

1999

Attachment Styles and Childhood Trauma in Batterer Subtypes

Eric S. Davidson

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Clinical Psychology](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Davidson, Eric S., "Attachment Styles and Childhood Trauma in Batterer Subtypes" (1999). *Masters Theses*. 1514.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/1514>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of request from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow these to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university or the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

12/6/88
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University **NOT** allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

Author's Signature

Date

Attachment Styles and Childhood Trauma

in Batterer Subtypes

BY

Eric S. Davidson

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts in Clinical Psychology

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1999
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

10/29/99
Date

10/29/99
Date

Running head: ATTACHMENT STYLES AND CHILDHOOD TRAUMA

Attachment Styles and Childhood Trauma
in Batterer Subtypes

Eric S. Davidson
Eastern Illinois University

Abstract

Eighty-three men seeking treatment for domestic violence and 28 non-violent control subjects completed self-report questionnaires on conflict resolution, attachment styles, and childhood trauma. Those seeking treatment were divided into three batterer subtypes in order to determine if there were differences between the three groups and the control group in attachment styles, and childhood trauma (overall trauma, sexual assault, punishment, and neglect). There were no significant relationships found between batterer subtype or subject status (batterer vs. non-batterer) concerning attachment style. Significant results were found concerning trauma and batterer status, as well as some significant differences between batterer subtype and trauma. Limitations of this study are discussed.

Acknowledgments

I would like to first thank Jill, my wife, for her support, encouragement, and sacrifices made during the time I have been working on this thesis and my degree. I would also like to extend my thanks to my parents, Don & Peg, who provided me with the encouragement I needed to return from the "working world" to the college setting.

I would like to thank my thesis committee, the Clinical Psychology faculty, and the forensics staff at Coles County Mental Health Center for their participation and input with my thesis. Special thanks go to Dr. Genie Lenihan for chairing my work, Dr. Ronan Bernas for providing assistance and mentoring with statistical analysis, and Dr. Howard Levine for presenting me with my thesis topic. I would also like to give thanks to Barb Estes, LCPC, who mentored me during my internship experience and introduced me to the world of domestic violence batterer treatment.

Lastly, I would like to thank the following agencies and organizations for their assistance in providing subjects:

Coles County Mental Health Center, Mattoon, Illinois

DOVE Inc., AIM, Decatur, Illinois

Stop Woman Abuse Now (SWAN), Olney, Illinois

Wesley Foundation of EIU

Coles County Barbershop Singers

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgments.....	3
Introduction.....	5
Method.....	27
Results.....	34
Discussion.....	37
References.....	59
Appendices.....	67

Introduction

The issue of domestic violence against female partners has gained increasing awareness in recent years. According to the National Crime Victimization Survey, approximately 27% of all violence against women was committed by intimates. This proportion roughly reflects an annual average of over 500,000 acts of non-fatal violence (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994).

Based on attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969), several researchers have examined the role of attachment style as a contributing factor for men involved in domestic violence toward their intimates. As with most research on domestic violence, these studies characterize batterers as one homogenous group, failing to differentiate any traits or qualities that may separate them into subtypes.

It is the purpose of this study to examine the effects of attachment styles and childhood traumatic events on three subtypes of male batterers in an additional effort to understand the factors which contribute to male violence toward their female partners. Such study could aid in the design of effective treatment modalities.

Batterers and Attachment Types

In past decades much attention has been given to attachment and interaction between infants and their primary caregiver. Bowlby defined attachment as “a bond developed with a preferred individual who is conceived as stronger and/or wiser” (1977). Determined by the relationship between the infant and caregiver, and the sense of security

experienced by the infant, different means of coping with relationships and abandonment are developed.

In their work on infant behavior toward their mother during phases of separation and reunion during "the strange situation," Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978), identified three styles of infant attachment behaviors: secure, avoidant, and anxious-ambivalent.

Inspired by Bowlby's contention that "attachment behavior [characterizes] human beings from the cradle to the grave" (1977, p.203), Hazan and Shaver (1987) argue that the three styles of infant attachment identified by Ainsworth et al. (1978) continue to be manifested in adult love relationships. Similar to the findings of the Ainsworth group with infants, they suggest that adult individuals with secure attachment styles view their most important romantic relationship as happy, friendly, and trusting, and are accepting and supporting of their partner despite their partner's limitations and faults. Avoidant adults fear intimacy, have difficulty trusting and depending on others, possess both emotional highs and lows, and are extremely jealous. Anxious/ambivalent adults experience love in an obsessional manner, want to be more intimate, desire complete merging and union, demonstrate emotional highs and lows, and are easily attracted sexually to others, in addition to having high amounts of jealousy.

Adding to the work of researchers before her, Bartholomew (1991) developed a model of attachment styles that considered four prototypes derived by combining two levels of self-image (low or high dependence)

with two levels of image of others (low or high avoidance).

Bartholomew's four prototypes are: secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissing. Conceptually corresponding to the work of Hazan and Shaver (1987), secure individuals are comfortable with intimacy and autonomy, have a high sense of worth with low dependence on others, and expect others to be accepting and responsive. Corresponding to Hazan and Shaver's ambivalent group (1987) are Bartholomew's preoccupied individuals. These individuals are preoccupied with relationships, have a low sense of self-worth with high dependence on others, and view others in a positive light expecting them to be accepting and responsive. Individuals with a fearful style correspond to Hazan & Shaver's avoidant group (Hazan & Shaver, 1987), thus often being labelled as fearful-avoidant. These individuals are fearful of intimacy, socially avoidant, have a low sense of self worth with a high dependence on others, coupled with an expectation that others will be rejecting and untrustworthy. Dismissing individuals dismiss intimacy, are counter dependent, have low dependence on others, and view others as unreliable and rejecting.

If such attachment style prototypes exist, then it is plausible that they have an impact on the quality of adult relationships that involve intimacy. A number of studies have been published that have investigated such an impact. In a study involving 205 males and 415 females who responded to a newspaper questionnaire on love-experience, Hazan and Shaver (1987) found that individuals with a secure attachment tended to have longer relationships compared to

anxious/ambivalent and avoidant subjects. Furthermore only 6% of this secure group had been divorced in comparison with 10% of the anxious/ambivalent group, and 12% of the avoidant group. Individuals with a secure attachment style were found to report greater happiness, more trust, a better friendship with their mate, and less fear of closeness.

Collins and Read (1990) used Hazan and Shaver's three types of attachment while studying 80 female and 38 male undergraduates at the University of Southern California who participated for extra credit. They found that subjects with a more anxious attachment style possessed negative beliefs about themselves and others, were more likely to be obsessive and dependent, had a lower sense of self worth and social confidence, and lacked a greater sense of control. Males who were comfortable with closeness viewed their relationship more positively, and felt closer to their partner leading to improved communications and feelings of greater trust and dependability.

While conducting a study involving 37 males and 37 females who were randomly selected from a introductory psychology course, Feeny and Noller (1990) found that the 24 avoidant subjects were most likely to try to maintain distance, while the 24 anxious/ambivalent subjects appeared to reflect a demanding relational style characterized by over involvement. The 26 secure subjects who reported higher marital relationship satisfaction, tended to emphasize the importance of openness and closeness while seeking to retain individual identity.

In studying 40 couples recruited through newspaper and radio advertising, Koback and Hazan (1991) found that husbands were less secure when their wives displayed more rejection and less support during problem solving, while wives reported greater security when they believed their husbands were effectively listening in a confiding task. Senchack and Leonard (1992) found that in 322 couples participating in a longitudinal study of alcohol use and marital functioning, husbands and wives in secure couple types reported significantly less frequent withdrawal and verbal aggression by partners than secure male-insecure female, or both insecure type couples. In studying attachment styles and conflict resolution in 147 college students, Pistole (1989) found that the securely attached reported higher relationship satisfaction while being more likely to use a mutually focused conflict strategy while individuals who were anxious/ambivalently attached were more likely than avoidantly attached subjects to oblige their partner's wishes.

Using the four-group model of attachment, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) studied 40 female and 37 male students from an introductory psychology class and found that attachment style is associated with a distinct pattern of interpersonal problems. Fearful subjects reported interpersonal problems from being overly passive; dismissing subjects reported interpersonal problems related to a lack of warmth in interpersonal interactions, and the preoccupied subjects reported interpersonal problems due to attempts to achieve a positive self-regard through overly dominating others.

A few researchers have examined the role of attachment as a possible factor contributing to violence against intimates. In a study involving 15 male, self-reported rapists and 15 male control subjects attending a large Southwestern university, Lisak & Ivan (1995) found that the sexually aggressive men manifested a lower need for intimacy and possessed a lower capacity for empathy. In studying intimacy and loneliness involving a group of 47 sex offenders, 18 exhibitionists, 15 wife beaters, 15 community controls, and 15 university student controls, Seidman, Marshall, Hudson, & Robertson (1994) discovered that the lack of intimacy was a better predictor of violence than loneliness in the sex offenders. Regarding men who committed acts of violence against their partners, Murphy, Meyer, & O'Leary (1994) discovered that 24 partner-assaultive men scored higher in general spouse specific dependency, possessed lower self-esteem and social-confidence, and emotionally relied more heavily on significant others than did the 48 non-violent men who were in both happy and discordant relationships. Furthermore, these assaultive men had marked fear of being abandoned by their partners. In studying maritally violent husbands receiving treatment, maritally violent husbands not in treatment, and non-maritally violent husbands, Barnett, Martinez, and Bluestein (1995) discovered that 90 maritally violent wife beaters were significantly more jealous in comparison to 44 satisfactorily married husbands and 46 non-maritally violent, yet unsatisfactorily married husbands.

In a sample consisting of 91 men recruited from a treatment group program in a large Midwestern city, or through newspaper advertisements soliciting involvement in a study focusing on family roles and men's health, Kesner, Julian, and McKenry (1997) found that a cluster of attachment-related variables involving a perceived deficiency in love and caring from their mother while growing up, low self-esteem, perception of less relationship support perception of low relationship autonomy, and the number of recent life stressors was significantly related to male violence in interpersonal relationships. Kesner and his colleagues report that the perceived support from the female intimate was the predictor of male violence.

In comparing the attachment styles, dependency, and jealousy of 45 violent and maritally distressed husbands recruited from marital violence treatment programs and the community with that of 24 nonviolent-distressed and 24 nonviolent - nondistressed husbands recruited from the general community, Holtzworth-Munroe, Stuart, & Hutchinson (1997) discovered that violent husbands with preoccupied and anxious attachment styles possessed less trust in their wives. These violent men also reported being less secure and more fearful than nonviolent-nondistressed men. Violent men, while fearing closeness, were also found to be more ambivalent and anxious regarding their desire for such intimacy. In addition to being more jealous and less trusting than nonviolent men, violent husbands were more likely to be classified

as having a preoccupied, ambivalent-anxious, and disorganized attachment strategies.

In a sample of 62 males participating in a psychoeducational group as a sanction of their conviction of violence against a family member, Pistole and Tarrant (1993) used Bartholomew & Horowitz's Relationship Questionnaire to assess attachment style. Pistole and Tarrant's study revealed that 22 (35%) of the batterers were secure, 14 (23%) were dismissing, 11 (17%) were preoccupied, and 15 (25%) were fearful. These findings do not deviate from the distribution of attachment styles found in Bartholomew and Horowitz's college sample. These results suggest that violence can occur regardless of an individual's attachment style.

Using 120 court-referred and a demographically matched control group of 40 men recruited from a union, Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, and Bartholomew (1994), using Griffin & Bartholomew's Relationship Styles Questionnaire (1994) and Bartholomew & Horowitz's Relationship Questionnaire (1991), found that the scores on fearful and preoccupied batterers were significantly higher than the control group of males belonging to local unions. Furthermore, fearful attachment, and to a lesser degree, preoccupied attachment were strongly related with a constellation of measures such as borderline personality organization, anger, current trauma, and jealousy that were associated with physical and emotional abusiveness in intimate relationships and emotional abusiveness.

Batterer Subtypes

While most research conducted on partner abusive men has examined them as a homogenous group, clinicians and researchers have discovered that some attitudes and behavior patterns are consistent with these men. As a result, some researchers (Gondolf, 1988; Hamberger and Hastings, 1986; Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994; Dutton, 1995; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, and Tolin, 1996) have attempted to taxonomize partner-abusive men into groups based upon significant characteristics.

In his work, Gondolf (1988) classified batterers into three groups: typical batterers, antisocial batterers, and sociopathic batterers. Typical batterers, consisting of 52% of the sample researched, were found to generally be violent only within their families, did not abuse substances, did not have any arrests, and were unlikely to have any form of mental illness. Antisocial batterers, consisting of 41% of the sample, were found to be extremely emotionally volatile and abusive, were often violent outside of the home, and had some form of mental health and/or substance abuse issue. Sociopathic batterers, consisting of 7% of the sample, were typically the most violent men, were chemically dependent, possessed no feeling of remorse or regret for their actions, and were the most likely to have been arrested.

While factor analyzing the basic eight personality scores of the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory on two samples of domestically violent men, Hamberger and Hastings (1986) characterized batterers as falling into three groups based upon the batterers' personality disorder.

Batterers fell into groups of men having either borderline personality disorder, antisocial personality disorder, or a form of compulsive personality disorder.

Dutton (1995) has divided batterers into three types also. Dutton refers to the first group, comprised of 40% of the men in Dutton's treatment program, as psychopathic wife assaulters. These individuals meet the DSM-IV criteria for antisocial behavior, and like Gondolf's sociopaths (1988) have little, if any regret, guilt, or remorse for their actions. Dutton refers to approximately 30% of the men in his program as overcontrolled assaultive men. These men typically have an overwhelming desire for control, often set high expectations of themselves and others, are perfectionistic and domineering, and use emotional abuse in addition to physical violence. The last group, which is comprised of approximately 30% of the men in Dutton's program, is referred to as cyclical/emotionally volatile wife abusers. These men fear intimacy, often believe that their partner is planning to abandon them, are overly dependent, and often best fit Walker's (1979) phases of abuse.

Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart (1994) have proposed three major subtypes of batterers after conducting an extensive literature review. They have labeled these subtypes as family only, dysphoric/borderline, and generally violent/antisocial. Family only batterers are characterized as generally restricting their violence to family members, are the least likely of batterers to engage in violence outside of the home, and usually evidence little, if any, psychopathology or personality disorders.

Dysphoric/borderline batterers typically engage in moderate to severe physical, psychosocial, and sexual abuse of their partner, mostly confine their violence to the home, are dysphoric, psychologically distressed, and emotionally volatile. Often these men have issues with substance abuse, and may evidence borderline and schizoid personality characteristics.

Generally violent/antisocial batterers also engage in moderate to severe physical, psychological, and sexual abuse of their partner, but also engage in the most cases of extrafamilial aggression, have extensive histories of related criminal behavior and extensive interaction with the legal system, are likely to have substance abuse problems, and in many cases have psychopathology or antisocial personality disorder.

Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart's conceptual model (1994) received empirical validation when Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin (1996) studied 833 abusive men, and determined personality types using a cluster analysis of data from the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory. The researchers found a three-cluster solution consistent with the three batterer sub-type model proposed by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart.

Batterers and Childhood Trauma History

The long-term effects of experiencing or witnessing traumatic events, such as physical or sexual abuse, as a child have received notable attention by researchers. Several researchers have examined the relationship of these childhood experiences with violent behaviors of these individuals during their adult lives. Finkelhor, Hotaling, and Yllo

(1988) suggest that those who are abused use violence as a primary coping mechanism as a result of their perceptions of stigmatization and powerlessness, and inability to develop trust in others.

In studying 227 female undergraduate students, Briere and Runtz (1990) found that childhood physical and psychological abuse tend to occur together, often leading to deficits in self-esteem, dysfunctional sexual behavior, and anger/aggression as an adult. The researchers also discovered a significant inverse relationship between sexual abuse and dysfunctional sexual behavior and between physical abuse and later anger/aggression, suggesting that after controlling for psychological abuse, history of either physical or sexual abuse usually implied absence of the other.

When conducting research with 112 male felons convicted for sexual offenses four years after their release from Oregon penal institutions, childhood abuse was more prevalent in the criminal population than in the 376 noninstitutionalized controls sampled by area probability methods (Sack & Mason, 1980). In a retrospective chart review of 411 patients hospitalized on the Alcohol Treatment Unit at the Ann Arbor Veteran's Administration between January 1978 and June 1981, Kroll, Stock, and James (1985) found that when matching for age, education, marital status, employment, occupational level, and drinking patterns, adult male alcoholics, abused as children, demonstrated more violence related legal difficulties and resistance toward authority figures than did nonabused control subjects. In a case review of six homicidal,

depressed patients matched with six nonhomicidal, depressed controls along with an analysis of 81 case summaries, Rosenbaum and Bennett (1986) found that higher rates of childhood physical abuse were reported by homicidal, depressed outpatients than a sample of nonhomicidal, but depressed outpatients matched on marital status, sex, and age.

In an examination of 188 male and female psychiatric patient records, Carmen, Rieker, and Mills (1984) found that abused males were more likely than abused females to have abused others. Sixty percent of the 67 abused males had been violent toward others, while 17% of the 121 abused females had been violent. While females typically were passive, males, it seemed, had become more aggressive as a result of being themselves abused. One-third of the abused males coped with anger by directing it toward others, while two-thirds of the abused females directed their anger inward.

Childhood trauma of domestic batterers has also been examined as a means of assessing the factors associated with violence. Laner and Thompson (1982), found that abused subjects inflicted higher rates of violence toward their partners than did non-abused subjects. Similar to Laner and Thompson, Bernard and Bernard (1983) found that in studying 461 students enrolled in an introductory psychology class, 19 out of 26 (73%) of abusive males had experienced or observed abuse in their family of origin. Seventy-four percent (14) of the 19 used the same form of abuse against their partners. Of the 142 nonabusive subjects, only 32% (46) had experienced or observed abuse in their family of origin.

In examining both dating and marital violence in students recruited from an introductory psychology course, Marshall and Rose (1988) also discovered that childhood abuse among 159 males significantly predicted violence toward intimates, whereas childhood abuse among 171 women predicted them as being victimized. Riggs, O'Leary, and Breslin (1990) found that in 283 female and 125 male students enrolled in an introductory psychology course, physical abuse, as well as parental marital violence and life events, significantly correlated with dating violence in male college students.

In efforts to measure domestic violence on a national scale, the National Family Violence Survey (Straus, 1990; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980) was conducted in 1980, and again in 1990. In 1980, 2,134 couples were surveyed; in 1990, 8,145 families participated. Findings indicate that males and females who were the recipients of physical punishment as children were found to have higher rates of both ordinary and severe violence within their marital relationships. Both men and women who witnessed their parents physically abusing each other were three times more likely to physically abuse their partners than those who had not witnessed such violence. Subjects responding that they had not only witnessed parental violence, but also had been themselves abused had a 33% chance of encountering marital violence during the year of the study.

Kalmuss (1984) also explored the relationship between directly experiencing and witnessing childhood family aggression with marital

violence as adults using the same nationally representative sample of 2,143 couples used by Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz. According to her findings, observing the odds of parental hitting doubled the odds of males being violent toward their spouses. In adults from families in which violence was not witnessed or experienced, the probability of a husband being aggressive toward his partner was 1%. In families where only violence was directly experienced as a child, the probability of a adult male being aggressive with his wife was 3%. When only parental hitting was witnessed, the probability of the male being violent with his wife was doubled to 6%. In families where both violence was witnessed and experienced, the probability for severe husband-to-wife aggression was 12%.

In reviewing 52 empirical studies of marital violence, Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) discovered that witnessing marital violence as a child was associated with husband-to-wife violence in 88% of the studies, while being a childhood victim of violence was associated with husband-to-wife violence in 69% of the studies.

Rosenbaum and O'Leary (1981) found that almost 82% of 20 husbands in maritally dysfunctional, nonviolent couples had experienced more physical abuse than 20 husbands in satisfactory marriages. Furthermore, the maritally dysfunctional, but nonviolent husbands were more prone to come from families in which marital violence occurred than the husbands in satisfactory marriages.

In conducting research with 604 adult men incarcerated at seven federal institutions within the Correctional Service of Canada, Dutton and Hart (1992) indicated that those who suffered or witnessed physical or sexual abuse as a child were approximately three times more likely to commit acts of violence than those who did not experience or witness abuse. A history of childhood physical abuse not only increased the chance for all types of violence, but greatly increased the chances of being violent toward family members. Being physically abused as a child increased the odds five times for physical abuse within the family and two times for outside of the family. Being the victim of sexual abuse as a child increased the odds for committing sexual abuse within the family by eight, and outside of the family by five. Findings concerning men who had experienced other forms of abuse, which include witnessing marital violence, support Kalmuss's study (1984), in that 69% of these men committed physical violence compared to 25% of the men who committed sexual violence.

Previous research has found that generally violent batterers are more likely than other batterer subtypes to have experienced child abuse and other trauma. Fagan, Stewart, & Hansen (1983) found that when compared, generally violent batterers were more likely to have been abused than the family-only batterers. Saunders (1992) research paralleled that of Fagan et al., in finding that generally violent batterers were often more severely physically abused than other batterer subtypes. Cadsky and Crawford (1988) found that wife assaulters, whose

characteristics match that of the family-only batterers, were more likely to report less violence from parents. Mixed assaulters, whose characteristics match those of the generally violent/antisocial were more likely to report greater violence that resulted in need for medical attention.

Measurement of Battering, Attachment, and Childhood Trauma

When measuring individual responses to conflict situations within the family, there are very few instruments that focus on the batterer's perspective. Many of those instruments available measure the degree and severity of physical abuse from the viewpoint of those victimized. Self-administered instruments which measure battering from the domestic violence perpetrator's perspective include: the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), the Violent Behavior Inventory (Gondolf, 1985), and the CRA Abuse Index (Shupe & Shupe, 1983).

The most widely used measurement tool measuring severity and degree of battering by partner-abusive men is the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) developed by Murray A. Straus (1979). The CTS is a 19 item, 7-point Likert scale questionnaire usually administered by itself or as part of an assessment interview. Respondents are asked to indicate the types and frequency of 19 versions of conflict related behaviors over the past year. The 19 items are broken into three subscales of conflict strategies: reasoning, verbal/symbolic aggression, and physical violence.

Similar to the CTS is the Violent Behavior Inventory (VBI), used by the Domestic Abuse Project in Minneapolis (Gondolf, E.W., 1985). As in

the CTS, descriptions of conflict related behaviors are provided. Unlike the CTS, respondents are asked about 27 different behaviors on a 4-point Likert scale that quantifies the behavior as never, once or twice, sometimes, or a lot. Additionally, respondents are asked to provide this information for the previous six months, and for the time prior to six months before completing the measure.

The CRA Abuse Index, adapted from Stacey and Shupe (1983) is a 26 item index that is similar to both the CTS and the VBI in that it too uses a Likert scale in measuring abusiveness in relationships. Unlike the CTS and the VBI, this questionnaire does not place a time restriction on the conflict related behaviors used. Also, when scored, the sum of the responses allows the individual to be placed in one of four categories: dangerously abusive, seriously abusive, moderately abusive, and nonabusive.

Several measures have been created that measure adult romantic attachment, but two stand out as most commonly used by researchers, with a third more recently developed.

Hazan and Shaver (1987) developed the original self-report measure evaluating adult romantic attachment. This measure attempted to identify the attachment styles proposed by Ainsworth et al. (1978) focusing on romantic attachment of adults, rather than mother-infant interaction. The tool consists of a single-item measure that classifies individuals into secure, anxious/ambivalent, and avoidant attachment styles. Individuals taking the measure choose the one paragraph, out of

the three, that best describes their comfort with intimacy and attachment in relationships. Hazan and Shaver report that the measure is valid and the proportions of individuals within each attachment style correspond with proportions reported in Ainsworth's infant-mother attachment studies. Pistole (1989) collected data on a sample demographically similar to that used by Hazan and Shaver and reported a contingency coefficient of .598 suggesting adequate consistency in terms of reliability.

Developed by Bartholomew and published by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991), the Relationships Questionnaire is an adaptation of Hazan and Shaver's attachment measure. The tool consists of a single-item measure that classifies individuals into secure, fearful, preoccupied, and dismissing attachment styles. Participants are asked to rate themselves with a 7-point Likert scale on the degree to which they resemble each of the attachment styles described in paragraph form. Participants' attachment styles are typically classified by the attachment style with the highest rating.

Recently developed by Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, (1998a), and currently in press, the Experience in Close Relationships Inventory (ECL) is a 36-item self-report measure created from a large sample factor analysis which included Hazan and Shaver's attachment measure, Bartholomew and Horowitz's Relationship Questionnaire, and other self-report adult attachment measures. The measure creates two sub-scales, avoidance and anxiety. When clustered into four groups based on

scores of avoidance and anxiety, the participants not only matched Bartholomew's four attachment style model, but provided evidence for a stronger relationship between clusters and the target variable than did Bartholomew's Relationship Questionnaire and target variables.

Shaver and Fraley (1998) strongly recommend that researchers studying romantic attachment styles who plan to use self-report measures include the older Hazan and Shaver measure, Bartholomew's Relationship Questionnaire, and the 36-item Experiences in Close Relationship (ECL) Questionnaire. Shaver and Fraley recommend the older, typological measures due to their brief and easy administration, in addition to the extensive amount of literature that have been based upon these measures. They also recommend the ECL because it conceptualizes data into dimensional terms, and it incorporates all recent self-report measures.

In measuring childhood trauma in adults, there are very few measures that account for multiple forms of abuse and neglect; most instruments available usually measure one specific form of abuse, with the majority focusing on sexual abuse. Briere and Runtz's (1989) Trauma Symptom Checklist - 33 (TSC-33), a revised and extended version of the Crisis Symptom Checklist (Briere & Runtz, 1987), is a brief instrument used to measure current symptoms of childhood abuse. Elliot and Briere (1992) revised and extended the TSC-33 to create the Trauma Symptom Checklist-40. A revised and expanded form of the TSC-40, the Trauma Symptom Inventory (Briere & Elliot, 1995), is a 100-

item measure that assesses a variety of symptoms related to traumatic events experienced as a child or adolescent.

Sanders and Becker-Laussen's Child Abuse and Trauma Scale (1995) measures a subject's perceptions of their home environment during their childhood or adolescent years. Consisting of 38 five-point likert scale questions that inquire about an individual's childhood or adolescent experiences of sexual abuse or assault, psychological mistreatment, physical mistreatment or punishment, emotional or physical neglect, parental violence, and parental substance abuse, four scores may be obtained: overall childhood maltreatment, sexual abuse, punishment, and negative home environment. On all four scales the higher the score a subject receives, the greater the negative perception that individual has of his childhood home environment.

Purpose of this Study

In this study it was proposed that domestic violence batterer subtypes each have a different attachment style, based on Bartholomew's four attachment style prototypes. It was hypothesized that members of a non-battering control group possess a secure attachment in their relationships, and that members of the family-only domestic violence subtype possess a preoccupied attachment style. As cited by Holtzworth and Munroe (p.488, 1994) previous research (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Faulk, 1974; Saunders, 1992; Shields, McCall, & Hanneke, 1988; Stith, Jester, & Bird, 1992) has shown that family-only batterers have more satisfactory marriages, have less conflict, and are more committed to

their partners, but may be over dependent on their partners (Hamberger & Hastings, 1986)

It was predicted that members of a dysphoric-borderline subtype possess a preoccupied attachment style. As cited by Holtzworth and Munroe (p. 488, 1994), "Researchers have generally hypothesized that these men are pathologically dependent on their wives (Caesar, 1986; Elbow 1977; Faulk, 1974) and experience high levels of jealousy, marital dissatisfaction, relationship strife, and ambivalence about relationships (Faulk, 1974; Hamberger & Hastings, 1985, 1986; Saunders, 1992; Stith et al., 1992)."

It was also predicted that members of the generally violent/anti-social battering group possess a fearful attachment style. As cited by Holtzworth and Munroe (p.488, 1994) , previous research (Caesar, 1986; Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Elbow 1977; Saunders, 1992; Shields et al., 1988; Stith et al., 1992) has viewed these men as having a large amount of marital problems, objectifying their partners, being self-centered, and feeling little empathy for their partners. These predictions are illustrated in Figure 1

It was also proposed that type and severity of childhood trauma is associated with domestic batterer subtypes. It was hypothesized that domestic violence batterers who are "Generally Violent/Anti-Social" score the highest on overall childhood trauma, neglect, sexual abuse, and punishment followed by borderline/dysphoric batterers, family only batterers, and lastly the control group.

Method

Participants

This study included 83 court-referred and self-referred males currently involved in group or individual therapy at local and regional mental health centers and social service agencies providing group treatment for male domestic violence offenders. These 83 subjects were divided into three batterer subtypes: family only, dysphoric/borderline, and generally violent/anti-social. Batterers in treatment have been assigned to one of three groups based on battering history, generality of violence, substance use, depression, personality disorder traits, and legal history. These subgroupings match Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart's (1994) model of batter subtypes.

A control group of non-violent men without a record of criminal violence represented 25.2% (28) of the overall sample. These men were recruited from various men's community and civic organizations in central Illinois. Those individuals recruited from the community, who reported no physical violence on the Conflict Tactics Scale were placed into the non-violent control group. Three men were deleted from the control sample due to moderate to severe levels of physical violence as indicated by their CTS physical violence subscale scores.

The sociodemographic characteristics of the overall sample, by batterer and control groupings, are presented in Table 1.

Thirteen subjects (11.7%) of the overall sample fell into the category of family only batterers. The average age of this group was 30

years, 11 months with a range of 22 to 43 years. Ten (77%) were Caucasian, six (46.1%) reported as being married, and all but one man attained a General Equivalency Degree (GED) or higher. The average income of this group was \$17,884 with a range of \$2,500 to \$57,500.

Thirty subjects (27%) of the overall sample fell into the category of dysphoric/borderline batterers. The average age of this group was 31 years, 1 month with a range of 19 to 47 years. Twenty-five (83.3%) were Caucasian, 15 (50%) reported as being married, and all but 7 men (23.33%) had earned a G.E.D. or higher. The average income for this group was \$17,833 with a range of \$2,500 to \$42,500.

Forty subjects (36%) were placed in the generally violent/antisocial batterer category. The average age of this group was 34 years, two months with a range of 18 to 69 years. Twenty-nine (72.5%) of the subjects reported themselves as being Caucasian, 15 (37.5%) were currently married, while 11 (27.5%) were divorced, and all men, except 8 (20%) had earned a G.E.D. or higher. The average income for this group was \$19,500 with a range of \$2,500 to \$57,500.(9)

The average age of the control group was 41 years, 2 months with a range of 19 to 85 years. One hundred percent (28) of this group were Caucasian. Fifteen (53.6%) were married, 17 (60.7%) had earned either an associates or vocational degree or higher, and all had graduated from high school. The average income for this group was \$34,375 with a range of \$2,500 to \$70,000 plus.

Participants were treated in accordance with the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (American Psychological Association, 1992), the ethical research protocol of the Department of Psychology at Eastern Illinois University, and the research policy of each participating agency.

Procedure

Eight agencies that had been approved to provide treatment to domestic violence offenders by the Illinois Attorney General's Office were contacted by phone to elicit subjects for the study. Out of these eight, five requested additional information. After receiving additional information, three agencies agreed to participate. Men receiving treatment for domestic violence battery issues were contacted and asked to participate in the study either through their counselors during their initial assessment, or by the researcher.

Those participating were provided with an informative description of the study outlining the study, benefits and risks, an informed consent form, a demographics form and three measures. Participants completed the measures during their initial assessment or one of their regular group therapy sessions. Upon completion of the forms, participants then received a more complete explanation of the study, a debriefing statement, and a recommendation of further services if needed.

Leaders of community and civic organizations were contacted via phone or mail and asked for permission to speak and invite their members to participate. Participants were provided with the same packet

of forms and questionnaires, asked to complete the measures before or after a meeting, and provided with a written debriefing statement and offer to provide results on request. Community members not participating through their organization were solicited and returned surveys by mail.

Measures

All materials used in this study can be found in the appendices. Participants were administered a demographics form and three questionnaires: The Conflict Tactics Scale (Appendix C) (Straus, 1979), the Experiences in Close Relationships (Appendix D) (Brennan et al., 1998), and the Child Abuse and Trauma Scale (Appendix E) (Sanders & Becker-Laussen, 1995).

The demographics form asked for each subject's age, ethnicity, current marital status, times previously married, educational level, and income.

The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) is a 19 item, 7-point likert scale questionnaire in which respondents are asked to indicate the methods by which they resolved conflict with their significant other. The 19 items of the CTS are broken into three subscales of conflict strategies: reasoning (3 items), verbal aggression (5 items), and physical violence (8 items). The reasoning subscale measures the use of intellectual approaches to conflict resolution (e.g., discussing a situation, reasoning, and argument). The verbal aggression subscale measures the use of verbal and nonverbal acts and communication which are intended to

emotionally hurt, threaten, or hurt one's partner. The physical force subscale measures how one uses physical force and violence as a means of solving conflict. Using a nationally representative sample of 2,134 couples, the coefficient of reliability for the reasoning subscale was .76, for the verbal aggression subscale, .88; and for the violence subscale, .88. When examining husband to wife violence, the alphas ranged from .50 to .83. The test also has good concurrent and construct validity (Straus, 1979). Only the physical violence subscale was used in this study.

The Experiences in Close Relationships (ECL) is a 36-item self-report measure which examines Bartholomew's four attachment prototypes. Using two 18 item subscales which measure avoidance and anxiety, Brennan et al. (1998) provide four mathematical formulas that use the avoidance and anxiety scores, placing these in four equations, each representing an attachment prototype. This allows the researcher to determine attachment style based on the respondent's highest score. Derivation of the scoring formulas is not provided.

The Child Abuse and Trauma Scale (CAT) (Sanders & Becker-Laussen, 1995), is a 38-item measure which uses a 5-point likert scale. In addition to an overall score, the CAT is divided into three subscales that measure sexual abuse (6 items, highest score possible is 24), punishment (6 items, highest score possible is therefore 24), and neglect/negative home atmosphere (14 items, highest score possible is therefore 56). The higher the score for the scales, the higher the trauma perceived as a child. Since each subscale contains different numbers of items, subscale

scores are not equivalent unless converted to t-scores. The sexual abuse subscale measures sexual mistreatment directly experienced by the subject, or mistreatment experienced through observation. The punishment subscale measures the level of punishment received within the home and how the subject felt the punishment was justified. The neglect subscale measures physical and emotional neglect, in addition to the safety the subject perceived in their home environment. The measure was normed on 560 female and 337 male college students enrolled in introductory psychology courses whose mean age was 18.2 (age range 17 to 23). The range of the CAT scores was 1.90 to 101.08 with a mean score of 27.74 for males. The means for the sexual abuse, punishment, and negative home environment/neglect subscales were respectively: 0.48, 7.20, and 11.90. Seventy-three subjects completed the CAT a second time. The range of the CAT scores was identical to the first administration. However, the mean scores for the sexual abuse, punishment, and negative home environment/neglect subscales were respectively: 0.66, 6.96 and 11.20. The internal consistency for the entire measure was reflected in a Cronbach's alpha of .90. The alpha for the sexual abuse subscale was .76. Alphas for the punishment and neglect subscales were .63 and .86 respectfully. For each of the three subscales, comparisons of gender were made. The only significant difference found was in the sexual abuse subscale, in which women had a mean of .10, twice that of men. The test-retest reliability for the 73 subjects of the entire measure was .89 ($p < .001$). For the subscales the $r =$

.85, .71, and .91 for sexual abuse, punishment, and neglect respectfully (Sanders & Becker-Laussen, 1995).

Statistical Analysis

To test the hypothesis that attachment styles are related to batterer subtypes, a 4 x 4 chi-square (X^2) test for independence was implemented. Because of too few individuals identified in a particular batterer subtype or attachment style, cells were collapsed in a way that placed all batterers into one group.

To test the hypothesis that within batterer subtypes the generally violent/antisocial batterer scores higher on the severity of overall childhood trauma, neglect, sexual abuse, and punishment followed by borderline/dyphoric batters, family only batterers, and lastly the control group, a one-way analysis of variance with independent means, between subjects, was used for each trauma score.

A one-way analysis of variance with independent means, between subjects, was also utilized to determine if any significant relationships exist between avoidance and batterer subtype, anxiety and batterer subtype, attachment style and trauma, attachment style and sexual abuse, attachment style and punishment, and attachment style and neglect.

Results

The hypothesis concerning the association between batterer subtype and attachment style was tested using a Chi-square analysis. Because more than 20% of the cells had expected frequency values < 5 , and one cell had a frequency value < 1 , the 4 X 4 cell arrangement was collapsed into a 2 X 4 by placing all batterers into one group. Results of the analysis are presented in Table 2. The prediction that men who batter would possess a different attachment style than non-batterers was not supported.

As a result of the negative findings regarding the relationship between attachment style and batterer subtype, a one-way ANOVA with independent means was utilized to compare the status of the subjects (control vs. batterer) and childhood trauma. Significant results were found in all associations: status and overall trauma ($F = 10.79$, $p < .05$) status and sexual abuse ($F = 4.02$, $p < .05$), status and punishment ($F = 8.27$, $p < .05$), and status and neglect ($F = 8.65$, $p < .05$). These results are presented in Table 3

As planned, the hypotheses regarding the association between batterer subtype and childhood trauma were tested using one-way ANOVAS with independent means. Results are shown in Table 4. Analysis of all comparisons revealed a significant difference between

batterer subtype and overall trauma, batterer subtype and sexual abuse, batterer subtype and punishment, and batterer subtype and neglect.

When comparing batterer subtype and overall trauma by a Tukey's post hoc procedure, the prediction that the generally violent/anti-social batterer would score significantly higher was supported when compared against the family-only batterers and control group. There was no significant difference between the generally violent/anti-social batterer and the dysphoric/borderline batterer. A significant difference between the dysphoric/borderline and the control group was supported; however there was no significant difference between the borderline/dysphoric batterers and the family only batterers.

When analyzing the relationship between batterer subtype and sexual abuse through the use of a Tukey's post hoc procedure, the prediction that the generally violent/anti-social batterers would score significantly higher was supported when they were compared to the other batterer subtypes and the control group. No other significant differences were observed in the comparison of the other batterer subtypes and control group.

When using a Tukey's post hoc procedure to compare batterer subtype and punishment, the prediction that the generally violent/anti-social batterers would score significantly higher than the other batterer subtypes and control group was only supported when they were compared with the family-only batterers and the control group. A significant

difference between the dysphoric/borderline batterers and control group was also observed. No other significant differences were found.

When comparing batterer subtype and neglect by means of a Tukey post hoc procedure, the prediction that the generally violent/anti-social batterers would score significantly higher than the other batterer subtypes was not supported. However, there was a significant difference between the anti-social/generally violent batterers and the control group. There were significant differences observed between the control group and the other two batterer subtypes as well. As with the situation involving the generally violent/anti-social batterers, the predictions that the batterer subtypes would score significantly higher were not supported. Surprisingly, the control group scored significantly higher than all three batterer subtypes in terms of neglect. Results of all Tukey post hoc procedures are found in Table 5.

Additional analyses using one-way ANOVAs with independent means were performed to determine whether there were significant relationships between batterer subtype and avoidance and batterer subtype and anxiety, attachment style and trauma, attachment style and sexual abuse, attachment style and punishment, and attachment style and neglect. In all of these analyses there were no significant relationships observed. These results are found in Table 6.

Discussion

This study could not document a significant relationship between batterer status (batterer vs. non-batterer) and attachment style. Insufficient sample size prohibited examination of batterer subtype and attachment style. No significant differences between avoidance scores and batterer status and anxiety scores and classification were found. These findings support the notion that there is no existing relationship between batterer status (batterer vs. non-batterer) and attachment style at least as measured by Bartholomew's attachment prototypes (1991). Theoretically in terms of avoidance, individuals with higher scores would generally be placed into either the dismissing or fearful attachment styles, while lower avoidance scores would be placed into either the secure or preoccupied attachment styles (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Theory suggests that a batterer group should demonstrate higher avoidance scores which would place them more significantly in the dismissing or fearful attachment styles, while non-battering subjects would have a higher placement in the secure or preoccupied attachment types. In this sample, however, no significant differences in avoidance scores and batterer status were found.

Theoretically in terms of anxiety, individuals with higher scores should have been observed in the preoccupied or fearful attachment

styles, and lower scores in the secure and dismissing attachment styles (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). A batterer group would be expected to demonstrate higher placement in the preoccupied or fearful attachment styles, while non-battering subjects should have a higher placement in the secure or dismissing attachment types. However, again there existed no significant differences in anxiety scores and batterer status.

Despite the age and educational level differences, the controls and batterers had surprisingly similar distribution of attachment styles. This distribution of attachment styles among the control subjects was not significantly different from the distribution breakdown of the four attachment styles found in 77 college students (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The distribution of attachment styles in three previous studies and this study are presented in Table 7. In this study, 39% of the controls possessed a secure attachment style as compared with 47% of the college student sample. Subjects with a preoccupied attachment style in this study represented only 18% of the controls compared with Bartholomew and Horowitz's 14%. Fourteen percent of the control subjects in this study possessed a dismissing attachment style compared to the 18% of the college group and 28% percent of the controls and possessed a fearful attachment style as compared to the 21% found in Bartholomew and Horowitz's study.

The distribution of the batterers sample within this study was also similar to the distribution of the 77 college students in Bartholomew and

Horowitz's (1991) study and the 62 batterers in Pistole and Tarrant (1993) study. In this sample, 45% of the batterers possessed a secure attachment compared with Bartholomew and Horowitz's 47% Pistole and Tarrant's 35%. Preoccupied attachment style in this study represented only 22% of the batterers while preoccupied attachment was represented by 14% of Bartholomew and Horowitz's study and 17% of the batterers in Pistole and Tarrant's study. Twenty-two percent of the batterers in this study possessed a dismissing attachment style as compared to the Bartholomew and Horowitz's 18% and the 23% of the batterers in the Pistole and Tarrant study. Of the batterers in this study, 11% possessed a fearful attachment style, while 21% of the subjects in Bartholomew and Horowitz's study, and 25% of the Pistole and Tarrant batterers were labeled as having fearful attachment.

However, the only significant differences in these distributions are between Dutton's group and this study ($X^2 = 20.31$, $p < .01$). Dutton and his colleague's sample consisted of a much lower percentage of secure batterers (20%), and higher percentages of preoccupied (33%), dismissing (27%) and fearful (20%) batterers than the present study.

The finding in this study that a higher percentage of controls, than batterers, possessed fearful attachment contradicts the theoretical prediction that men who do not batterer will possess a more secure attachment style. Several factors may have contributed to this finding. The control sample in this study may not be truly representative of the general population. A significant difference was discovered between

attachment styles when the control group was divided into two age categories: under 41 years and older than 41 years. This significant difference may be the result of a bi-modal distribution. All five control subjects under the age of 41 who were found to have a fearful attachment were under the age of 24, while four out of the five subjects in the same classification who were found to have an preoccupied attachment were under the age of 26. Because of their young age, previous experiences in relationships and cultural norms which may have sent messages that these men should begin looking for their life mate, it is possible that they either fear possible rejection in relationships and choose to avoid them or are overly concerned about establishing or maintaining a relationship. Seven of the eight control subjects in the older classification who were found to have a secure attachment were older than 50. It is likely that these men felt secure as single bachelors or as a result of long-term relationships that had endured challenges and changes.

A significant difference between batterers and controls was found when education categories were divided into three classifications: those without a high school diploma or G.E.D., those who possessed a high school diploma or G.E.D., and those who had earned a degree beyond high school ($X^2 = 28.47$, $p < .01$). Regarding educational levels, all of the control subjects had graduated from high school, with many of them having attended college. 35.7% (10) of the controls had earned graduate degrees. Such differences may also have contributed to the significant

difference observed between batterer status and attachment styles on other studies. It is possible that those with lower academic backgrounds had difficulty reading the attachment questionnaire, and had too much pride to ask for assistance in the group setting.

The two principle citations in the literature concerning attachment style and domestic batterers are inconsistent. The findings of this study are contrary to the findings of Dutton et. al. (1994), but consistent with those of Pistole and Tarrant (1993). Dutton and his colleagues found that men seeking treatment for their violence had significantly higher scores for fearful and preoccupied attachment than control subjects recruited from a local union. However, two main differences exist between the current study and that of Dutton and his colleagues. Dutton et. al., used Griffen and Bartholomew's (1994) Relationship Style Questionnaire and Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) Relationship Questionnaire on 120 batterers who were mandated to undergo treatment. Brennan, Clark, and Shaver's (1998a) Experience in Close Relationship Questionnaire (ECL) which was used in this study, had not yet been constructed. The other consists of the significant difference in perceived attachment styles between Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) initial study involving college students and Dutton et. al.'s (1994) study with an older community sample.

The findings of this study support Pistole and Tarrant's (1993) finding that there is no significant relationship between attachment style and whether a man will batter his partner. Like Dutton and his

colleagues, Pistole and Tarrant used Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) Relationship Questionnaire in studying batterers in court-mandated treatment. This study, like Pistole and Tarrant's did not significantly differ in the distribution of attachment styles.

This is the first study to use the ECL in determining the attachment styles of domestic violence batterers. The strength of this questionnaire lies in that it measures attachment in a two-dimensional form, rather than the singular prototypes measured by Griffen and Bartholomew's (1994) Relationship Style Questionnaire and Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) Relationship Questionnaire. Subjects tested with the ECL are not as aware of the method by which the measure is scored, thus reducing the possibility of the subject attempting to answer in a socially desirable fashion. The major weakness of the measure is its relatively recent introduction. Because the instrument is new, many are unaware of its existence and continue to use the older measures. As a result, there is very little literature on the psychometrics of the ECL, the distribution of attachment styles within subject samples, or the comparison of these distributions with those found using the older measures.

This is the first study to empirically examine a relationship between batterer subtype and childhood traumatization using the Child Abuse and Trauma Scale (CAT) (Sanders & Becker-Laussen, 1995). The results of the analysis concerning batterer status (batterer vs. non-batterer) and trauma support much of the previous literature dealing

with the relationship of physically violent behavior as an adult and child victimization, trauma, and abuse. The battering group scores on the CAT overall score and the three subscales were significantly higher than those of the non-violent control group. These findings are consistent with several previous studies (Laner & Thompson, 1982; Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Fagan, Stewart & Hansen, 1982; Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Marshall & Rose, 1988; Riggs, O'Leary, & Breslin, 1990; and Saunders, 1992).

The majority of the findings from the analysis concerning batterer subtype and trauma, sexual abuse, punishment, and neglect are quite consistent with the literature dealing with childhood trauma and physical violence as an adult with one exception. One would expect that neglect scores would be higher for any batterer subtype when compared to the control group. In this study however, the control group not only had higher neglect scores, but there existed significant differences on this subscale between the control group and each of the three batterer subtypes. One possible explanation of this finding may lie in the high percentage of control subjects observed with fearful or dismissive attachment styles. Childhood experiences which these individuals perceived as neglectful, may have fostered a sense of mistrust in others, which in turn, could lead these control group members to be afraid of engaging in interpersonal relationships, or to believe that they must totally rely on themselves.

This study also supports the concept that higher levels of childhood trauma and victimization contribute to more generalized violence. In overall trauma and punishment, the generally violent/anti-social batterer group scored significantly higher than the family-only and control groups. Of greatest importance is the finding that being a victim of childhood sexual assault may contribute to generalized violence. Generally violent/anti-social batterers also scored significantly higher on the sexual abuse scale than all of the other subtypes.

This study's findings also support the literature that provides evidence for the concept of a transgenerational cycle of violence (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Kalmuss, 1984; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Straus, 1990; and Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). Overall, the batterers experienced significantly higher levels of overall trauma, sexual abuse and punishment than did the controls. While not significant, it is interesting to note that family-only batterers experienced a higher degree of sexual assault than did dysphoric-borderline batterers. This finding suggests that men who batter only within the family may be modeling the abuse witnessed and experienced as a child.

The analyses conducted on attachment subtype and overall trauma, sexual abuse, punishment and neglect resulted in no significant differences. These outcomes are not consistent with the findings of Dutton, et. al. (1994) who did identify a significant difference between attachment styles in batterers and trauma. Their study yielded results which indicated the fearful attachment style as having the highest

trauma score, significantly different from the trauma scores of the secure and dismissing attachment styles. This may well be due to the use of the Trauma Symptoms Checklist (TSC 33) (Briere & Runtz, 1989) which is designed to measure present day symptoms of past childhood abuse. For this study the TSC-33 was not considered appropriate because there is a possibility that the measure reflects current symptoms and emotional status that could be linked to present situations, rather than reflecting historical abuse. The Child Abuse and Trauma Scale (CAT; Saunders & Becker-Laussen, 1995) instead measures perceptions of one's childhood environment.

The findings of this study are limited as a result of several factors. Perhaps the most important limitation lies with the psychometric qualities of attachment measures; most were established using samples consisting of college students rather than a more mature community sample. While there were no significant differences between batterer status and attachment styles found in this study and those of Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) and Pistole and Tarrant (1993), the distribution breakdown of the control subjects in this study was closer to that of Bartholomew and Horowitz's college student group than was that of the battering group, with the exception of the percentage of secure batterers. These results may have occurred due to the literacy difficulties previously mentioned.

The psychometric qualities of the CAT may also pose another limitation. The CAT's norming population consisted of male and female

college students in laboratory sessions of their introductory psychology class and a second group of independently samples college students. Concerning this study's control subjects from the general community, the group's mean score for the neglect subscale was almost two times as high as the range found by Sanders and Becker-Lausen's (1995) studies. However, in terms of the punishment subscale, the control group's mean was within the range found by Sanders and Becker-Lausen, while the other experimental group's mean scores were higher. Lastly, the sexual abuse mean score of all experimental groups, with the exception of the generally violent/anti-social batterer group, scored below Sanders and Becker-Lausen's range of scores. The generally violent/anti-social batterer group's mean score was almost twice as high as the upper end point of Becker-Lausen's range.

Another limitation of this study is the imbalance of subjects within batterer subtypes. The family-only batterer group contained 13 subjects, while the generally violent/anti-social batterer group consisted of 40 subjects. This imbalance affects the power of statistical analyses

The process used to place batterers into their particular subtype was also limited by the clinical and historical information available. In selecting a particular subtype, the subject's clinical file was used. Agency to agency differences in the information gathered and contained within a subject's clinical file often made the selection of a subtype a challenge. One agency for example, asked each client questions concerning the subject's involvement in possibly violent activities such

as sports, martial arts, and military experience; in another agency such information might be documented only if it was disclosed spontaneously in the assessment interview. One agency, which had established an excellent reputation with their county's probation office, often had a copy of each subject's legal history in the clinical file. Other agencies asked these questions, but were usually limited to the information provided by the client.

Recommendations

Further research concerning attachment styles in relation to batterer subtypes and childhood trauma is needed. This study suggests that there are no differences between batterer status (batterer vs. non-batterer) but was unable to document any significant findings on attachment style differences between batterer subtypes.

Future research on batterer subtype needs to be undertaken with a much larger sample size which includes a higher number of subjects within each battering subtype. Such research should attempt to balance the disproportionate number of the family-only batterers with the other two subtypes. If possible, equal numbers of batterers in each subgroup would be ideal.

For additional research concerning batterer subtypes the interview approach might be a more accurate method of gathering historical or psychological information to determine a batterer subtype as compared with examining clinical files, especially if battering subjects are recruited from different treatment programs. The interview method would

allow the researcher greater control over the consistency of information requested, thus possibly resulting in a more evenly balanced distribution of batterer subtypes. It is also important to better match batterers and control subjects in age and educational levels.

Additional research on attachment styles needs to be undertaken in several areas. It is important that data are gathered to measure the distribution of attachment styles not only within special populations, such as domestic violence batterers, but also within a community setting. It would also be important to explore attachment style differences across the life span. Furthermore, continuing research and development of attachment measures needs to be conducted and shared. Normative psychometrics need to be established for non-college student groups. At this time, it is suggested that any attachment research use Brennan et. al.'s (1998a) Experience in Close Relationship Questionnaire, along with Griffen and Bartholomew's (1994) Relationship Style Questionnaire and Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) Relationship Questionnaire.

Further research concerning the norming of the CAT involving a community sample is strongly encouraged in order to make the instrument more viable for future research involving a non-college student population.

In summary, attachment styles appear unrelated to a man's tendency to commit domestic violence. Batterers do not differ in attachment from their non-battering counterparts. Batterers also do not

appear to differ in levels of anxiety or avoidance from their non-battering peers.

This study has yielded some unexpected and confusing results concerning levels of childhood neglect and fearful attachment among a non-battering community control group. In part these may be due to a non homogenous sample, but some interesting differences in attachment styles were identified between young men and the group of more senior men.

Furthermore, those who were abused or victimized as a child do not appear to differ in terms of attachment from those who were not abused or traumatized. There does appear to be a correlation concerning that those who do batter however are more likely to have been victimized or abused as children, especially those who are generally violent/anti-social. This study's results strongly reinforce the critical need to provide therapeutic intervention with children who live in physically violent homes and environments as a preventive measure to reduce both general and domestic violence in the future.

Figure 1

Attachment Style and Batterer Subtype Hypothesis Predications

	Batterer Subtype			
	Control Group	Family Only	Borderline Dysphoric	Gen. Violent Anti-Social
Attachment Style				
Secure	X			
Preoccupied		X	X	
Dismissing				
Fearful				X

Table 1

Selected Sociodemographic Characteristics of Study Participants

<u>Age</u> n=	Control Group (n=28)	Family Only (n=13)	Borderline Dysphoric (n=30)	Gen. Violent Anti-Social (n=40)
	41 yrs, 2 mo	30 yrs, 11 mo.	31 yrs, 1 mo.	34 yrs., 2 mo.
<u>Race</u>				
Caucasian	100% (n=28)	76.9% (n=10)	83.3% (n=25)	72.5% (n=29)
African-Am	0%	7.7% (n=1)	0%	10% (n=4)
Hispanic	0%	0%	0%	0.5% (n=1)
Asian	0%	0%	0%	0%
American Indian	0%	7.7% (n=1)	6.7% (n=2)	7.5% (n=3)
Other	0%	7.7% (n=1)	10% (n=3)	7.5% (n=3)
<u>Marital Status</u>				
Married	53.6% (n=15)	46.1% (n=6)	50% (n=15)	37.5% (n=15)
Divorced	3.6% (n=1)	23.1% (n=3)	26.7% (n=8)	27.5% (n=11)
Separated	0%	0%	10% (n=3)	10% (n=4)
Never Married, Living Alone	39.2% (n=11)	30.8% (n=4)	3.33% (n=1)	17.5% (n=7)
Never Married, Living with Partner	3.6% (n=1)	0%	10% (n=3)	7.5% (n=3)

Table 1 Continued

	Control Group (n=28)	Family Only (n=13)	Borderline Dysphoric (n=30)	Gen. Violent Anti-Social (n=40)
Education				
Graduate Deg.	35.71% (n=10)	0%	0%	0%
Bachelor's Deg. Associate/ Vocation	14.29% (n=4)	7.69% (n=1)	3.33 (n=1)	10% (n=4)
Some College, No Degree	10.71%(n=3)	15.38% (n=2)	3.33 (n=1)	2.5% (n=1)
High School Diploma	35.71% (n=10)	23.08% (n=3)	30% (n=9)	17.5% (n=7)
GED	3.57% (n=1)	7.69% (n=1)	30% (n=9)	25% (n=10)
Some High School	0%	38.46% (n=5)	10% (n=3)	25% (n=10)
No High School	0%	7.69% (n=1)	23.33% (n=7)	17.5% (n=7)
	0%	0%	0%	2.5% (n=1)
Income Level				
0 - 5000	17.86% (n=5)	38.46% (n=5)	16.67% (n=5)	12.5% (n=5)
5000-10000	17.86% (n=5)	0%	3.33% (n=1)	12.5% (n=5)
10000-15000	3.57% (n=1)	7.69% (n=1)	26.67 (n=8)	17.5% (n=7)
15000-20000	0%	15.38% (n=2)	10% (n=3)	15% (n=6)
20000-25000	10.71% (n=3)	15.38% (n=2)	3.33% (n=1)	20% (n=8)
25000-30000	0%	0%	13.33% (n=4)	5% (n=2)
30000-35000	0%	7.69% (n=1)	6.67% (n=2)	2.5%(n=1)
35000-40000	3.57% (n=1)	7.69% (n=1)	3.33% (n=1)	2.5%(n=1)
40000-45000	0%	0%	10% (n=3)	7.5%(n=3)
45000-50000	7.14% (n=2)	0%	0%	2.5%(n=1)
50000-55000	7.14% (n=2)	0%	0%	0%
55000-60000	3.57% (n=1)	7.69% (n=1)	0%	2.5%(n=1)
60000-65000	7.14% (n=2)	0%	0%	0%
65000-70000	10.71% (n=3)	0%	0%	0%
70000+	10.71% (n=3)	0%	0%	0%

Table 2

Chi-Square Analysis Involving Attachment Style and Batterer Subtype

Attach- ment Style	Control n = 28	Batterer n=83
Secure	11 (12.36) 39%	38 (36.64) 45%
Preocc- pied	5 (5.80) 18%	18 (17.20) 22%
Dismissing	4 (5.55) 14%	18 (16.45) 22%
Fearful	8 (4.29) 28%	9 (12.71) 11%

Table 3

Child Abuse Trauma Scores of Batterers and Non-Batterers

CAT Subscales	Batterer Status		
	Batterers (n=83)	Non-Batterers (n=28)	
	score	score	F
Overall Trauma	40.18	23.00	4.06*
Sexual Assault	0.67	00.04	4.02*
Punishment	9.23	06.64	8.27*
Neglect	17.30	21.62	8.65*

* p. <.05

Table 4

Mean Scores of CAT Subscales by Batterer Subtype

CAT Subscales	Batterer Subtype				
	Gen. Vio Anti/Soc (1) n= 40	Dysporic Borderline (2) n= 30	Family Only (3) n= 13	Control (4) n= 28	F Significance (Tukey's)
Overall Trauma	43.05	38.93	34.23	23.00	4.06*, 1 vs.4, 3; 2 vs. 4, 3 vs.1
Sexual Assault	1.20	0.17	0.23	0.04	5.03* 1 vs. 4, 3
Punishment	9.83	9.00	7.92	6.64	3.51* 1 vs.4, 3; 2 vs.4
Neglect	17.52	17.47	14.85	21.62	3.10* 4 vs. 1, 2, 3

* p. < 05

Table 5

Mean Scores of Avoidance and Anxiety by Batterer Subtype

Score	Batterer Subtype				F
	Gen. Vio Anti/Soc n= 40	Dysporic Borderline n= 30	Family Only n= 13	Control n= 28	
Avoidance	2.82	2.96	2.20	2.87	2.11
Anxiety	3.13	3.03	2.88	3.22	-.86

* p. < 05

Table 6

Mean Scores of Childhood Abuse & Trauma by Attachment Type

CAT Score	Attachment Type			
	Secure n= 40	Preoccupied n= 30	Dismissing n= 13	Fearful n= 28
Overall Trauma	34.18	39.04	37.95	34.18
Sexual Assault	0.43	0.61	0.55	0.53
Punishment	8.47	9.04	7.91	9.12
Neglect	13.96	16.78	17.09	14.88

* p. < 05

Table 7

Attachment Style Distributions in Three Research Studies

Attachment Style	Researchers		
	Pistole & Tarrant 1993 n=62	Dutton, Saunders, Griffin & Bartholomew 1994 n=120	Davidson 1999 n = 83
Secure	35%	20%	45%
Preoccupied	17%	33%	22%
Dismissing	23%	27%	22%
Fearful	25%	20%	11%

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- American Psychological Association. (1992). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. American Psychologist, 47, 1597-1611.
- Barnett, O. W., Martinez, T. E., & Bluestein, B. W. (1995). Jealousy and romantic attachment in maritally violent and nonviolent men. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10 (4), 473-486.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7, 147-178.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four-category model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61 (2), 226-244.
- Bernard, M. L., & Bernard, J. L. (1983). Violent intimacy: The family as a model for love relationships. Family Relationships, 32, 283-286.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss. Vol. 1, Attachment. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. British Journal of Psychiatry, 130, 201-210.

Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998a). Experiences in close relationships [On-line]. Available:

<http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/Shaver/ecl.html>

Brennan K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P.R. (1998b). Self-report measures of adult attachment: an integrative overview [On-line].

Available: <http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/Shaver/brennan.html#scoring>.

Briere, J., & Elliot, D. (1995). Trauma symptom inventory. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10, (4), 387-401.

Briere, J., & Runtz, M. (1989). The trauma symptom checklist (TSC-33): Early data on a new scale. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4, (2), 151-163.

Briere, J. & Runtz, M. (1990). Differential adult symptomatology associated with three types of child abuse histories. Child Abuse & Neglect, 14, 357-364.

Cadsky, O., & Crawford, M. (1988). Establishing batterer typologies in a clinical sample of men who assault their female partners. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 7, 119-127.

Carmen, E. H., Rieker, P. P., & Mills, T. (1984). Victims of violence and psychiatric illness. American Journal of Psychiatry, 141, (3), 378-383.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58 (4), 644- 663.

Dutton, D. G., & Golant, S. K. (1995). The batterer: A psychological profile. New York: Basic Books.

Dutton, D. G., & Hart, S. D. (1992). Evidence for long-term, specific effects of childhood abuse and neglect on criminal behavior in men. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 36, (2), 129-137.

Dutton, D. G., Saunders, K., Starzomski, A., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Intimacy-anger and insecure attachment as precursors of abuse in intimate relationships. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24 (15), 1367-1386.

Elliot, D., & Briere, J. (1992). Sexual abuse trauma among professional women: Validating the trauma symptom checklist - 40 (TSC-40). Child Abuse and Neglect, 16, 391-398.

Fagan, J. A., Stewart, D. K., & Hansen, K. V. (1983). Violent men or violent husbands? Background factors and situational correlates. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), The dark side of families: Current family violence research. (pp. 49-68). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1991). Attachment style and verbal descriptions of romantic partners. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8, 187-215.

Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G. T., & Yllo, K. (1988). Stopping family violence: Research priorities for the coming decade. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Gondolf, E. W. (1985). Men who batter: An integrated approach for stopping wife abuse. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.

Gondolf, E. W. (1988). Who are those guys? Toward a behavioral typology of batterers. Violence and Victims, 3, 187-203

Griffin, D. W., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). The metaphysics of measurement: The case of adult attachment. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), Advances in personal relationships Vol. 5: Attachment processes in adulthood (pp. 17-52). London, England: Jessica Kingsley.

Hamberger, L. K., & Hastings, J. E. (1986). Personality correlates of men who abuse their partners: A cross-validation study. Journal of Family Violence, 1, 323-341

Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M., Bonge, D., & Tolin, D. F. (1996). A large sample empirical typology of male spouse abusers and its relationship to dimensions of abuse. Violence & Victims, 11, (4) 277-292.

Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 511-524

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. Psychological Bulletin, 116 (3), 476-497.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Stuart, G. L., & Hutchinson, G. (1997). Violent versus nonviolent husbands: Differences in attachment patterns, dependency, and jealousy. Journal of Family Psychology, 11 (3), 314-331.

Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, D. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1, (2), 101-124.

Kalmuss, D. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. Journal of Marriage and the Family, February, 11-19.

Kesner, J. E., Julian, T., & McKenry, P. C. (1997). Application of attachment theory to male violence toward female intimates. Journal of Family Violence, 12 (2), 211-228.

Kobak, R. R., & Hazan, C. (1991). Attachment in marriage: Effects of security and accuracy of working models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60 (6), 861-869.

Kroll, P. D., Stack, D. F., & James, M. E. (1985). The behavior of adult alcoholic men abused as children. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 173, 689-693.

Laner, M. R., & Thompson, J. (1982). Abuse and aggression in courting couples. Deviant Behavior, 3, 229-224.

Lisak, D. & Ivan, C. (1995). Deficits in intimacy and empathy in sexually aggressive men. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10 (3), 296-308.

Murphy, C. M., Meyer, S., & O'Leary, K. D. (1994). Dependency characteristics of partner assaultive men. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 103 (4), 729-735.

Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1988). Family of origin violence and courtship violence. Journal of Counseling and Development, 66, 414-418.

Pistole, M. C. (1989). Attachment in adult romantic relationships: Style of conflict resolution and relationship satisfaction. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 6, 505- 510.

Pistole, M. C., & Tarrant, N. (1993). Attachment style and aggression in male batterers. Family Therapy, 20, (3) 165-173.

Riggs, D. S., O'Leary, K. D., & Breslin, F. C. (1990). Multiple correlates of physical aggression in dating couples. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5, 61-73.

Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, K. D. (1981). Marital violence: Characteristics of abusive couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 63-71.

Rosenbaum, M., & Bennett, B. (1986). Homicide and depression. American Journal of Psychiatry, 143, 367-370.

Sack, W. H., & Mason, R. (1980). Child abuse and conviction of sexual crimes: A preliminary finding. Law and Human Behavior, 4, 211-215.

Sanders, B., & Becker-Lausen, E. (1995) The measurement of psychological maltreatment: Early data on the child abuse and trauma scale. Child Abuse and Neglect, 19, (3), 315-323.

Saunders, D. G. (1992). A typology of men who batter women: Three types derived from cluster analysis. American Orthopsychiatry, 16, 264-275.

Seidman, B. T., Marshall, W. L., Hudson, S. M., Robertson, P. J. (1994). An examination of intimacy and loneliness in sex offenders. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9 (4), 518-534.

Senchak, M., & Leonard, K. E. (1992). Attachment styles and marital adjustment among newlywed couples. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 9, 51-64.

Shaver, P. R., & Fraley, C. F. (1998). Self-report measures of adult romantic attachment [On-line]. Available:
<http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/Shaver/measures.html>.

Stacey, W., & Shupe, A. (1983). The family secret: Domestic violence in America. Boston: Beacon Press.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: the Conflict Tactics (ct) Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 75-88.

Straus, M. A. (1990). Ordinary violence, child abuse, and wife beating: What do they have in common? In Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (eds.), Physical Violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8145 families. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

U.S. Department of Justice. (1994). Violence between intimates: Domestic Violence (NCJ Publication No. 149259). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Walker, L. (1979). The battered woman. New York: Harper & Row.

Appendix A

INFORMED CONSENT

Prospective Research Subject: Please read this consent carefully and feel free to ask any questions you may have before deciding to participate in this study.

Project Information

Principle Investigator: Eric S. Davidson
Faculty Advisor: Genie O. Lenihan, Ph.D.

Introduction/Purpose of This Study

You are being asked to participate in a research study investigating the relationship between childhood home environments, male relationship patterns, and resolution strategies when in conflict with an intimate partner. Over 120 men are expected to participate in this study.

Procedures

You are being asked to fill out the following four survey: a demographic form, the Childhood Home Environment Survey, the Conflict Tactics Survey, and the Experiences in Close Relationships Survey. These surveys should take approximately between 30 - 60 minutes to complete. After you have completed these forms, no further assistance will be required.

Possible Risks

There are no significant risks involved in being a participant in this study. However, some of the questions may lead you to examine aspects of your life that you may not have been willing to acknowledge prior to the survey.

Benefits

While you will not be financially compensated for your participation, participants may benefit from insight gained while completing the necessary forms. Furthermore, the results of this study may be beneficial in creating effective treatment strategies for men who are seeking psychotherapy for problems they are encountering with an intimate partner.

Privacy and Confidentiality

Your identity in this study will be treated as confidential. The results of this study may be published for scientific purposes, but in no way will give your name or include any identifiable references to you.

Refusal or Withdrawal of Participation

You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this study. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled if you choose not to participate. If after beginning your participation, you decide that you wish to stop, you may also do so.

Subject's Authorization

I have read and understand this consent form, and all questions that I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form. I voluntarily choose to participate this research study.

Subject's Signature	Date	Investigator's Signature	Date
---------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Appendix B

INFORMED CONSENT

Prospective Research Subject: Please read this consent carefully and feel free to ask any questions you may have before deciding to participate in this study.

Project Information

Principle Investigator: Eric S. Davidson
Faculty Advisor: Genie O. Lenihan, Ph.D.

Introduction/Purpose of This Study

You are being asked to participate in a research study investigating the relationship between childhood home environments, male relationship patterns, and resolution strategies when in conflict with an intimate partner. Over 120 men are expected to participate in this study.

Procedures

You are being asked to fill out the following four survey: a demographic form, the Childhood Home Environment Survey, the Conflict Tactics Survey, and the Experiences in Close Relationships Survey. These surveys should take approximately between 30 - 60 minutes to complete. In addition to completing these forms, you are also asked to give your permission to allow the researcher to access your clinical file. The researcher will use information within the file to place you into one of three experimental groups. After you have completed these forms, no further assistance will be required.

Possible Risks

There are no significant risks involved in being a participant in this study. However, some of the questions may lead you to examine aspects of your life that you may not have been willing to acknowledge prior to the survey.

Benefits

While you will not be financially compensated for your participation, participants may benefit from insight gained while completing the necessary forms. Furthermore, the results of this study may be beneficial in creating effective treatment strategies for men who are seeking psychotherapy for problems they are encountering with an intimate partner.

Privacy and Confidentiality

Your identity in this study will be treated as confidential. The results of this study may be published for scientific purposes, but in no way will give your name or include any identifiable references to you.

Refusal or Withdrawal of Participation

You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this study. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled if you choose not to participate. If after beginning your participation, you decide that you wish to stop, you may also do so.

Subject's Authorization

I have read and understand this consent form, and all questions that I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form. I voluntarily choose to participate this research study.

Subject's Signature	Date	Investigator's Signature	Date
---------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Appendix C

Conflict Tactics Survey

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed with something the other person does, or just has spats or fights because they're in a bad mood, tired, or for some other reason. This survey seeks to determine the ways in which you try to settle your differences with your partner.

Instructions: Respond to each statement by circling a number of times you have used each tactic.

	WITHIN THE PAST YEAR							EVER	
A. Discussed the issue calmly.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
B. Got information to back up your side of things.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
C. Brought someone in or tried to bring..... in someone to help settle things.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
D. Insulted or swore at your partner.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
E. Sulked and/or refused to talk about it...	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
F. Stomped out of the room or house.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
G. Cried.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
H. Did or said something to spite your partner.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
I. Threatened to hit or throw something at your partner.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
J. Threw, smashed, hit, or kicked something.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
K. Threw something at your partner.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
L. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved your partner.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
M. Slapped the your partner.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
N. Kicked, bit, or hit your partner with a fist.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
O. Hit or tried to hit your partner with something.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
P. Beat up your partner.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
Q. Threatened your partner with a knife or gun.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No
R. Used a knife or gun on your partner.....	0	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Yes	No

Appendix D

Experiences in Close Relationships Survey

This survey seeks to determine how you generally experience and feel in romantic relationships including past relationships.

Instructions: Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it.

In responding to these statements, simply circle the appropriate number according to the following definitions:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly			Neutral			Strongly
Disagree			Mixed			Agree

- ___ 1. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.
- ___ 2. I worry about being abandoned.
- ___ 3. I am very uncomfortable being close to romantic partners.
- ___ 4. I worry a lot about my relationships.
- ___ 5. Just when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away.
- ___ 6. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.
- ___ 7. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.
- ___ 8. I worry a fair amount about losing my partner.
- ___ 9. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.
- ___ 10. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him/her.
- ___ 11. I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back.
- ___ 12. I often want to merge completely with romantic partners, and this sometimes scares them away.
- ___ 13. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.
- ___ 14. I worry about being alone.
- ___ 15. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.
- ___ 16. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
- ___ 17. I try to avoid getting too close to my partner.
- ___ 18. I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner.
- ___ 19. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.
- ___ 20. Sometimes I feel that I force my partners to show more feeling, more commitment.
- ___ 21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.
- ___ 22. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
- ___ 23. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.
- ___ 24. If I can't get my partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry.
- ___ 25. I tell my partner just about everything.

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--|----------|---|---|---------|---|---|----------|
| | Strongly | | | Neutral | | | Strongly |
| | Disagree | | | Mixed | | | Agree |
-
- ___ 26. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.
 - ___ 27. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.
 - ___ 28. When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure.
 - ___ 29. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.
 - ___ 30. I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like.
 - ___ 31. I don't mind asking romantic partners for comfort, advice, or help.
 - ___ 32. I get frustrated if romantic partners are not available when I need them.
 - ___ 33. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.
 - ___ 34. When romantic partners disapprove of me, I feel really bad about myself.
 - ___ 35. I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance.
 - ___ 36. I resent it when my partner spends time away from me.

Appendix E

Childhood Home Environment Survey

This questionnaire seeks to determine the general atmosphere of your home when you were a child or teenager and how you felt you were treated by your parents or principal caretaker. (If you were not raised by one or both of your biological parents, please respond to the questions in terms of the person, or persons who had the primary responsibility for your upbringing as a child.) Where a question inquires about the behavior of both of your parents and your parents differed in their behavior, please respond in terms of the parent whose behavior was the more severe or worse.

Instructions: In responding to these questions, simply provide the appropriate number according to the following definitions:

- 0 = never
- 1 = rarely
- 2 = sometimes
- 3 = very often
- 4 = always

- ___1. Did your parents ridicule you?
- ___2. Did you ever seek outside help or guidance because of problems in your home?
- ___3. Did your parents verbally abuse each other?
- ___4. Were you expected to follow a strict code of behavior in your home?
- ___5. When you were punished as a child or teenager, did you understand the reason you were punished?
- ___6. When you didn't follow the rules of the house, how often were you severely punished?
- ___7. As a child, did you feel unwanted or emotionally neglected?
- ___8. Did your parents insult you or call you names?
- ___9. Before you were 14, did you engage in any sexual activity with an adult?
- ___10. Were your parents unhappy with each other?
- ___11. Were your parents unwilling to attend any of your school activities?
- ___12. As a child were you punished in unusual ways (e.g. being locked in a closet for a long time or being tied up?)

In responding to these questions, simply provide the appropriate number according to the following definitions:

- 0 = never
- 1 = rarely
- 2 = sometimes
- 3 = very often
- 4 = always

- ___13. Were there any traumatic or upsetting sexual experiences when you were a child or teenager that you couldn't speak to adults about?
- ___14. Did you ever think you wanted to leave your family and live with another family?
- ___15. Did you ever witness the sexual mistreatment of another family member?
- ___16. Did you ever think seriously about running away from home?
- ___17. Did you witness the physical mistreatment of another family member?
- ___18. When you were punished as a child or teenager, did you feel the punishment was deserved?
- ___19. As a child or teenager, did you feel disliked by either of your parents?
- ___20. How often did your parents get really angry with you?
- ___21. As a child, did you feel that your home was charged with the possibility of unpredictable physical violence?
- ___22. Did you feel uncomfortable bringing friends home to visit?
- ___23. Did you feel safe living at home?
- ___24. When you were punished as a child or teenage, did you feel "the punishment fit the crime."
- ___25. Did your parents ever verbally lash out at you when you did not expect it?
- ___26. Did you ever have traumatic sexual experiences as a child or when you were a teenager?
- ___27. Were you lonely as a child?
- ___28. Did your parents yell at you?
- ___29. When either of your parents was intoxicated, were you ever afraid of being sexually mistreated?
- ___30. Did you ever wish for a friend to share your life?
- ___31. How often were you left at home alone as a child?
- ___32. Did your parents blame you for things you didn't do?
- ___33. To what extent did your parents drink heavily or abuse drugs?

In responding to these questions, simply provide the appropriate number according to the following definitions:

- 0 = never
- 1 = rarely
- 2 = sometimes
- 3 = very often
- 4 = always

- ___34. Did your parents ever hit or beat you when you did not expect it?
- ___35. Did your relationship with your parents ever involve a sexual experience?
- ___36. As a child, did you have to take care of yourself before you were old enough?
- ___37. Were you physically mistreated as a child or teenager?
- ___38. Was your childhood stressful?

Appendix F

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Now that you have completed the demographics form and the three surveys, I can tell you more about what I am hoping to find. I am interested in looking at how men interact with their intimate partners based on attachment styles and childhood victimization or trauma.

Previous research has demonstrated that certain attachment styles are associated with a variety of feelings which include security, jealousy, intimacy, anxiety. Furthermore, when paired together these attachment styles and feelings often affect how one interacts with significant others.

Previous research has also demonstrated that either being a victim or witnessing abuse as a child often impacts how one related to significant others. For example, men who have witnessed their parents in physical confrontation are often at higher risk for being physically abusive to their partners.

The purpose of the study you have just participated in is twofold. The first is to determine whether a relationship exists between how different subgroups of males resolve conflict with their partners and how they are attached to their partners. The second is to determine whether a relationship exists between childhood victimization and attachment styles, and how violent males are toward their partner.

As noted in your informed consent form, all responses will be treated confidentially and in no way will be made public.

If you are interested in obtaining the conclusions made by the researcher in this study please fill out your name and address on the request for conclusions form available from the researcher.

In the event that your participation has caused you discomfort, or shed some insight on a personal problem, counseling is available from the Coles County Mental Health Center or other treatment providers. Please contact either the Eric Davidson, the principle investigator, for information concerning treatment options, at 217/581-3912.