



Adult Attachment Patterns and Courtship Violence

Ofra Mayselless

Family Relations, Vol. 40, No. 1. (Jan., 1991), pp. 21-28.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-6664%28199101%2940%3A1%3C21%3AAAPACV%3E2.0.CO%3B2-S>

Family Relations is currently published by National Council on Family Relations.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/NCFR.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Adult Attachment Patterns and Courtship Violence*

Ofra Maysseless**

This article explores the possible relationships between adult attachment and violence among intimates. An attempt is made to understand the apparent contradiction between intimacy and violence by the heuristic use of adults' attachment patterns. Two insecure attachment patterns are described (Avoidant and Anxious/ambivalent). Each of them is related to specific manifestations of courtship violence in a specific dyadic interaction. These concepts contribute to an understanding of courtship violence as an exaggerated form of a behavior (anger and protest) which in the right time and place is functional in the regulation of intimacy. The descriptions of the specific patterns may aid in tailoring interventions to suit the different underlying problems of individuals involved in courtship violence.

This article is an attempt to apply the framework of the theory of attachment and its related findings to the phenomenon of courtship violence. It is suggested that the concept of attachment with its underlying theory and findings can help us understand individual differences in the occurrence of violence, as well as the seeming contradiction between violence and intimacy. During the last 10 years one has witnessed an unprecedented proliferation of both conceptual and empirical research in the area of courtship and domestic violence. Following many attempts to provide different explanations to this phenomenon it is now widely accepted that the causes of violence in intimate relationships are multidimensional (Edleson, Eisikovits, & Guttman, 1985; Gelles & Maynard, 1987; Giles-Sims, 1983; Vivian & O'Leary, 1987). Factors like intergenerational transmission (i.e., children of violent parents becoming violent love-mates), sex-role norms, socioeconomic class, social norms regarding violence, as well as personality factors like depression and dependency, have all been identified as related to the occurrence of violence among intimates. The following attempt is therefore not intended as a sole explanation or predictor of violence among intimate partners, but rather as an illumination of yet another facet of that phenomenon. The focus of the article is on the level of individual personality factors and how they relate to courtship violence.

The Violence-Intimacy Contradiction

One major dilemma in the area of courtship violence centers around the coexistence of intimacy and violence under the same roof. Intimacy is usually associated with warmth, closeness, protectiveness, and acceptance, while

violence evokes opposite images such as distance, rejection, rage, animosity, and unpredictability. Still, they intertwine along the following dimensions of the violent couple's existential experience: These couples choose each other, often in spite of early indications pointing towards possible interpersonal violence (Hotelling & Sugarman, 1986); they choose to live together, and in many cases they choose to remain with each other as violence continues (Feraro, 1983; Gelles, 1976). Several statistics regarding courtship relationships which illustrate these points are available. Between 30 to 50% of the couples who have reported violence in their relationship remain in that relationship and even report on its improvement (Cate, Henton, Koval, Christopher, & Lloyd, 1982; Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd, & Christopher, 1983; Makepeace, 1981; Roscoe & Benaske, 1985). Further, about 30% of the dating partners who have experienced violence in the relationship interpret the violence as an act of love (Cate et al., 1982; Henton et al., 1983; Roscoe & Benaske, 1985). More support for the coexistence of love and conflict is found in Cate and Lloyd (1988), who reported that overall, for the whole group of premarital couples they studied, love and conflict were not correlated. This was due to the fact that for one subgroup of subjects love and conflict correlated negatively, as we would expect, while for another subgroup, love and conflict correlated positively. Hence, for one group of subjects instead of conflict causing love to decrease, high levels of both conflict and love were reported.

The concept of attachment is suggested as a useful tool in understanding this intriguing phenomenon, namely, the co-occurrence of seemingly contradictory states: intimacy and violence. Three major patterns of attachment have been identified within

the area of attachment research, two of which are considered insecure attachment patterns. The present article will point to a similarity between the personality configuration of these two insecure patterns and many individual level factors which have been identified as associated with violence among intimates. Hence, it will be suggested that some of the violence exhibited in courtship has its roots in insecure attachment patterns. Further, it will be claimed that the two insecure attachment patterns exhibit different phenomenological and dynamic clusters of violent acts.

The Theory of Attachment

The concept of attachment is based on Bowlby's observations (1969, 1973, 1980) of young children's reactions to separations from primary caregivers. These reactions ranged from search and protest to despair and detachment. Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) proposed that these severe emotional reactions are manifested because a very basic primary goal, namely, proximity to a caregiver, is blocked. Bowlby postulated that every infant is born with a readiness to activate a system of behaviors ("behavioral system") whose

*Parts of this article are based on a research proposal written in collaboration with Zvi Eisikovits and Avi Sagi. Appreciation is expressed to them for suggesting the idea of applying attachment notions to courtship violence and for our fruitful discussions on this topic. Thanks are also expressed to Ruth Sharabany for her helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

**Ofra Maysseless is an extramural teacher at the Psychology Department, Haifa University, Mount Carmel, 31999, Haifa, Israel.

Key Words: abuse, aggression, attachment, courtship violence.

(Family Relations, 1991, 40, 21-28.)



aim is to keep a caregiver in proximity. The *behavioral system* includes, for the newborn infant, such behaviors as crying, smiling, and cuddling, which are usually instrumental in keeping the caregiver in proximity and contact. This behavioral system is seen as having an evolutionary significance in that being in proximity to a caregiver helps to protect the helpless newborn infant from danger. Later, the caregiver becomes an attachment figure and serves as a "secure base" from which the child is able to explore the world and other relationships. As the newborn child matures, the goal of proximity to an attachment figure and the behavioral repertoire are modified. The goal now becomes the availability of the caregiver (rather than her/his mere proximity) and the behavioral repertoire becomes richer and includes such behaviors as walking, holding, talking. While attachment behavior is at first directed towards the primary caregivers (usually the parents) it can be observed in other relationships which are intimate and important to the individual throughout the life cycle (Ainsworth, 1989).

Anger and Violence in Attachment Relationships.

Attachment behaviors are usually activated in emergencies, in accordance with the evolutionary purpose of the attachment system. Emergencies of this sort include situations of external danger, or when the child is sick or hurt, and especially whenever there is a threat as to the availability of the attachment figure. In cases of major separations (e.g., Robertson & Bowlby, 1952), when the attachment figure is not available, the first attachment behavior which will be activated is search for the missing figure. Whenever this figure is found the child will react by clinging and regaining proximity and contact. However, if the attachment figure does not return after a considerable time, as is usually the case in major separations, most children will react in protest and anger (Robertson, 1953, 1970). This protest will be directed at others if the attachment figure does not return, and will be also directed at the caregiver if he/she returns at that point. This angry response is also considered a part of the behavioral repertoire of attachment behaviors.

Bowlby (1988) regards the aggression involved in this angry protest at this phase as functional in the sense that it is geared to "persuade" the attachment figure to remain available

and to refrain from another attempt to separate. Hence, it is as instrumental in keeping the caregiver in proximity as other responses (e.g., running towards her/him, holding on, smiling). Bowlby (1988) suggests:

Thus, in the right place, at the right time, and in right degree, anger is not only appropriate but may be indispensable. It serves to deter from dangerous behavior, to drive off a rival, or to coerce a partner. In each case the aim of the angry behavior is the same—to protect a relationship which is of very special value to the angry person (pp. 79-80).

In this sense, anger is a demonstration of caring and attachment and serves to protect and maintain relationships in which one partner becomes unavailable or tries to move out of the relationship. From the theory of attachment point of view, anger, in such circumstances, is rightly interpreted as a manifestation of care and attachment, and its expression may indeed result in greater intimacy and security in the relationship.

The Violence-Intimacy Paradox Revisited

Recall the puzzling phenomenon described earlier of the coexistence, in some relationships, of intimacy and violence. This phenomenon is in accord with the point of view presented by attachment theory, which sees an expression of anger in an "endangered" relationship as a manifestation of caring about the other and as an attempt to maintain that important relationship. While anger (at the right time, place, and degree) is seen by the theory of attachment as functional, violence (an exaggerated form of anger) is not. Namely, for *some* individuals in *certain* circumstances the normal and functional reaction of anger becomes exaggerated and is manifested in violent acts toward the partner in the relationship, in order to prevent that partner from leaving the relationship. One of the questions to be addressed later is how and why some individuals in certain circumstances, with some partners exhibit violence and aggression in situations where others would have exhibited "just" anger.

Once this assumption is accepted (regarding the continuum between violence and anger), attachment theory can serve to highlight some of the circumstances of the occurrence of violent acts. Relationship violence may

occur in cases where one of the participants in an intimate and important relationship feels that the relationship is threatened by the partner and/or that he/she does not "control" the availability of other. Many situations may exemplify this threat: physical unavailability of the partner; partner threatening to dissolve the relationship; partner having other relationships (sexual or platonic) which threaten the uniqueness and boundaries of the relationship; partner emotionally distanced and having more power in the relationship, namely being less dependent and tied than the other. In each of these cases it is assumed that attachment behaviors are aroused and they might include anger and in certain cases evolve into violence. Research findings on the occurrence of violence in intimate relationships tend to corroborate this contention.

For example, in a study conducted on wife-abusers, which may still inform us on courtship violence, Dutton and Browning (1983) compared physically violent men with verbally violent and nonviolent men. They found that violent men manifested more anger and more aggression watching scenes in which the woman was dominant and distanced. The strongest anger was manifested by the group of physically violent men as a reaction to a scene depicting a dominant female who abandons her partner. The dominance of the female is interpreted as her having more power in the relationship, which includes the power to come and go, give and withdraw as she pleases. Many other studies (e.g., Bernard & Bernard, 1984; Gelles, 1980; Neidig, Friedman, & Collins, 1986; Walker, 1979) have found that men who are physically violent in intimate relationships tend to be characterized by low self-esteem, low confidence in their partner, possessiveness, and jealousy. These features correspond very well with the viewpoint of attachment theory where a perceived threat to the relationship is seen as a trigger of attachment behavior, in extreme cases including violence as a means to coerce a partner to stay in a relationship. While most of these studies were conducted with married men they nevertheless are relevant to issues of courtship violence.

One should bear in mind the difference in this respect between marital and courtship relationships. *Courtship* relationships, at least in their initial phases, include less commitment and lower predictability than marital rela-



tionships (Billingham, 1987; Flynn, 1987). For those who are not yet "attached" in their courtship relationships this may mean no arousal of the need to have the partner available, hence lower possible incidence of angry or violent responses. Accordingly, Cate et al. (1982) found premarital abuse to occur more frequently in serious relationships. Others, however, may become "attached" very early in the courtship relationship. For them, the unpredictability of this kind of relationship may trigger strong attachment behaviors including, perhaps, violent responses. An indication for the coexistence of violence and love even at the early stages of courtship comes from Billingham (1987). Billingham reports that for some dating couples violence is a part of intimate relationships already at the casual dating stage.

Of course, the point should be made that not all premarital partners respond to a threat to a relationship with an act of violence. Factors which might contribute to the occurrence of violence among intimates have been quite extensively discussed (e.g., Gelles, 1980). First, from a situational perspective it seems that the tendency to act angrily or violently as a response to threats of unavailability may become pronounced, especially if violence is perceived as legitimate and/or if the violent person does not expect to be punished, as might be the case in an unequal power balance between men and women (Walker, 1979). Second, violence will also tend to be exhibited by individuals who have learned it as a potential way of responding (i.e., via modeling) (Herrenkohl, Herrenkohl, & Toedter, 1983). It was also suggested (Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, & Bohmer, 1987) that personal experiences in other courtship relationships, may serve as a learning environment for courtship aggression. Further, and more pertinent to the present article, it seems that some people are more prone than others to experience those feelings of abandonment and perceive themselves as having low control of their partner's availability. For them even minor cases of threat provoke anxiety and more severe threats may elicit this exaggerated form of anger, namely, violence. For example, Cate et al. (1982) report that premarital abusers perceive themselves to have fewer alternatives than those who had not been abused, hence feeling less in control of the situation. In the same vein, Stets and Pirog-Good (1990) found that interpersonal control is related to premarital abuse. Further understand-

ing of why and how some individuals exhibit this exaggerated version of anger can be obtained by referring to empirical findings regarding individual differences in patterns of attachment.

Individual Differences in Patterns of Attachment

The general stand of the theory of attachment regarding individual differences can be summarized in three main propositions (Bowlby, 1973): (a) Individuals who are confident as to the availability of an attachment figure are less vulnerable to chronic or acute anxiety. (b) Confidence in attachment figures develops during childhood and early adolescence and remains relatively immune to change. (c) The expectations concerning accessibility and responsiveness of attachment figures are reflections of actual experiences those individuals have had in the past.

Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall (1978) were the first to explore experimentally individual differences in attachment behavior. On the basis of their observations of infants at home and in a special laboratory procedure (the Strange Situation) they outlined three patterns of attachment called Secure, Anxious/ambivalent, and Avoidant. The Anxious/ambivalent and Avoidant patterns are considered insecure patterns. In their description of the three attachment styles, Ainsworth et al. (1978) referred to infants' "expectations" concerning their mothers' accessibility and responsiveness. This fits with Bowlby's claim (1973, 1980) that infants and children construct "inner working models" of themselves and their major social-interaction partners. Based on experimental findings, natural observations, and clinical experience (e.g., Bowlby, 1988; Bretherton, 1985; Erickson, Sroufe, & Egeland, 1985; Grossmann, Grossmann, & Schwan, 1986; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985; Sroufe, 1983) more knowledge has accumulated about the presumed internal working model of these three attachment patterns, their behavioral manifestations later in life, and the parenting patterns associated with each of them. The following descriptions are based upon this accumulating knowledge.

The internal working model of the Secure individual includes a basic trust in her/his caregiver and confidence that the caregiver will be available, responsive, and helpful should the child encounter adverse or frightening situations. With this assurance, the child is bold in his/her explorations of

the world and able both to rely on her/himself and to turn to others when in need. This pattern is promoted by a caregiver being readily available, sensitive to the child's signals, and lovingly responsive when the child seeks protection and/or comfort.

The internal working model of the Anxious/ambivalent pattern is characterized by uncertainty and low predictability that the parent or caregiver will be available, responsive, or helpful when called upon. Because of this uncertainty, the Anxious/ambivalent person is always prone to separation anxiety and tends to be clinging while manifesting unresolved anger directed at the caregiver. The Anxious/ambivalent child may show intimacy alternating with subtle or even overt hostility. This pattern, in which conflict is evident, is promoted by such conditions as a parent being available and helpful on some occasions but not on others, and by separations or threats of abandonment used as means of control. The parenting style involves high unpredictability and may be described as involving partial and inconsistent reinforcement of attachment needs. The child is almost constantly alert lest the caregiver not be available and attachment behaviors are almost constantly exhibited (i.e., clinging and protesting).

Individuals falling in the Avoidant pattern have no confidence that if they seek help they will meet a helpful response. On the contrary, they expect to be rebuffed. As a result the child tries to live his/her life without the support and comfort of others and tries to become emotionally self-sufficient. The child may nevertheless be hostile towards others and in several instances may direct attention-seeking behavior to a nonparental caregiving figure (e.g., teacher). This pattern is associated with parents who consistently rebuff the child whenever she/he approaches the caregiver for comfort or protection. These same parents can relate to the child when she/he is in a good mood but not when she/he is distressed.

The internal working models with their accompanying behavioral manifestations are conceptualized by Bowlby (1988) as central components of personality which characterize each individual later in his/her life as an adult. While the claim of cross-age continuity is still controversial, it is supported by a growing list of longitudinal studies from infancy through the early elementary school years (Donatas, Maratos, Fafoutis, & Karangelis, 1985; Erickson et al., 1985; Main et al., 1985; Oppen-

heim, Sagi, & Lamb, 1988; Waters, Wippman, & Sroufe, 1979). Continuity, according to Bowlby (1973, 1988), is due primarily to two major factors: (a) the actual persistence of parenting patterns through the years, when the family setting is fairly stable and (b) the self-perpetuating nature of behavioral patterns (self-fulfilling prophecies). A child who grows up in a family with stable emotional characteristics (e.g., avoidance of warm physical contact) will tend in adulthood to show patterns similar to the ones she/he had demonstrated as a child. Further, a child who develops certain characteristics (e.g., avoidance) will behave, with other people besides the parents, in a manner which will elicit a corroboration of his/her expectations. For example, an ambivalent person will trigger an ambivalent and inconsistent response from others; an avoidant and cool person will trigger coolness and emotional distance from others.

Adult Attachment Patterns and Love

A direct application of attachment related notions to adult intimate relationships was attempted by Shaver, Hazan, and Bradshaw (1988). They suggested that since the specific patterns of attachment are the primary socially relevant behavioral system which is learned and becomes internalized, it lays foundations for other intimate relationships as well. Thus, the three different attachment styles were thought to be manifested in different patterns of romantic relationships.

In this respect, Hazan and Shaver (1987) found that people who classified themselves as having different adult attachment styles reported differential love experiences and beliefs about marital relationships. Further, the adult secure/insecure attachment patterns were discriminated by the subjects' perceived childhood experiences with their parents. Hazan and Shaver (1987) found that secure adults indicated that their love relationship was characterized by happiness, friendship, trust, and acceptance. Secure individuals reported the lowest rate of fear of closeness and a belief that true love exists and can be rather stable.

Insecure adults of the Avoidant type described their love experiences as involving less happiness, friendship, acceptance and trust than others. They tended to fear closeness and indicated that it was difficult for them to fall in love.

Adults who classified themselves as Anxious/ambivalent described their love experiences as an emotional roller-coaster ranging from high hopes and euphoria to jealousy and depression. These individuals felt obsessive preoccupation with their love partner and desired more union and reciprocity from their love partner than adults in other patterns. They tended to fall in love easily and at first sight. Concentrating on this insecure pattern—the Anxious/ambivalent pattern, Hindy and Schwarz (1984) found similar results.

Using an interview method rather than self-classification and relying also on peers' reports, Kobak and Sceery (1988) found corresponding results. They found that Secure adults compared with the other patterns were rated as more ego-resilient, less anxious, and less hostile by peers, and reported little distress and high levels of social support. Avoidant adults were rated low on ego-resilience and higher on hostility by peers and reported more distant relationships in terms of more loneliness and low levels of social support from family. The Anxious/ambivalent persons were viewed as less ego-resilient and more anxious by peers and reported high levels of personal distress. Hence, both the Ambivalent and the Avoidant adults are perceived as having low ego-resilience yet the Avoidant is described as distant and hostile while the Ambivalent is described as anxious and distressed.

Pistole (1989), using Rahim's (1983) inventory, studied the utilization of conflict-resolution strategies by individuals with the three attachment patterns. Pistole (1989) found that adults exhibiting the three attachment patterns differ in the ways they resolve conflicts within love relationships. Secure individuals tended to report higher satisfaction and cohesion and were more likely to use integrating (trying to reach a decision jointly) and compromising (finding a middle course of action) strategies. Hence, persons from both the insecure patterns reported less use of positive conflict-resolution strategies. Combining measures of styles of love and conflict-resolution strategies, Levy and Davis (1988) found similar results: Compared with Secure individuals, Anxious/ambivalent individuals were characterized by a higher level of conflict and lower level of intimacy, viability, care, commitment, and satisfaction. Anxious/ambivalent individuals also tended to utilize a dominating conflict-resolution style. Their relationship involved a manic, possessive love style which in-

cluded jealousy, possessiveness, and lower sense of friendship. Avoidant compared with Secure individuals tended to score higher on conflict measures and lower on intimacy, passion, commitment, and satisfaction. These individuals were less likely to take an integrating and compromising approach to conflict and tended to avoid the conflict altogether.

Combining the results from the different studies it can be seen that people exhibiting the two insecure (Avoidance and Anxious/ambivalence) patterns, compared to the Secure pattern, have low ego-resilience, report low satisfaction and intimacy in their love relationships, endure a higher level of conflict, and are less likely to utilize compromise and integration as strategies in solving interpersonal conflicts. The two insecure patterns differ in certain respects: People exhibiting the Avoidant pattern seem to be distant, to have a low level of passion, to be perceived by others as hostile, and to utilize avoidant strategy to solve conflicts. People exhibiting Anxious/ambivalent pattern seem to be anxious, distressed, jealous, and possessive, and to utilize dominating conflict-resolution strategy.

Insecure Attachment Patterns in Dyadic Interaction and Courtship Violence

As indicated earlier many variables were found to be associated with courtship violence. They include cultural, environmental, and circumstantial factors, as well as interpersonal processes and intrapsychic factors. The following analysis concentrates mostly on inter- and intrapersonal factors related to courtship violence. More specifically, the relations between personality configurations of different attachment patterns and courtship violence will be explored. The following attempt is, at this point, quite new and speculative. Nevertheless, it does rely on existing data and theory regarding attachment styles (e.g., Bartholomew, 1990; Bowlby, 1988; Cassidy & Kobak, 1988; Crittenden, 1985; Main, 1981; Main & Goldwyn, 1989; Morris, 1981). It is also consistent with current findings within relationship violence research. Moreover, it can help practitioners who encounter instances of courtship violence and serve as a source of working hypotheses.

Three major types of attachment patterns, one secure and two insecure



ones have been reviewed. Secure adults seem to be able to relate emotionally and cognitively to others and to be able to constructively solve conflicts they confront within intimate relationships. Thus, it seems quite reasonable that the phenomenon of violence in romantic intimate relationships will be more readily manifested by insecurely rather than securely attached adults. However, romantic relationships are not a one-sided action but rather an interaction between two people. Not every insecure person is involved in courtship violence. It is suggested that violence will be more readily exhibited by an individual with an insecure attachment pattern in relationship with a corresponding partner having a "complementary" triggering pattern. Further, characteristics of the violence exhibited will differ depending on the specific dyadic combination for each of the insecure patterns.

Avoidant Pattern and Courtship Violence

The *Avoidant pattern* is characterized by "obsessive self-reliance" (Bowlby, 1988). Avoidant adults while deep inside longing for intimacy and closeness, do not trust others but prefer to rely on their own resources. Moreover, they tend to rebuff attempts to get close to them and seem to have enough ego strength to repress their longing, loneliness, and anger while making it on their own. They find it easier to relate to other people in terms of gains and losses, giving and taking, rather than warm love and care (Cassidy & Kobak, 1988). Being in control and having the power in interpersonal relationships, especially intimate ones, is of utmost importance for them. As children they are sometimes angry and aggressive without any apparent reason, and as adults they are perceived as somewhat lonely and hostile. Their hostility is more of the passive-aggressive type rather than open expression of anger and aggression. They tend to be cool and critical, having rigid ideas and expectations and rather high self-esteem. Thus, they seem to protect themselves from attempts to be intimate, which for them may denote danger of rejection and abandonment (Main & Weston, 1982). Usually these adults are able to contain and repress their anxiety, fear of abandonment, and anger at previous rejections by caregivers and control the extent of closeness in their relationships. However, there may be certain cases where these individuals

become openly hostile, aggressive, and even physically violent.

First, even a very cautious Avoidant person may sometimes grow to trust another person or to fall in love with another. In this case he/she may be very vulnerable. If at that point an *objective danger* (a realistic threat) of rejection, abandonment or loss of control in the relationship surfaces this may trigger the whole repressed syndrome of anxiety and anger. Since the Avoider is usually in control of his/her impulses and tends to obey social norms, the anger may culminate in courtship violence if there is cultural or legitimate justification for it, and/or if the violent act has been learned as part of socialization.

Toward what type of individual may such abuse be directed? It is speculated that the most likely individual will trust is one with a secure attachment style. A secure and stable adult may personify for the Avoidant the kind of person she/he may securely fall in love with. This may be a true reflection of the secure nature of the Secure pattern of attachment. However, things may happen and the Secure partner may want to leave the relationship. Such an occurrence validates the innermost fears and anxieties that the Avoidant person fought so hard to overcome. The whole repressed syndrome of helplessness, resentment, and anger may then be manifested, and culminate in a sudden, almost surprising burst of violence, much like the unexplained bouts of anger and violence of the avoidant child at home (Ainsworth et al., 1978). A scenario of this kind is likely to happen between an Avoidant male and a Secure female in a social milieu which legitimizes violence and in cases of real threat of abandonment. Since, as mentioned, this kind of violence is part of a committed relationship it may appear more in serious dating relationships or marriage and less in the beginning phases of courtship. Further it may be associated with high rather than low self-esteem of the aggressor.

There is another case in which an Avoidant individual may become abusive. It was noted that hostility is used by Avoidant adults as a way of deterring possible partners from becoming too intimate (Kobak & Sceery, 1988), since intimacy for them denotes danger of rejection and abandonment. In this respect if an avoidant adult comes across an intimate partner who "pushes" his/her way to intimacy,

his/her reaction may include an even stronger hostility. Furthermore, if such a partner is also ambivalent, sometimes pushing too close and sometimes distancing and rejecting, it may prove too provocative for the Avoidant individual to handle with coolness and avoidance. Moreover, if these ups and downs are accompanied by resentment and aggressiveness on the part of the partner this may even give the Avoidant adult the moral legitimacy of using force. A scenario of this kind is likely to happen between an Avoidant person and an Anxious/ambivalent one. This scenario is rather aversive to both partners. An Avoidant person may, therefore, choose to leave this kind of relationship, thus avoiding the painful experience. Hence, this scenario is less likely to occur in more committed and advanced relationships and more likely to occur within courtship relationships rather than marriage.

Anxious/Ambivalent Pattern and Courtship Violence

The *Anxious/ambivalent* adult seems to be characterized by an open expression of both proximity/contact seeking and aggressiveness. As children these individuals seem to want to be close to their caregiver and cling to him/her, while at the same time exhibiting anger and aggressiveness towards the caregiver (Ainsworth et al., 1978). They are unable to relax and be really comforted by the caregiver. They seem to be caught in an endless and impossible struggle to please their attachment figure, who is inconsistent in his/her reactions to their attachment needs (Main & Goldwyn, 1989). As adults these people seem to fall in love easily, yet to be as easily disappointed. Though, they would like to control the availability and responsiveness of their love partner they feel rather helpless (Hindy & Schwartz, 1984). Some of them may even present a helpless, passive image of themselves. The more *passive Anxious/ambivalent* individuals may be more dependent and less openly hostile than other Ambivalent individuals. However, all the ambivalent individuals are very jealous and possessive, never satisfied with their partner or their intimate relationship, and caught in a love-hate situation without being able to separate from their partner on their own initiative (Morris, 1981). Much like the anxious/ambivalent child they want total proximity to their partner, yet do not believe in this possibility and become angry and sometimes aggressive, blaming their love partner. They

are therefore very labile emotionally as if on an emotional roller-coaster. Expecting inconsistent or rejecting responses from their intimate partner they are ambivalent and inconsistent, sometimes loving and caring, and sometimes angry and even aggressive.

Aggressiveness towards an intimate partner seems to be an inherent characteristic of the Anxious/ambivalent's attachment style. It may evolve into violence if over and above the imagined inconsistency they project onto their partner, she/he behaves in a manner to confirm those fears. Thus, an inconsistent, unpredictable or "game playing" lover may heighten the ambivalence and conflict harbored by an Anxious/ambivalent adult. This heightened ambivalence and resentment may culminate in using violence as means of "pulling" the partner back into the relationship—a dysfunctional attempt to keep the partner close. This scenario could most likely be manifested by an Anxious/ambivalent person and an either Avoidant or Anxious/ambivalent partner. For an Anxious/ambivalent person, an Avoidant partner is perceived as almost always distant and unattainable. The Avoidant's coolness, rigidity, hostility, and criticism may be interpreted as distancing. The Anxious/ambivalent person may react to this perceived distancing in a violent response to make the partner care.

The pattern of violence which may be exhibited by an Anxious/ambivalent person is most likely to occur already at the courtship phase. The uncertainty involved in courtship relationships may be an added factor which contributes to the stress an Anxious/ambivalent person feels in intimate relationships and may fuel the jealousy and fears of abandonment she/he experiences.

So far theoretical speculations regarding attachment patterns and courtship violence have been presented. While no direct test of these speculations has been carried out, the vast research and relevant evidence on courtship violence partly supports them. Many of the features found to characterize battering men correspond to the patterns described earlier. For example, battering men were described as unpredictable, immature, projecting blame on the partner, jealous, needing to control and use the partner rather than relate to her, insecure, having "Jekyll and Hyde" personalities, and having problems with impulse control (Bernard & Bernard, 1984; Elbow, 1977; Finkelhor, Gelles, Hotaling, & Straus, 1983; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986;

Neidig et al., 1986; Symonds, 1978; Walker, 1979). All these features are very similar to the descriptions of the Anxious/ambivalent pattern. Even the findings regarding intergenerational transmission of violence may be interpreted as transmission of attachment insecurity over and above learned strategies to deal with conflict. Thus, for example, an insecure caregiver who is Anxious/ambivalent may raise a child who is also Anxious/ambivalent and both may behave violently to their children and/or spouses.

Several researchers have also produced typologies of men who batter. Some of these typologies seem quite in accord with the descriptions of the two insecure attachment patterns. For example, Simpson-Subotnik (1983) suggests two basic types of battering men. The first includes overcontrolled men who have rigid inhibitions against expression of aggression so that violence is rare, but when it does occur it is intense and associated with guilt for the violence. This pattern seems to fit the descriptions of the Avoidant individuals. The second type proposed by Simpson-Subotnik is of uncontrolled men. They react with aggression to frustration or provocation and show little inhibition. This type corresponds to the Anxious/ambivalent pattern.

In the same vein, Faulk (1974) found similar patterns of battering men: dependent-passive, dominating, and dependent-suspicious. It is speculated that both the dependent-passive and the dependent-suspicious have Anxious/ambivalent characteristics while the dominating ones have Avoidant characteristics.

Another description which seems to correspond well to the two insecure attachment types is proposed by Symonds (1978). This author describes one type of aggressive man who is impulsive, explosive, poorly controlled, with a "Jekyll and Hyde" personality (this would correspond to Anxious/ambivalent pattern); the other type is of men who are overly controlled and compulsively hostile (perhaps an Avoidant personality).

In general, various lines of research, conducted on married men and using different terminologies, have identified several types of battering men. These types broadly correspond to two major personality configurations: an uncontrolled, impulsive, dependent, and labile personality and a compulsive, rigid, and hostile one. The

first may correspond to the Anxious/ambivalent personality configuration, and the second to the Avoidant personality. While the various studies were conducted mostly with married men, they are relevant to courtship violence as well. Overall, the research findings about personality correlates of men who are violent in their intimate relationship are in accord with the theoretical outline of the two insecure attachment patterns.

Implications for Practice

First, the idea based on attachment theory and advocated here that violence is a distorted form of a functional anger which is geared to maintain and protect rather than destroy intimate relationships, may help practitioners understand and relate to the psychological makeup of an abusive love partner. Further, the analysis presented in this article highlights the importance of themes of threats of abandonment or perceived unavailability of a love partner as triggering stimuli for the eruption of violence. It may therefore help practitioners identify the kinds of interactions most conducive to evoking a violent act.

Second, the two insecure patterns depicted in this article while similar in their basic insecurity differ very dramatically in several respects relevant to interventions. These differences may serve as a basis for a working hypothesis for the practitioner. For example, during intake the practitioner may wish to classify the clients in terms of Secure/Insecure patterns and in terms of similarity to the Avoidant versus Anxious/ambivalent personalities. Bearing in mind their different characteristics the practitioner may probe regarding jealousy, rigidity, and coolness in the relationship. Further, the practitioner may want to inquire about the specific instances that provoke the violence, bearing in mind the distinction between the two insecure patterns. Moreover, specific intervention techniques may be more suitable with each of the attachment types.

Anxious/ambivalent individuals may react with violence when someone dear to her/him becomes less intimate and available, and more distanced, even if this is only temporary, subtle, or projected onto the partner. Similar problems may arise in the therapeutic relationship. An Anxious/ambivalent person may fear abandonment and complain that the therapist does not show enough affection and care. With



an Anxious/ambivalent individual, the practitioner should, therefore, be quite active, setting limits and consistently pointing to the client the inherent inconsistency of his/her inner world. The practitioner should be very cautious not to go along with the rapidly changing conceptions of his/her client, but to exemplify a steady and secure base.

A different picture emerges with the Avoidant person. An Avoidant individual may be more threatened and overtly anxious when someone becomes *more* intimate than desired or manageable for him/her. An Avoidant individual may also become violent when the person he/she has finally learned to trust attempts to break off the relationship. In the therapeutic relationship an Avoidant may fear the therapist will become too close, hence one should be cautious not to show too much warmth and intrusiveness lest the client feel threatened. The practitioner should allow the client to explore his/her inner world quite free from intrusions, providing an atmosphere of nonjudgemental acceptance. In another case, an Avoidant person who has come to trust a therapist may react very strongly, and perhaps violently, if the therapist informs the client about a sudden vacation or termination of the relationship.

Turning to couple therapy, the point of view advocated in the present article is very conducive to interventions, because one may view violence within a relationship as an attempt to equalize an unbalanced relationship. For example, an Avoidant individual may resort to violence as means to negotiate a balance in the issue of intimacy between a sense of belonging and a fear of closeness. Thus, for an Avoidant partner, violence may serve as a distancing tool when closeness is too frightening. For an Anxious/ambivalent person, who feels insecure and powerless in a relationship with a "game playing" partner, violence may be chosen to assert his/her power in the relationship, to prevent the partner from leaving and to keep the boundaries of the relationship. In each of these cases a practitioner may need to expose the balancing effect of violence and help the couple renegotiate a different, better balance. For example, the partner of an Avoidant person may attempt to "leave him/her alone" more often thus lessening the threat of closeness and enabling the Avoidant to show more affection and less violence, or the Avoidant person may learn other means of distancing him/herself beside violence.

In the present article it is proposed that protest and anger are functional attachment behaviors geared to keep and maintain a relationship that is threatened. It is further maintained that violence in intimate relationships may be seen as an exaggerated form of the functional anger which is geared to the same purpose: maintaining an important relationship, balancing its intimacy, and restoring security. Two insecure attachment patterns, Avoidant and Anxious/ambivalent, were described along with their attachment history. It is argued that depending on many other factors contributing to the occurrence of violence, people exhibiting each of these two patterns have a unique and typical way of manifesting violence in a close relationship.

The foregoing analysis presents a theoretical framework which provides both developmental history, and personality characteristics of people involved in courtship violence. It also helps organize in a coherent and theoretical framework a list of personality qualities which have been found to be associated with courtship violence. Future inquiry may utilize this theoretical framework to classify people who are involved in courtship violence in terms of attachment patterns, and study their antecedents and developmental history, as well as the progression of their relationships. Overall, the explanatory potential of the concept of attachment may help the practitioner to accommodate to various types of courtship violence and to fashion his/her interventions accordingly. It may also guide research in this area along the lines and hypotheses proposed in the article.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachment beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44, 709-716.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 147-178.

Bernard, J. L., & Bernard, M. L. (1984). The abusive male seeking treatment: Jekyll and Hyde. *Family Relations*, 33, 543-547.

Billingham, R. E. (1987). Courtship violence: The patterns of conflict resolution strategies across seven levels of emotional commitment. *Family Relations*, 36, 283-289.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. London: Hogarth Press.

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation*. London: Hogarth Press.

Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 3. Loss*. London: Hogarth Press.

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base*. London: Routledge.

Bretherton, I. (1985). Attachment theory: Retrospect and prospect. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points of attachment theory and research* (pp. 211-222).

Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50(1-2, Serial No. 209).

Cassidy, J., & Kobak, R. (1988). Avoidance and its relations to other defensive processes. In J. Belsky & T. Nezworski (Eds.), *Clinical implications of attachment* (pp. 300-323). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cate, R. M., Henton, J. M., Koval, J., Christopher, P. S., & Lloyd, S. (1982). Premarital abuse: A social psychological perspective. *Journal of Family Issues*, 3, 79-90.

Cate, R. M., & Lloyd, S. A. (1988). Courtship. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 409-428). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Crittenden, P. M. (1986). Social networks, quality of child rearing, and child development. *Child Development*, 56, 1299-1313.

Donatas, O., Maratos, O., Fafoutis, M., & Karangelis, A. (1985). Early social development in institutionally reared Greek infants: Attachment and peer interaction (pp. 136-146). *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50, (1-2, Serial No. 203).

Dutton, D., & Browning, J. (1983). *Violence in intimate relationships*. Paper presented at the International Society for Research on Aggression, Victoria, British Columbia.

Edleson, J., Eisikovits, Z., & Guttman, E. (1985). Men who batter women: A critical review of the evidence. *Journal of Family Issues*, 6, 229-247.

Elbow, M. (1977). Theoretical considerations of violent marriages. *Social Work*, 58, 515-526.

Erickson, M. F., Sroufe, L. A., & Egeland, B. (1985). The relationship between quality of attachment and behavior problems in preschool in a high-risk sample. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points in attachment theory and research* (pp. 147-166). *Monograph of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50, (1-2, Serial No. 209).

Faulk, M. (1974). Men who assault their wives. *Medicine, Science and the Law*, 14, 180-183.

Feraro, K. J. (1983). Rationalizing violence: How battered women stay. *Victimology*, 8(3-4), 203-212.

Finkelhor, D., Gelles, R. J., Hotelling, T. J., & Straus, M. A. (1983). *The dark side of families: Current family violence research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Flynn, C. P. (1987). Relationship violence: A model for family professionals. *Family Relations*, 36, 295-299.

Gelles, R. J. (1976). Abused wives: Why do they stay? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 39, 659-668.

Gelles, R. J. (1980). Violence in the family: A review of research in the seventies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42, 873-885.

Gelles, R. J., & Maynard, P. E. (1987). A structural family approach to intervention in cases of family violence. *Family Relations*, 36, 270-275.

Giles-Sims, J. (1983). *Wife battering: A systems theory approach*. New York: Guilford Press.

Grossman, K. E., Grossmann, K., & Schwan, A. (1986). New York: Guilford Press.

Grossmann, K. E., Grossmann, K., & Schwan, A. (1986). Capturing the wider view of attachment: A reanalysis of Ainsworth's Strange Situation. In C. E. Izard & P. B. Read (Eds.), *Measuring emotions in infants and children* (Vol. 2, pp. 124-171). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A., Stockard, J., & Bohmer, S. (1987). Learning courtship aggression: The influence of parents, peers, and personal experiences. *Family Relations*, 36, 276-282.

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.

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

Henton, J., Cate, R., Koval, J., Lloyd, S., & Christopher, S. (1983). Romance and violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 4, 467-482.

Herrenkohl, R., Herrenkohl, L., & Toedter, L. (1983). Perspectives on the intergenerational transmission of abuse. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotelling, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families* (pp. 305-316). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Hindy, L. G., & Schwartz, J. C. (1984, June). *Individual differences in the tendency towards anxious-romantic attachment*. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Personal Relationships, Madison, WI.

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

Kobak, R. R., & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect regulation, and perception of self and others. *Child Development*, 59, 135-146.

Levy, M. B., & Davis, K. E. (1988). Lovestyles and attachment styles compared: Their relations to each other and to various relationship characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 439-471.



- Main, M. (1981). Avoidance in the service of attachment: A working paper. In K. Immelmann, G. W. Barlow, L. Petrionovich, & M. Main (Eds.), *Behavioral development* (pp. 651-693). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Main, M., & Goldwyn, R. (1989). *An adult attachment classification system*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.
- Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood and adulthood: A move to level of presentation. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points of attachment theory and research* (pp. 66-104). *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50(1-2, Serial No. 209).
- Main, M., & Weston, D. R. (1982). Avoidance of the attachment figure in infancy: Descriptions and interpretations. In C. M. Parkes & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *The place of attachment in human behavior* (pp. 31-59). London: Tavistock.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. *Family Relations*, 30, 97-102.
- Morris, D. (1981). Attachment and intimacy. In G. Stricker (Ed.), *Intimacy* (pp. 305-323). New York: Plenum.
- Neldig, D. H., Friedman, D. H., & Collins, B. S. (1986). Attitudinal characteristics of males who have engaged in spouse abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*, 1, 223-233.
- Oppenheim, D., Sagi, A., & Lamb, M. E. (1988). Infant-attachments on the kibbutz and their relations to socio-emotional development four years later. *Developmental Psychology*, 24, 427-433.
- 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.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 368-376.
- Robertson, J. (1953). Some responses of young children to loss of maternal care. *Nursing Times*, 49, 382-386.
- Robertson, J. (1970). *Young children in hospital* (2nd ed.). London: Tavistock.
- Robertson, J., & Bowlby, J. (1952). Responses of young children to separations from their mothers. *Courier Centre internationale Entance*, 2, 131-142.
- Roscoe, B., & Benaske, N. (1985). Courtship violence experienced by abused wives: Similarities in patterns of abuse. *Family Relations*, 34, 419-424.
- Shaver, P., Hazan, C., & Bradshaw, D. (1988). Love as attachment: The integration of three behavioral systems. In R. Sternberg & M. Barnes (Eds.), *The Psychology of love*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Simpson-Jobson, L. (1983). *Overcontrolled and undercon-*
- trolled types of men who batter women*. Paper presented at the North American Meeting of the International Society for Research on Aggression, Victoria, British Columbia.
- Sroufe, L. A. (1983). Infant-caregiver attachment and patterns of adaptation in preschool: The roots of maladaptation and competence. In M. Perlmutter (Eds.), *The Minnesota symposia on child psychology*. (Vol. 16, pp. 41-81). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1990). Interpersonal control and courtship aggression. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 371-394.
- Symonds, A. (1978). The psychodynamics of violence-prone marriages. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 38, 213-222.
- Vivian, D., & O'Leary, D. (1987, July). *Communication patterns in physically aggressive engaged couples*. Paper presented at the Third National Family Violence Research Conference, Durham, NH.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). *The battered woman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Waters, E., Wipman, J., & Sroufe, L. A. (1979). Attachment, positive affect, and competence in the peer group: Two studies in constructive validation. *Child Development*, 50, 821-829.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Family Relations will be publishing a special collection of papers on the theme "*Prevention Programs for Families and Children*." This collection will include articles on primary as well as secondary prevention programs for families and children. Programs focusing on particular family structural types such as single parent families, premarital couples, newly married couples, families with adolescents, etc.; focusing on preventing particular behaviors such as teen sexuality/pregnancy, substance abuse, physical/sexual abuse, etc.; or doing innovative programming such as getting government and the private sector to work together in support of prevention programs, would be of special interest. Articles about small local programs as well as large national programs (such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Just Say No, etc.) that have proven successful are solicited. Papers should provide enough detail that the program can be replicated. Papers that provide measures of effectiveness are particularly appropriate, and thought pieces on the philosophy and theory of programming for families and children or family program evaluation are also welcomed. The deadline for submitting articles is **June 1, 1991**. Instructions for authors are included in the January 1991 issue of Family Relations. Four copies of the manuscript and a nonrefundable \$15 processing fee should be sent to:

Thomas B. Holman
 Department of Family Sciences
 Brigham Young University
 Provo, UT 84602

Inquiries about the special collection topic should go to Thomas B. Holman at the address above or by calling (801) 378-6704.



LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 1 of 3 -



You have printed the following article:

Adult Attachment Patterns and Courtship Violence

Ofra Mayseless

Family Relations, Vol. 40, No. 1. (Jan., 1991), pp. 21-28.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-6664%28199101%2940%3A1%3C21%3AAAPACV%3E2.0.CO%3B2-S>

This article references the following linked citations. If you are trying to access articles from an off-campus location, you may be required to first logon via your library web site to access JSTOR. Please visit your library's website or contact a librarian to learn about options for remote access to JSTOR.

References

The Abusive Male Seeking Treatment: Jekyll and Hyde

J. L. Bernard; M. L. Bernard

Family Relations, Vol. 33, No. 4. (Oct., 1984), pp. 543-547.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-6664%28198410%2933%3A4%3C543%3ATAMSTJ%3E2.0.CO%3B2-L>

Courtship Violence: The Patterns of Conflict Resolution Strategies across Seven Levels of Emotional Commitment

Robert E. Billingham

Family Relations, Vol. 36, No. 3. (Jul., 1987), pp. 283-289.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-6664%28198707%2936%3A3%3C283%3ACVTPOC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0>

Social Networks, Quality of Child Rearing, and Child Development

Patricia M. Crittenden

Child Development, Vol. 56, No. 5. (Oct., 1985), pp. 1299-1313.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-3920%28198510%2956%3A5%3C1299%3ASNQOCR%3E2.0.CO%3B2-J>

Relationship Violence: A Model for Family Professionals

Clifton P. Flynn

Family Relations, Vol. 36, No. 3. (Jul., 1987), pp. 295-299.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-6664%28198707%2936%3A3%3C295%3ARVAMFF%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8>

LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 2 of 3 -



Abused Wives: Why Do They Stay

Richard J. Gelles

Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 38, No. 4. (Nov., 1976), pp. 659-668.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2445%28197611%2938%3A4%3C659%3AAWWDTS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3>

Violence in the Family: A Review of Research in the Seventies

Richard J. Gelles

Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 42, No. 4, Decade Review. (Nov., 1980), pp. 873-885.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2445%28198011%2942%3A4%3C873%3AVITFAR%3E2.0.CO%3B2-O>

A Structural Family Systems Approach to Intervention in Cases of Family Violence

Richard J. Gelles; Peter E. Maynard

Family Relations, Vol. 36, No. 3. (Jul., 1987), pp. 270-275.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-6664%28198707%2936%3A3%3C270%3AASFAT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-M>

Learning Courtship Aggression: The Influence of Parents, Peers, and Personal Experiences

Patricia A. Gwartney-Gibbs; Jean Stockard; Susanne Bohmer

Family Relations, Vol. 36, No. 3. (Jul., 1987), pp. 276-282.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-6664%28198707%2936%3A3%3C276%3ALCATIO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>

Attachment in Late Adolescence: Working Models, Affect Regulation, and Representations of Self and Others

R. Rogers Kobak; Amy Sceery

Child Development, Vol. 59, No. 1. (Feb., 1988), pp. 135-146.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-3920%28198802%2959%3A1%3C135%3AAILAWM%3E2.0.CO%3B2-T>

Courtship Violence among College Students

James M. Makepeace

Family Relations, Vol. 30, No. 1. (Jan., 1981), pp. 97-102.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-6664%28198101%2930%3A1%3C97%3ACVACS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6>

LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 3 of 3 -



A Measure of Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict

M. Afzalur Rahim

The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 26, No. 2. (Jun., 1983), pp. 368-376.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0001-4273%28198306%2926%3A2%3C368%3AAMOSOH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-U>

Courtship Violence Experienced by Abused Wives: Similarities in Patterns of Abuse

Bruce Roscoe; Nancy Benaske

Family Relations, Vol. 34, No. 3. (Jul., 1985), pp. 419-424.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-6664%28198507%2934%3A3%3C419%3ACVEBAW%3E2.0.CO%3B2-W>

Attachment, Positive Affect, and Competence in the Peer Group: Two Studies in Construct Validation

Everett Waters; Judith Wippman; L. Alan Sroufe

Child Development, Vol. 50, No. 3. (Sep., 1979), pp. 821-829.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-3920%28197909%2950%3A3%3C821%3AAPAACI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z>