines attachment style, relationship conflict tactics and stalking behaviors in a sample of undergraduates
- Main hypothesis:
  - Students with anxious attachment styles will have more trouble with partner violence and stalking behaviors after a break-up
The Sample

- 486 survey sets were distributed to introductory courses in criminal justice, psychology and sociology
- 256 anonymously completed surveys were returned
- This yielded a return rate of 53% without further follow-up
The Instruments

- Attachment style was assessed using the Multi-item Measure of Adult Romantic Attachment (MMARA)
- 36-item self-report, scored on 7-point Likert scale
  - Disagree strongly to Agree Strongly
The Instruments

- Conflict style was assessed using the Conflict Tactics Scale, 2\textsuperscript{nd} version (CTS-2)
  - Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman (1996)
- 39-item, self-report of conflict style
- 39-item report of partner’s conflict style
The Instruments

- Stalking behavior were assessed with the Stalking Behavior Checklist (SBC)
- A 29-item, self-report measure of stalking behaviors
- Two factors:
  - Harassing Behaviors
  - Violent Behaviors
The Research Design

- An *Ex Post Facto Control Group* design was used by assigning those subjects who indicated that they had never experienced repeated, unwanted attention following a breakup and who had never given repeated, unwanted attention following a breakup to the control/comparison group condition.
Experimental Groups

- Subjects who indicated that they were the recipient of repeated, unwanted attention following a breakup were assigned to the “Stalked” group.
- Subjects who indicated that they had given repeated, unwanted attention following a breakup were assigned to the “Stalker” group.
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Stalked</td>
<td>Stalker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55(43)</td>
<td>21(37)</td>
<td>21(34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73(57)</td>
<td>36(63)</td>
<td>41(66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent in parentheses; Chi Sq N.S.
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Stalked</td>
<td>Stalker</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>110(87)</td>
<td>53(93)</td>
<td>55(89)</td>
<td>218(89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td></td>
<td>16(13)</td>
<td>4(7)</td>
<td>7(11)</td>
<td>27(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages in parentheses
## Results

### Mean Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Stalked</th>
<th>Stalker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>19.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Break-up</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results: MMARA (Attachment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>$F(2,223)=0.075$</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety*</td>
<td>$F(2,231)=3.98$</td>
<td>$p&lt;0.05$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure*</td>
<td>$F(2,223)=3.06$</td>
<td>$p&lt;0.05$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>$F(2,223)=2.49$</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied*</td>
<td>$F(2,223)=3.46$</td>
<td>$p&lt;0.05$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissive</td>
<td>$F(2,223)=1.61$</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bartholomew’s Model
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## Results: CTS-2 Own Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>( F(2, 246) = 1.43 )</th>
<th>( p &lt; .001 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Aggression*</td>
<td>( F(2, 247) = 7.76 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assault*</td>
<td>( F(2, 247) = 3.58 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coercion</td>
<td>( F(2, 247) = 1.54 )</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>( F(2, 247) = 1.02 )</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results: CTS-2 Partner’s Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>$F(\text{df})$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>$0.26$</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Aggression*</td>
<td>$6.45$</td>
<td>$&lt;.01$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assault*</td>
<td>$4.59$</td>
<td>$&lt;.01$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coercion</td>
<td>$2.9$</td>
<td>NS(p=.057)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>$0.49$</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Analysis

- Examine relationship between Attachment Style and conflict tactics generally
- For stalked/stalker group examine by attachment style and types of stalking behavior (harassing or violent)
Q&A