

QUALITY OF ATTACHMENT
IN
ABUSED AND NONABUSED WOMEN

by

Anita Bloy

B.A. (Honours Psychology), Simon Fraser University, 1988

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
in the
Faculty of Education

©Anita Bloy 1995

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

March 1995

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

NAME Anita Bloy
DEGREE Master of Arts
TITLE Quality of Attachment in Abused
and Nonabused Women
EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Chair Adam Horvath

Janny Thompson
Senior Supervisor

Kim Bartholomew
Assistant Professor, Psychology Department
Member

Patricia K. Kerig
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology, SFU
External Examiner

Date: March 27, 1995

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

Quality of Attachment in Abused and Nonabused Women

Author:

(Signature)

(Name)

March 27/95

(Date)

Abstract

This study used attachment theory as a way of studying the experience of abused women. Twenty abused women were compared with 47 nonabused women on measures of attachment style, attachment dimensions, depressive symptomatology, silencing the self behaviours, relationship attributions, and relationship satisfaction. Results showed that abused women differ from nonabused women in depressive symptomatology, silencing the self behaviours, relationship attributions and relationship satisfaction. Abused women also rated themselves as being less secure and more fearful-avoidant than nonabused women and they feared losing the relationship to a greater degree, saw their partners as less available and used their partners for support to a lesser degree than did nonabused women. Results suggest that attachment theory is a useful perspective from which to view the experience of abused women.

Acknowledgments

To begin with, I would like to thank the many women who shared their experiences with me, by enthusiastically participating in this research study. These women were participating in programs at the Downtown Eastside Women's Centre, Burnaby Family Life's Safe Place, SHARE's Mountainview Drop-In, North Shore and Langley Family Services and a number of Family Place Drop-Ins throughout the Lower Mainland. Without these women, this study would not have been possible.

I would like to thank my senior supervisor, Janny Thompson, for her unending support and guidance over the past two years. She has been instrumental in helping me shape my thesis into a realistic and manageable project. Without her, I'm sure I would still be floundering in a literature search, wondering what to do. I would also like to thank Anne Corbishley for making the first two years of graduate school incredibly enjoyable and intellectually stimulating.

I am indebted to the staff in the Centre for Educational Technology, who helped me decipher SPSSX, and who patiently showed me how to retrieve what I thought were "lost" data files. Their calmness and expertise were greatly appreciated.

I would especially like to thank my husband Harry, who continuously provides me with encouragement and support. He is my biggest fan, and I love him for it. Finally, I would like to thank Jeremy and Katie for helping me keep my thesis in perspective.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Overview	1
Attachment Theory	5
The Present Research	23
Method	26
Results	37
Discussion	41
References	55
Tables	65
Appendix - A - Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form	70
- B - Questionnaire Package	72

Quality of attachment in abused and nonabused women

Overview

Wife assault is a serious personal and social problem. Canadian estimates of prevalence suggest that as many as one million women are abused by their partners each year (Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, 1991; MacLeod, 1987). In British Columbia, it is estimated that 36% of ever-married women have experienced physical and/or sexual violence in a current or previous marriage. The national average is 29% (Battered Women's Support Services, 1993). For many women the problem is not simply one of being shoved or pushed once or twice. Rather, the abuse is a severe, chronic problem of extremely violent behaviour. In documenting Statistics Canada's first national survey on violence against women, Karen Rodgers (1994) reports that for almost two-thirds of women whose spouse or ex-spouse has assaulted them, the violence occurred on more than one occasion. Of women who had experienced violence by a previous partner, three-quarters were subjected to multiple assaults, 41% on more than ten occasions. Of women currently living with an abusive partner, 39% had been violently assaulted more than once, 10% more than ten times.

Among women who had ever been assaulted by their spouses, pushing, grabbing and shoving (25%) was the most commonly reported type of violence, followed by threats (19%), slapping (15%), throwing objects (11%), and kicking, biting and hitting with fists (11%). Other less prevalent types of violence included being beaten, sexually assaulted, choked, hit with an object and having had a gun or knife used against them (Rodgers, 1994).

Emotional abuse is also a predominant part of the abused woman's experience. Emotional abuse can be defined as anything that undermines an individual's self-

esteem, their self confidence, and their sense of competency. Gelles and Straus (1989) point to belittling, scorning, ignoring, tearing down, harping and criticizing as possible forms of emotional abuse. Rodgers (1994) discusses a variety of emotionally abusive situations and cites the percentage of women participating in Statistics Canada's national survey who experienced each incident. The man may insist on knowing where his partner is and with whom at all times (22%); the man may call his partner names in order to put her down or to make her feel bad (21%); the man may not allow his partner to speak with other men because of his unrealistic jealousy (19%); the man may try to limit his partner's contact with family or friends (16%); and the man may limit his partner's independence by not giving her access to, or even telling her about, the family income (10%). Rodgers reports that 77% of women who had been physically and sexually abused by their spouse or ex-spouse also experienced emotional abuse. From the perspectives of the women themselves, it is emotional abuse, rather than physical and sexual abuse that is the most devastating (MacLeod, 1987). Furthermore, Rodgers reports that many women (18%) experienced only emotional abuse from their spouse or ex-spouse.

The seriousness and pervasiveness of wife assault is captured in the following statement by Linda MacLeod.

"Wife battering is the loss of dignity, control, and safety as well as the feeling of powerlessness and entrapment experienced by women who are the direct victims of ongoing or repeated physical, psychological, economic, sexual and/or verbal violence or who are subjected to persistent threats or the witnessing of such violence against their children, other relatives, friends, pets and/or cherished possessions, by their boyfriends, husbands, live-in lovers, ex-husbands or ex-lovers, whether male or female. The term 'wife battering' will also be understood to encompass the ramifications of the violence for the woman, her children, her friends and relatives, and for society as a whole" (MacLeod, 1987, p. 16).

Many social scientists are now looking at the problem of wife assault and

attempting to answer a variety of questions. Some studies attempt to answer the question, Why does wife assault occur? A number of answers, including psychological, sociological, feminist and systemic explanations have been suggested (Gelles, 1993; Kurz, 1993; O'Leary, 1993; Rounsaville, 1978; Stahley, 1978; Yllo, 1993). Other studies have asked, Who are abused women? These studies look at abused women's demographic and personality characteristics (Rounsaville, 1978; Walker, 1984), and their previous experience with abuse either as children or adults (Andrews & Brewin, 1990; Painter & Dutton, 1985; Walker, 1984). A final group of studies has asked, What is the experience of abuse like? These studies look at abused women's emotional, social, psychological and physical responses to the abuse (Bowker, 1993; Frieze, 1979; Gelles & Harrop, 1989; Hilberman & Munson, 1978; Mitchell & Hodson, 1983; Walker, 1983, 1984, 1993), their methods and stages of coping with the abuse (Mills, 1985; Mitchell & Hodson, 1983), their thoughts and attributions surrounding the abuse (Andrews & Brewin, 1990; Cantos, Neidig & O'Leary, 1993; Frieze, 1979; Holtzworth-Munroe, 1988), their social support networks (Mitchell & Hodson, 1983) and their explanations as to why they stay with or leave their abusive partner (Barron, 1991; Gelles, 1976; Strube, 1988; Strube & Barbour, 1983; Strube & Barbour, 1984).

A woman's experience of abuse is multifaceted and is composed of her thoughts, feelings, and behaviours. Her experience is influenced by the responses of others, as well as her past experiences and future expectations. Her experience of abuse is not limited to just one of the previously mentioned factors, but few studies examine two or more aspects of the abused woman's experience. A notable exception is a study by Andrews and Brewin (1990), who report on the interrelationships between abused women's attributions, their past

experience with abuse, their social support network, their depressive symptomatology and the status of the relationship, i.e., whether the women are currently living with or apart from their partner.

Perhaps the lack of attention paid to integrating the many facets of abused women's experience is due to the lack of an overriding theoretical perspective which can guide the research? The present research looks to attachment theory as a possible theoretical guide. The usefulness of employing attachment theory as a way of examining the experience of abused women is demonstrated in a series of studies by Dutton and Painter (1983, 1993).

These researchers term the emotional bond that is formed between an abused woman and her batterer "traumatic bonding" and show that such bonds develop in relationships of unequal power where abusive behaviour is alternated with more positive social behaviour. Traumatic bonds are similar in some respects to the bond between captor and hostage and between cult leader and follower (Painter & Dutton, 1985). Although Dutton and Painter's traumatic bonding theory does incorporate the concepts of the attachment process, their research does not explicitly examine the quality of attachment of abused women.

A recent study by Henderson (1994) extends Dutton and Painter's research and looks at the attachment styles of women who had recently left an abusive partner. She shows that these abused women's attachment styles are correlated with specific psychological and relationship separation variables. The present study furthers this research and looks specifically at the quality of attachment for women currently in relationships with abusive men.

After a brief overview of attachment theory and research, the present paper makes and expands upon theoretical connections between attachment

and the experience of abuse, particularly women's depressive symptomatology, attributions and relationship satisfaction. For example, an abused woman's emotional response of depression, especially when explained from a self-in-relation perspective (Kaplan, 1986), can be theoretically linked to the despair stage of Bowlby's (1973) attachment theory; and the attributions that a woman has surrounding the abusive behaviour of her partner can be theoretically linked to her internal working models.

Attachment Theory

Historically, attachment theory, as formulated by Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) and Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall (1978) focused on the emotional bond between an infant or young child and a care-giving adult (usually the mother). The interaction between the child and caretaker was hypothesized to result in the development of one of three attachment styles (secure, avoidant and anxious/ambivalent). Each attachment style is characterized by specific behaviours and emotional responses and is hypothesized to set the tone for the formation of later relationships outside the family.

Secure infants have a primary caregiver who is responsive and available. These children develop positive expectations about the responsiveness of others and about their own worthiness. Avoidant infants, on the other hand, have a primary caregiver who constantly rebuffs or rejects their attempts to establish physical contact. These children respond with indifference, or as Bowlby termed, detachment. Finally, anxious/ambivalent infants have a primary caregiver who is inconsistent in responding to their needs, being sometimes unavailable and at other times intrusive. These children respond by being either extremely preoccupied with their caregivers (i.e., clinging to them) or by rejecting them

and displaying overt expressions of anger. Bowlby termed this pattern of behaviour, protest.

Continuity of attachment style can be explained in terms of persistent inner working models of the self and of others. Bowlby (1969) describes internal working models as schemas or enduring cognitive representations of the self in relation to other people. Collins and Read (1994) argue that working models not only consist of an individual's beliefs and expectations, but also contain memories of attachment related experiences, attachment related goals and needs, and specific strategies and plans associated with achieving attachment goals. A child learns through interactions with others whether or not other people are available and responsive (model of other) and also whether or not the self is worthy of care and support (model of self). The expectations regarding the self and others affect how an individual interacts and forms relationships with others.

Recent research has focused on the applicability of attachment theory to adult relationships. For example, in a hallmark study, Hazan and Shaver (1987) suggested that adult romantic love is an attachment process that is experienced somewhat differently by people because of variations in their attachment histories. By translating Ainsworth et al.'s (1978) descriptions of infants into terms appropriate to adult romantic love, these researchers developed a single-item, self-report measure of adult attachment style. They showed that the prevalence of the three attachment styles among adults is similar to that reported in studies of infants and that the adult experience of a specific attachment style with a romantic partner is theoretically similar to the child's experience of a specific attachment style with a primary caregiver.

Much discussion and research has centered around how to classify and

measure adult attachment styles. Hazan and Shaver (1987) suggest a threefold typology that is based upon the classification systems of Bowlby and Ainsworth. Bartholomew (1990), however, argues that a fourfold typology more closely reflects the experience of adult attachment. She obtained four distinct patterns of adult attachment by crossing the two levels (positive and negative) of model of self with the two levels (positive and negative) of model of other.

Bartholomew named these attachment styles secure (positive model of self, positive model of other), preoccupied (negative model of self, positive model of other), dismissing-avoidant (positive model of self, negative model of other) and fearful-avoidant (negative model of self, negative model of other).

In a study comparing the three and four category classification systems, Brennan, Shaver and Tobey (1991) note that although there are some similarities and some differences between the two typologies, they are both based upon the same underlying dimensions: dependency and avoidance of intimacy.

Bartholomew's secure and preoccupied styles correspond very closely to Hazan and Shaver's secure and anxious-ambivalent styles, respectively. Individuals who strongly endorse these styles tend to approach intimacy. Bartholomew's dismissing-avoidant and fearful-avoidant styles both correspond to Hazan and Shaver's avoidant style. Although both fearful-avoidant and dismissing-avoidant individuals tend to avoid close relationships, they do so for different reasons. In a theoretical paper, Bartholomew (1990) argues that dismissing-avoidant individuals believe that there is no need for close relationships and are quite content to maintain independence and self reliance. Fearful-avoidant individuals, alternatively, believe that relationships will lead to disappointment and rejection and that by avoiding relationships, they are protected against anticipated pain. Duggan and Brennan (1994) examined correlates of the

avoidant styles and found that fearful-avoidant individuals avoided relationships because of shyness, whereas dismissing-avoidant individuals avoided relationships because of low sociability.

Further differences between fearful-avoidant and dismissing-avoidant individuals have been found in other studies. Employing an attachment interview, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) showed that fearful-avoidant individuals exhibited greater emotional expressiveness, frequency of crying, and warmth, and less self-confidence, and balance of control in relationships than dismissing-avoidant individuals. Employing a single-item, self-report measure of the four attachment styles developed by Bartholomew and Horowitz, Whiffen, Thompson, Blain and Johnson (1994) found that fearful-avoidant individuals exhibited greater depressive symptomatology, self-criticism, dependency, submissiveness and less marital satisfaction than dismissing-avoidant individuals. Finally, employing the attachment interview designed by Bartholomew and Horowitz, Scharfe and Bartholomew (in press) found that the two avoidant styles were different in terms of accommodation strategies. Fearful-avoidant individuals reported passively ignoring the problem or the partner and/or leaving or threatening to leave the relationship in response to destructive partner behaviour. There was not, however, a clear pattern of correlations between dismissing-avoidant ratings and accommodation strategies for responding to destructive partner behaviour.

The measure devised by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) seems to be more sensitive, allowing for a more accurate depiction of an individual's attachment style. Their typology also has the advantage of being sensitive to gender differences. Hazan and Shaver (1987) found no relationship between gender and attachment style, but Bartholomew and Horowitz claim that there is

a difference in the percentage of men and women who endorse the various attachment styles. According to their study, more men than women were dismissing-avoidant and more women than men were preoccupied. This knowledge has implications for any study, including the present one, that examines only the quality of attachment of men or the quality of attachment of women.

Assessing attachment style with categorical measures does not provide a clear picture of the variability of individuals within each style nor does it allow for identification of those individuals who may be blends of two or even three of the attachment styles. For these reasons, many researchers have conceptualized attachment in terms of underlying dimensions. These dimensions reflect particular feelings and behaviours that are representative of the attachment process. For example, West and Sheldon-Keller (1992) examine attachment by looking at proximity seeking behaviour, separation protest, feared loss of an attachment figure, availability of an attachment figure, and use of an attachment figure in times of stress. West and Sheldon-Keller focus solely on insecure adult attachment.

When developing their measure of adult attachment, West and Sheldon-Keller looked directly to Bowlby's and Ainsworth et al.'s work regarding insecure infant attachment. Their measure originally consisted of eight separate dimensions (West, Sheldon & Reiffer, 1987) but, through a series of studies, these researchers reduced the number of discrete attachment dimensions to five (West, personal communication, August, 1993). Proximity Seeking is the tendency to move physically closer to the attachment figure in times of stress. Separation protest is the degree to which physical separation, actual or anticipated, is perceived as threatening to the attachment relationship. Feared Loss is the

inability to sustain confidence in the future of the attachment relationship.

Availability is the extent to which the attachment figure is perceived as reliably accessible. Finally, use of the attachment figure is defined as the extent to which the individual asks for the attachment figure's availability and responsiveness (West & Sheldon-Keller, 1992).

Another group of researchers study attachment by employing dimensions that are extrapolated directly from Hazan and Shaver's (1987) categorical measure. For example, both Simpson (1990) and Collins and Read (1990) divided the three attachment style descriptions into separate clauses, turned each into a complete statement, and measured the degree to which subjects endorsed each statement. Simpson constructed three continuous indices (secure, avoidant, anxious) by adding together the appropriate statements from each of the attachment styles. Collins and Read factor analyzed the items to produce three factors: close, depend and anxiety. These factors do not directly correspond to Hazan and Shaver's three discrete styles (secure, avoidant and anxious), but instead, represent three underlying dimensions.

Much research on romantic adult relationships has employed the attachment measure developed by Hazan and Shaver (e.g. Feeney & Noller, 1990) and/or the dimensional scales developed from it. These studies demonstrate various relationships between attachment measures and romantic feelings, thoughts, or behaviours. For example, secure attachment is correlated with positive and self-assured interaction with others (Feeney & Noller, 1990) and with high levels of interdependence, trust, commitment and satisfaction with a romantic partner (Simpson, 1990). Furthermore, secure lovers describe their most important love experience as being especially happy and friendly (Hazan &

Shaver, 1987). Avoidant attachment is correlated with a tendency to avoid intimacy (Feeney & Noller, 1990) and with a low amount of emotional upset when a relationship dissolves (Simpson, 1990). Avoidant lovers are characterized by emotional highs and lows, and jealousy (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

Anxious/ambivalent attachment is correlated with high emotional dependence, reliance upon partner, preoccupation with the relationship (Feeney & Noller, 1990) and with high emotional upset upon dissolution (Simpson, 1990).

Furthermore, anxious/ambivalent participants in Hazan and Shaver's study experienced love as involving obsession, desire for reciprocation and union, emotional highs and lows, and extreme sexual attraction and jealousy.

Another way of assessing attachment dimensions was developed by Brennan and Shaver (1994). These researchers not only employed statements from Hazan and Shaver's categorical measure but also included other theoretically relevant statements to produce a measure assessing seven underlying dimensions: frustration with partners, proximity seeking, self-reliance, ambivalence, trust/confidence, jealousy/fear of abandonment, and clinging to partners. They found that satisfaction with a romantic partner was positively related to security and to six of their dimensional scales (excluding jealousy/fear of abandonment).

A final way of conceptualizing attachment dimensions is found in the research by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994a). These researchers examined ratings of Bartholomew's four attachment styles and derived two attachment dimensions, positive self-model and positive other-model, that are directly linked to Bowlby's theoretical propositions. The positive self-model dimension was obtained by combining the ratings of the secure and dismissing attachment patterns and subtracting the ratings of the preoccupied and fearful attachment

patterns. The positive other-model dimension was obtained by combining the ratings of the secure and preoccupied attachment patterns and subtracting the ratings of the dismissing and fearful attachment patterns. These researchers argue that positive self-model and positive other-model explain dimensions postulated by other researchers (e.g., Collins and Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Simpson et al, 1992).

All of the previously reported dimensions, regardless of how they were produced, prove useful in understanding the differences in the quality of attachment among individuals. Examining the quality of attachment among different adults is not as straightforward as Hazan and Shaver originally demonstrated. Quality of attachment can be examined by measuring attachment style, underlying attachment dimensions or a combination of the two approaches. Attachment can also be measured by a variety of methods, such as self-report questionnaires, peer and partner-report questionnaires, and interviews. Although this variety of approaches and methods has the potential to create an abundance of useful knowledge regarding attachment, it makes it difficult to compare or to consolidate many of the findings. This concern over measurement issues has been echoed by other researchers (Bartholomew & Thompson, 1995; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994b).

It has been suggested that the length of a romantic relationship is related to attachment style with secure individuals having the longest relationships and anxious/ambivalent individuals having the shortest (Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Kobak & Hazan, 1991). This association between attachment style and relationship length though, may not be as straightforward as it first appears. Recently, researchers have questioned the previously reported retrospective data and have used longitudinal studies to

demonstrate that relationship length is also related to other relationship variables, specific partner pairing, and the gender of individuals with specific attachment styles. For example, Keelan, Dion and Dion (1994) found that secure individuals maintained over time, high levels of satisfaction with their relationships, commitment to their relationships and trust for their partners, whereas insecure individuals reported decreases on all three variables.

Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) demonstrated that there is no universally "good" or "bad" attachment style with respect to romantic relationships, but that the combination of attachment styles within a romantic relationship is important. Relationships between anxious men and avoidant women were characterized by the highest breakup rates across time, whereas relationships between avoidant men and anxious women were at least as stable as relationships between secure individuals. Kirkpatrick and Hazan (1994) found that anxious/ambivalent individuals were just as likely as secure individuals to be with the same partner four years later, compared with avoidant individuals, who were most likely, four years later, to either not be in a relationship or to be seeing more than one person. This brings into question the previously found results that anxious/ambivalent individuals have the shortest relationships. Kirkpatrick and Hazan suggest that anxious/ambivalent individuals are most likely to participate in "on-again, off-again" relationships. It is possible, therefore, that previous research measured anxious/ambivalent respondents during an "off-again" period.

Most adult attachment research focuses on the prevalence and correlates of attachment styles and dimensions in community and college-based samples but does not address similar issues in more narrowly defined groups. A notable exception is a study by Carnelly, Pietromonaco and Jaffe

(1994) that examined the attachment of mildly depressed college women and married women recovering from clinical depression. Recently, attachment theory has also been used to help understand the familial antecedents and long-term consequences of childhood sexual abuse (Alexander, 1992).

Most adult attachment research also focuses on individuals' general attachment styles and attachment styles in romantic relationships, but does not look at the quality of attachment for individuals in a specific relationship. The present research is not concerned with abused women's general attachment style, but instead focuses on the women's attachment with a particular partner. Abused women may possess a predominant attachment style, but may be attached to their abusive partner in a distinctly different way. With this in mind, the present research studied the quality of attachment of women in a specific romantic relationship, and used attachment theory as a way of understanding the abused woman's experience.

Attachment Theory and Depressive Symptomatology in Abused Women

Epidemiological studies of psychiatric disorders show that major depression is a highly prevalent disorder for both men and women (Weissman, 1987). Weissman cites prevalence rates from three large American cities of 6.5/100, 4.6/100 and 6.2/100. She also found that being female; young (born after WW2); having a family history of major depression; and being separated, divorced or in an unhappy marriage are factors that increase an individual's risk of developing a major depressive illness. Not only are women more likely to suffer from depression than men, but women living in unhappy marriages are particularly at risk. Further studies documenting the higher rates of depression for women are cited in Weissman and Klerman (1987).

Kaplan (1986) and Jack (1991) employ the self-in-relation perspective to

explain the high depression rate among women. Grounded in attachment theory, the self-in-relation perspective views the experience of women's depression to be different from the experience of men's depression. Depression in women is seen as the result of distorted aberrations of important aspects of women's normative development.

The self-in-relation perspective is based on the premise that all human beings strive for meaningful relationships with others. More specifically, women's development and psychological growth are centered within relationships and are implicitly linked to women's abilities to create and maintain empathic connections with others. Because of the importance of emotional ties, many women may go to great lengths in order to preserve emotional connectedness with others. They may inhibit their own desires and wants, they may inhibit their feelings of anger and aggression, afraid that expressing such feelings will harm important relationships, and they may blame themselves when their relationships with others fail. According to Kaplan (1986), all of these self-sacrificing attempts to preserve emotional ties with others may lead women to become depressed.

Jack (1991) argues that it is the 'silencing nature' of these behaviours that contribute to women's depression. She argues that women in relationships silence their needs and wishes in order to maintain emotional connectedness with their partner and that this in turn contributes to women feeling as if they have no voice and no sense of self.

This preoccupation with maintaining emotional attachments may be viewed by some as a form of pathological dependence. Jack (1991), however, sees the maintenance of significant relationships not as an unhealthy process, but as a necessary part of healthy functioning. Jack looks to attachment theory as formulated by Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) and claims that attachment

behaviours such as crying, calling, following, clinging and searching are responses designed to ensure the development of close affectional bonds. Maintaining a close and secure bond with significant others is a normal healthy human need. Women who maintain close emotional attachments to others by putting their needs aside or by silencing themselves are acting in ways that are congruent with stereotypical feminine sex-roles. Seeing their needs as less important than those of their partner is an unfortunate, but understandable way that women have learned to maintain emotional bonds. Depression results when these self-sacrificing behaviours fail to ensure a continuing emotional attachment. According to Bowlby (1973) when a child's attachment behaviours fail to ensure the development of a close affectionate bond with a primary caregiver, that child will respond with despair.

The self-in-relation perspective is particularly relevant to the experience of depression in abused women. Women who are abused by intimate partners may become depressed because the abuse symbolizes that they have lost all or most of their close emotional connectedness with their partner.

In relating depression to specific patterns of attachment, Shaver and Brennan (1992) found that depression is predictive of insecurity. Relating the three attachment styles developed by Hazan and Shaver (1987) to the "Big Five" personality dimensions measured by the NEO Personality Inventory, these researchers showed that both avoidant and anxious/ambivalent attachment patterns are positively related to neuroticism (especially the depression subscale).

Research shows that depression is a predominant ingredient in abused women's experience. Using the Centre for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale, Rounsaville (1978) found that 80% of abused women reported a high

level of depressive symptomatology with 20% reporting a level comparable to that of hospitalized patients. This self-report was also correlated with symptom assessment by an examiner who found that 53% of the women had symptoms which warranted a diagnosis of depression. Similarly, Mitchell and Hodson (1983) found that abused women showed high levels of depressive symptomatology with a mean score on the depression scale of the Brief Symptom Inventory that was two standard deviations above the norm for nonpatient females (close to the norm for psychiatric outpatients). Both of these studies (Mitchell & Hodson, 1983; Rounsaville, 1978) examined only abused woman, therefore there was no indication of how abused women compare with nonabused women in terms of depressive symptomatology. The present study included both abused and nonabused women.

Attachment Theory and Attributions of Abused Women

Ever since Heider (1958) developed his theory of 'phenomenal causality,' the study of attributions or how individuals make sense of their social worlds has been an important part of the research done in social and cognitive psychology. The vast majority of this research has asked participants to make causal attributions for the behaviour of either strangers or hypothetical others but more recently the focus has shifted towards measuring attributions of individuals engaged in more personal ongoing relationships. In a review of research on attributions in marriage, Bradbury and Fincham (1990) suggest that there is a relationship between an individual's attributions for partner behaviour, marital satisfaction and the 'health' of the relationship. They report that dissatisfied spouses, compared with satisfied spouses, make attributions for the partner's behaviour that cast it in a negative light and that these attributions are related to low relationship satisfaction. After reviewing dozens of research

studies on distressed married couples, these researchers conclude that, in most cases, attributions for negative relationship events were internal to the actor, stable over time and globally influential across marital situations.

Abused women's attributions for their abuse can be examined in a number of ways. Explanations can centre around who is responsible (locus dimension), upon the likelihood that the abuse will stop (stability dimension) or upon the type and number of situations which are affected by the abuse (globality dimension). In terms of locus of control an abused woman can see the violence as being caused by either her partner or herself. In the first instance the violence may be attributed to a stable cause such as the personality of her partner (e.g., he is violent because he is a mean person) or to unstable situational determinants (e.g., he is violent because he is frustrated with work). Likewise, if a woman sees the violence as being caused by herself, she may attribute the violence to a stable cause such as her own personality (e.g., he hit me because I am stupid) or to an unstable factor such as her own behaviour (e.g., he hit me because I did not do the laundry). The majority of studies conducted on the attributions of abused women provide support for women seeing their partners as primarily responsible (Cantos, Neidig & O'Leary, 1993; Frieze, 1979; Holtzworth-Munroe, 1988; Walker, 1984). Looking at their partners, these women make stable attributions, blaming some unchangeable element of his personality (Cantos, Neidig & O'Leary, 1993). When women do see themselves as responsible for the abuse, they make unstable or behavioural attributions, blaming some modifiable aspect of their behaviour, rather than their character (Andrews & Brewin, 1990; Cantos, Neidig & O'Leary, 1993).

In general, research on the attributions of abused women has provided mixed results and many studies show that women often list more than one

cause for the violence, frequently seeing both themselves and their partner as responsible. Other studies show that an abused woman's attributions are dependent upon a variety of external factors, such as severity of the abuse (Andrews & Brewin, 1990; Frieze, 1979; Holtzworth-Munroe, 1988; Miller & Porter, 1983); frequency and duration of the abuse (Miller & Porter, 1983); the experience of abuse as a child (Andrews & Brewin, 1990; Frieze, 1979); and change in marital circumstances (Andrews & Brewin, 1990).

Frieze (1979) claims that the stability dimension is more important than the locus of control dimension, especially when looking at the women's ability to cope. For example, unstable causes, such as the man's frustration level or the woman's housecleaning behaviours, are amenable to change and therefore offer the women hope of controlling and changing the abusive situation. In contrast, stable attributions, such as personality characteristics, are less likely to be changed and therefore do not offer the women any hope of controlling the situation or of ending the abuse.

In looking at the globality or pervasiveness of the abuse, a woman can explain the violence as being very specific and occurring in only a few distinct situations or she can see the abuse as occurring in and affecting every aspect of her life. Attributing the violence to a specific cause, such as her partner's frustration during income tax time, enables the woman to come up with some specific ways of coping and of helping herself during this time. Attributing the violence to a global cause, such as a recession, does not offer the woman these same specific coping strategies. She is instead left feeling overwhelmed and hopeless about ending the abuse.

According to attribution theories (Helder, 1958; Kelley, 1972) people engage in the attributional process in order to predict and control their

environment. Abused women are no exception. Predicting when the next abusive incident will occur and attempting to prevent it is a common part of the abused woman's experience (Rounsaville, 1978). Evidence for the relationship between perceived control of negative life events, coping, and the mediating effects of specific attributions has been well-documented in the victimization literature (Bulman & Wortman, 1977; Janoff-Bulman, 1979; Miller & Porter, 1983; Wortman, 1976).

The explanation an individual gives as to why a specific event occurs may be related to that individual's internal working models. An individual's internal working models are important knowledge structures through which social events are filtered and understood. Individuals with different attachment styles have different internal models of themselves and others and are therefore, likely to explain relationship events and attribute causes in distinct ways.

In a study focusing on conflicts with a hypothetical dating partner, Collins (in press) offers support for this proposition. She demonstrated that individuals with a secure attachment style were less likely to attribute their partner's problem behaviour to themselves, to something negative about their relationship, and to something global and stable. Securely attached individuals were also less likely to view their partner as having acted with negative intentions. In contrast, avoidant and anxious/ambivalent individuals were more likely to attribute the behaviour to something about themselves and their relationship. They were also more likely to view their partner as having behaved intentionally and as being negatively motivated. In addition, avoidant adults were more likely to believe that their partner's negative behaviour was caused by something he or she could have controlled. Anxious individuals believed the behaviour was caused by something that was stable and not likely to change.

In sum, adults with different attachment styles explained and interpreted the same event in very different ways.

Relationship Satisfaction of Abused Women

Relationship satisfaction is a subjective evaluation of the overall quality of a relationship. It is the degree to which being in a specific relationship meets an individual's needs, expectations and desires. Most research on long-term relationships considers relationship satisfaction as an important variable and correlates relationship satisfaction with a variety of other variables. For example, Bahr, Chappell and Leigh (1983) show that relationship satisfaction is positively related to how well each partner is able to perform various marital roles (eg., paid employment, yardwork/maintenance, childcare, disciplining of children, family recreation, housework, emotional support, sexual intimacy and support of relatives), and the degree to which there is agreement between partners regarding these roles. Congruence between partners on other variables such as personality characteristics (Grayson, 1980) and mate perceptions (Fields, 1983) is also positively related to relationship satisfaction.

Other variables that have been correlated with relationship satisfaction are style of communication, sexual satisfaction, the degree to which each individual holds stereotypical (i.e., masculine or feminine) attitudes and personality characteristics, individual's sexual history, individual's early social environments, and specific personality characteristics, such as neuroticism, impulse control and impatience/irritability (Feeney, Noller & Callan, 1994; Fields, 1983; Grayson, 1980; Hendrick, 1981; Kelly & Conley, 1987; McEwan & Barling, 1993; Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1990).

Recent research also examines the link between relationship satisfaction and attachment. There is a general consensus among researchers that security

ratings are positively related to relationship satisfaction ratings (Brennan & Shaver, in press; Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson, 1990; Whiffen, Thompson, Blain & Johnson, 1993). Regardless of how attachment is measured (i.e., 3 discrete styles based on Hazan & Shaver's typology, 4 discrete styles based on Bartholomew's typology or continuous ratings of attachment dimensions) secure individuals are more satisfied with their intimate relationships than are insecure individuals. This relationship has been found in dating couples (Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson, 1990) and in married or cohabiting couples (Kobak & Hazan, 1991).

There are conflicting results though, when examining the different insecure styles. For example, Simpson (1990) showed that high ratings on both avoidant and anxious/ambivalent scales are negatively related to ratings of relationship satisfaction, but Brennan & Shaver (in press) argued that the negative relationship is only significant for the avoidant style. There is no relationship between the anxious/ambivalent style and relationship satisfaction. Furthermore, a study by Whiffen, Thompson, Blain and Johnson (1994) which looked at the four attachment patterns developed by Bartholomew (1990) showed that both secure and dismissing-avoidant styles are positively related to relationship satisfaction.

How does the research on relationship satisfaction and attachment help one in understanding the relationship satisfaction of abused women? Besides the intuitive stance that abused women are less satisfied than nonabused women, two areas of research provide support for such a hypothesis. The first line of reasoning is based on the finding that a man's impulsive/aggressive behaviour is negatively correlated with his partner's satisfaction with the relationship (Kelly & Conley, 1987). The second line of reasoning is based on the finding that negative communication behaviours, such as criticizing,

complaining, and sarcastic remarks are also negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction (Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1990). Although abusive men are not a homogeneous group, who demonstrate the same personality characteristics or behaviours, they do rate significantly higher than nonabusive men on antisocial behaviour, of which impulsivity/aggression and negative communication styles are a part (Beasley & Stoltengerg, 1992; Bernard & Bernard, 1984; Else, Wonderlich, Beatty, Christie & Staton, 1993). The preceding findings suggest that abused women see their relationships as less satisfying than nonabused women. The present study aimed to directly measure abused women's satisfaction with their relationship and to examine the relationship between attachment and relationship satisfaction.

The Present Research

Past studies of abused women have provided a large amount of descriptive information. Many of these studies are limited in their usefulness due to their failure to provide a comparison group of nonabused women (e.g., Mitchell & Hodson, 1983; Rounsaville, 1978). The present research aimed to rectify this concern by examining the experiences of both abused and nonabused women. The present study also aimed to extend adult attachment research to the study of abused women.

The present research is based upon the stance that any differences in the quality of attachment between abused and nonabused women are due to the very nature of their relationship experiences. Attachment was assessed with the West and Sheldon-Keller dimensional scales (1992) and a self-report measure developed from the Bartholomew and Horowitz self-report measure (1991). Bartholomew and Horowitz's self-report measure focuses on general attachment

relationships, or romantic relationships as a whole. The self-report measure used in the present study focuses on the women's current romantic relationship. Furthermore, by measuring attachment dimensions it is possible to discern which attachment feelings and behaviours are reflected in the abused woman's relationship with her partner.

Hypotheses

The Quality of Attachment. A number of hypotheses regarding attachment in a specific romantic relationship are presented. Furthermore, specific hypotheses regarding the relationship between the self-report measure based on Bartholomew's (1990; & Horowitz, 1991) classification system and the West and Sheldon-Keller scales (1992) are also presented. Individuals who rate themselves high on the secure and the preoccupied measure possess a positive model of other. They therefore, will want to be close to their partners, will see their partners as available and responsive and will use their partners for support to a greater degree than will individuals who rate themselves high on the dismissing-avoidant and fearful-avoidant measures. Individuals who rate themselves high on the secure, dismissing-avoidant and fearful-avoidant measures will also protest to a lesser degree when they are separated from their partners than individuals who rate themselves high on the preoccupied measure. Preoccupied individuals see the acceptance of valued others as a necessary prelude to self-acceptance. Without others, they feel lost. These individuals will therefore feel resentful and abandoned when separated from their partner. Finally, individuals who rate themselves high on the secure measure will fear the relationship ending to a lesser degree than individuals who rate themselves high on the preoccupied, dismissing-avoidant and fearful-avoidant measures. Secure individuals possess a positive model of themselves

and a positive model of others; they therefore have faith both in themselves and in their partner. There is no need to worry about the relationship coming to an end.

Attachment and Depressive Symptomatology. It is expected that because of the positive model of the self, that individuals who rate themselves high on the secure and the dismissing-avoidant measures will experience depressive symptomatology and report self-silencing behaviours to a lesser degree than will individuals who rate themselves high on the preoccupied and fearful-avoidant measures.

Attachment and Attributions. Based on previous research (Collins, in press), it is expected that secure individuals will make more unstable and specific attributions for negative partner behaviour than will insecure individuals. Insecure individuals will make more stable and global attributions. No specific predictions are being made regarding the locus of control measure.

Abused Women and Quality of Attachment. In terms of their specific romantic relationship, it is expected that abused women will rate themselves as less secure, more fearful and more preoccupied than nonabused women. It is also expected that abused women will see their partners as less available, that they will not use their partners for support and that they will fear losing their relationship to a greater degree than nonabused women. Furthermore, abused women will want to be around their partners and will see their partners as a secure base to a lesser degree than nonabused women.

Abused Women and Depressive Symptomatology. It is expected that abused women will report more depressive symptomatology and more silencing behaviours than nonabused women.

Abused Women and Attributions. It is expected that abused women will

make stable and global attributions for negative partner behaviours to a greater degree than will nonabused women. Because of previous mixed results, no specific prediction is being made concerning the locus of control measure.

Abused Women and Relationship Satisfaction. It is expected that abused women will be less satisfied with their relationship than nonabused women.

To summarize the hypothesized results, it is expected that being in a relationship with an abusive man will be associated with a particular pattern of attachment, depressive symptomatology, attributions and relationship satisfaction.

Method

Procedure

Women who were presently involved in romantic heterosexual relationships (i.e., dating, common-law or married) constituted the target sample. Women were recruited from community and counselling centres in the Lower Mainland where they were participating in either programs for Abused Women or Drop-In Parent groups.

The researcher visited these community and counselling centres on an ongoing basis for a period of approximately six months and interacted on a regular basis with the female clients at each centre. The researcher asked the women to participate in a study on intimate relationships and gave them the option of either completing a questionnaire package at the centre or of taking the package home and returning or mailing it to the experimenter at a later date. Most women completed the questionnaire package at the centre and therefore were able to discuss any difficulties or problems in understanding the questionnaires with the experimenter. Two hundred questionnaire packages

were distributed and 79 packages (39.5%) were returned.

Each woman was asked the status of her romantic relationship in a demographic questionnaire. If she indicated that she was together with her partner, either dating, married or cohabiting, then her questionnaire package was included in the data analysis.

Participants

The final sample consisted of 67 women who reported being currently involved with romantic partners. Five women were in a dating relationship and 62 women were either married or living in a common-law relationship.

Demographic information regarding these women is presented in Table 1.

Most women (64%) reported that they contributed to the family income by either running a family business from within the home, or by working either part-time or full-time outside of the home. Twenty-seven percent of women's paid employment centered around occupations that involved children, such as child minding, teaching or nursery school supervising. Nine percent of the women worked in retail-based jobs, 8% worked in business-related jobs, such as secretarial and management, 8% worked in health related jobs and 13% held a mixture of "other" types of jobs, such as artist, audio engineer and library assistant. The remaining 36% of women reported that their primary occupation was being a wife and mother.

Measures

The questionnaire package consisted of the following measures which were presented in the order given. After the Beck Depression Inventory, a two page questionnaire on social support, developed by Sarason, Levine, Basham and Sarason (1983), was inserted in order to help participants focus on relationships. The social support measure was a 'filler' item and was not used in

any data analysis.

Beck Depression Inventory (BDI). The BDI (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock & Erbaugh, 1961) is a well-established self-report measure of depressive symptomatology that asks respondents to choose one of four options for each of 21 questions. Each of the four options represent a different severity of depressive symptomatology. Respondents can receive a score ranging from 0, which indicates a lack of depressive symptomatology, to 63, which indicates extremely severe depressive symptomatology. In a review of the psychometric properties of the BDI, Beck, Steer and Garbin (1988) reported that for nonpsychiatric populations the BDI has very good internal consistency. The present study obtained a reliability alpha of .88. Beck et al. (1988) reported test-retest reliabilities for nonpsychiatric populations over an average interval of one week that range from .60 to .90.

Beck and his colleagues also reported on the validity of the BDI. In terms of concurrent validity, they reported high correlations ranging from .56 to .86 between the BDI and a number of other measures of depression (Hamilton Psychiatric Rating Scale for Depression, Zung Self Reported Depression Scale, MMPI Depression Scale). The BDI also demonstrates high construct validity. It is highly correlated with measures which assess behaviours and attitudes that are theoretically linked with depression (eg. suicide, alcoholism, adjustment, anxiety & social desirability). Finally, the BDI exhibits good discriminant validity. It differentiates between psychiatric and nonpsychiatric subjects and between subtypes of depression (Beck, Steer & Garbin, 1988).

Close Relationships Questionnaire (CRQ). The CRQ (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) is a self-report measure of attachment style that asks participants to choose which one of four paragraphs best describes their relationships with

others. Participants are also asked to rate on a seven point Likert scale, the degree to which each of the paragraphs is representative of themselves in relationships, with the number "one" anchored to the statement "not at all like me" and the number "seven" anchored to the statement "very much like me". The present study also asked participants to rate on a seven point Likert scale, the degree to which each of the paragraphs is representative of themselves in their current romantic relationship. The four alternatives correspond to the four attachment styles described by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). In their sample of undergraduate students 47% were secure, 21% were fearful-avoidant, 18% were dismissing-avoidant and 14% were preoccupied. The reliability of the CRQ is demonstrated by the fact that other studies using the CRQ have revealed similar distributions. For example, in a sample of married couples, Whiffen, Thompson, Blain and Johnson (1993) found that 51% of individuals were secure, 23% were fearful-avoidant, 12% were dismissing-avoidant and 14% were preoccupied. Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) also reported their CRQ self-ratings to be moderately correlated with their interview measure of attachment demonstrating construct validity. Furthermore, Bartholomew (1989 - cited in Scharfe & Bartholomew (1994)) reported moderate test-retest reliabilities over a two month interval with correlations of .71 for secure, .64 for fearful-avoidant, .59 for preoccupied and .49 for dismissing-avoidant.

Dyadic Adjustment - Satisfaction Subscale (DASS). The DASS (Spanier, 1976) is a ten item questionnaire that measures an individual's satisfaction with their marriage or long-term relationship. Respondents can receive a score ranging from 0, which indicates extreme dissatisfaction with their relationship to 50, which indicates extreme satisfaction with their relationship. Internal consistency of the DASS in the present study is excellent, with a reliability alpha

of .91. The DASS correctly classifies married and recently divorced individuals, showing that the subscale is significantly correlated to the external criterion of marital status. In a study by Spanier (1976) the mean satisfaction scores for married and divorced individuals were 40.5 and 22.2 respectively.

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale, of which the DASS is a subscale, has been shown to be correlated with other measures of marital adjustment, such as the Locke-Wallace Marriage Adjustment Scale, indicating that both scales measure the same general construct. The correlations between these two scales were .86 and .88 for married and divorced respondents respectively (Spanier, 1976).

Reciprocal Attachment Questionnaire (RAQ). The RAQ (West & Sheldon-Keller, 1992) is a self-report measure of attachment dimensions or components that asks participants to rate on a five point Likert scale, the degree to which they agree or disagree with 15 statements. Each statement taps one of five dimensions (proximity seeking, separation protest, feared loss, availability and use). Respondents can receive scores ranging from three to 15 for each of the five dimensions, with higher scores indicating agreement with an attachment dimension. Reliability alphas in the present study are .73 for proximity seeking, .69 for separation protest, .77 for feared loss, .83 for availability and .83 for use of attachment figure. Test-retest reliabilities over a four month period have also been obtained with correlations ranging from .63 for proximity seeking to .82 for use. (West & Sheldon-Keller, 1992). The RAQ also demonstrates good face validity. On the surface, individual items seem to tap the dimensions they are supposed to measure. For example, "I have to have my attachment figure with me when I'm upset" is a good example of the proximity seeking dimension.

Silencing the Self Scale (STSS). The STSS (Jack, 1991) is a 31 item self-report questionnaire that assesses specific schemas associated with depression.

Respondents are asked to rate on a five point Likert scale the degree to which they agree or disagree with statements that describe behaviour in relationships. Examples of statements are "I tend to judge myself by how I think other people see me", "I often feel responsible for other people's feelings" and "I speak my feelings with my partner, even when it leads to problems or disagreements". Respondents can receive a score ranging from 31 to 155, with higher scores indicating a greater degree of silencing. The STSS has very good internal consistency with a reliability alpha in the present study of .90.

In a study by Jack and Dill (1992) in which the STSS was used to assess depression in 140 women from three battered women's shelters, the internal and test-retest reliabilities of this sample were .94 and .93 respectively.

The STSS has also been shown to be correlated with the Beck Depression Inventory. Correlations ranging from .50 to .52 illustrate that both scales measure the same general construct. Furthermore, the STSS varied significantly in the expected direction across three distinct female populations (undergraduate students, pregnant drug-using women and abused women). STSS scores were lowest in students ($M = 78$) and highest in abused women ($M = 100$) (Jack & Dill, 1992).

Relationship Attribution Measure - short version (RAM). The RAM (Fincham & Bradbury, 1992) is a self-report questionnaire that directly measures causal and responsibility attributions, though the present study utilizes only those statements that address causality. After reading an example of a partner behaviour, respondents are asked to rate on a five point Likert scale the degree to which they agree or disagree with three attribution statements that assess locus of causality, stability and globality. The four stimuli statements are 1. Your partner criticizes something you say, 2. Your partner begins to spend less

time with you, 3. Your partner does not pay attention to what you are saying and 4. your partner is cool and distant. All of these stimuli statements represent negative partner behaviour. In order to balance this negativity, the present study added a positively framed filler statement (Your partner compliments you).

Respondents can receive scores ranging from four to 24, for each of the attribution dimensions. For the locus of causality dimension, a score of four indicates that the respondent sees the self as the sole cause of the partner's behaviour, and a score of 24 indicates that the respondent sees the partner as the sole cause. For the stability dimension, a score of four indicates that the respondent attributes the behaviour solely to unstable factors, and a score of 24 indicates that the respondent attributes the behaviour solely to stable factors. For the globality dimension, a score of four indicates that the respondent attributes the behaviour solely to specific factors, and a score of 24 indicates that the respondent attributes the behaviour solely to global factors.

The short version of the RAM shows good internal consistency. The present study (not including the positive filler statement) obtained alphas of .71 for locus of causality, .83 for stability and .85 for globality. Most of the attribution dimensions assessed by the RAM are also significantly related to corresponding attribution dimensions for real life marital difficulties. The only attribution dimension assessed by the RAM that was not significantly correlated with corresponding attributions for real-life marital problems was the locus of causality dimension as expressed by wives. Significant correlations ranged from .27 for husband's locus of causality attributions to .44 for husband's globality attributions (Fincham & Bradbury, 1992).

Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). The CTS (Straus, 1990) is a self-report or interview instrument used to assess the amount and type of tactics used by

family members to resolve conflict. The present study employed a self-report format that asked participants to rate on a seven point Likert scale how many times within the past six months their partner had used each of 18 conflict tactics with them (ranging from "never" to "more than 20"). The CTS can be divided into three subscales, the reasoning subscale which contains three items, the verbal aggression subscale which contains six items, and the violence subscale which contains nine items. An example of a reasoning tactic is "discussed an issue calmly", an example of a verbally aggressive tactic is "threatened to hit or throw something at you" and an example of a violent tactic is "used a knife or fired a gun". The CTS has moderate internal consistency with reliability alphas in the present study of .45, .86 and .83 for each of the three subscales; reasoning, verbal aggression and violence respectively.

There is strong evidence that the CTS has good concurrent and construct validity. Concurrent validity was established by asking University students how often their parents had done each of the items in the CTS and correlating their responses to the responses of their parents. Correlations obtained ranged from -.12 for wives' responses on the reasoning subscale to .64 for husbands' responses on the violence subscale (Straus, 1990). The fact that the reasoning subscale is comprised of only three items could account for the low validity and low reliability alphas obtained. The present study focuses on verbally aggressive and physically violent tactics, thus making it possible to overlook the low validity and reliability alphas of the reasoning subscale.

Construct validity is demonstrated by the fact that numerous studies (cited in Straus, 1990) have found correlations between the CTS and other variables, all of which are consistent with relevant theory. The CTS also has good face validity, since all of the acts, specifically those in the verbal aggression and

violence subscales, describe abusive acts that can be used by one family member on another.

Index of Spouse Abuse - Non Physical Subscale (ISANP). The ISANP (Hudson & McIntosh, 1981) is a 19 item scale that measures the degree of nonphysical abuse within marital or cohabiting relationships. Respondents are asked to rate on a five point Likert scale the degree to which their partner uses 19 different emotionally abusive behaviours towards them (ranging from "never" to "very frequently"). Examples of emotionally abusive behaviours are "my partner belittles me", " my partner acts like I am his personal servant" and "my partner is jealous and suspicious of my friends". Each of the 19 items are weighted, to reflect the more serious nature of some of the emotionally abusive behaviours, versus others. Respondents can receive overall scores ranging from -1.3, which indicates a lack of emotional abuse, to 100, which indicates an extremely high degree of emotional abuse. The ISANP has excellent internal consistency with a reliability alpha in the present study of .95.

The ISANP also demonstrates very good construct validity (Hudson & McIntosh, 1981). The ISANP correlates highly with the clinical status of women concerning the presence or absence of spouse abuse ($r = .80$) and also with other variables that are theoretically linked to the experience of abuse. For example, alphas of .56, .49 and .47 were obtained when the ISANP was correlated with fearfulness, depression and unhappiness respectively. (Hudson & McIntosh, 1981).

Demographic Questionnaire. This self-report questionnaire asked women to respond to a variety of questions on demographics, such as age, family income, cultural and religious backgrounds, education, current status and length of relationship, and number of children (if any).

Formation of the Abused and Nonabused Groups

Identification of whether a woman was abused or nonabused was dependent upon the woman's responses on the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1990) and the nonphysical subscale of the Index of Spouse Abuse (ISANP; Hudson & McIntosh, 1981). Abusive relationships generally involve physical and emotional abuse, though some women experience only emotional abuse. It is rare for a woman to experience only physical abuse because of the emotional and psychological repercussions of such an act (Walker, 1984). It was necessary therefore, to employ measures of both physical and emotional abuse to determine group assignment.

Women who endorsed any of the physical violence measures on the CTS or who obtained a score of greater than or equal to 25 on the ISANP were placed in the "Abused Women Group." The CTS selection criteria was based on the growing understanding that physically violent acts almost never occur in isolation. They are almost always preceded by a period of escalating psychological, verbal or economic violence (MacLeod, 1987; Walker, 1984). Therefore a woman who endorses even one physically violent act is most likely in a relationship with an abusive man. The ISANP selection criteria was based on the findings of Hudson and McIntosh (1981). These researchers found that an ISANP score of 25 was the best clinical cut-off score in terms of its ability to correctly classify abused women. In their study this criteria correctly classified 90.7% of the sample.

Based on these criteria, 20 women were classified as being abused and 47 women were classified as being nonabused.

Analytic Strategy

Correlations were calculated in order to test hypotheses concerning the

relationship between the two measures of attachment employed in the present study (the self-report measure based on Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) measure, and the West and Sheldon-Keller dimensional scales); attachment and depression; and attachment and attributions.

Next, abused women were compared to nonabused women. First it was necessary to show that the study consisted of two distinct groups of women, who differed only in the amount of abuse they experienced in their romantic relationships. This was accomplished by using a series of chi squares and t-tests to compare the groups on demographic variables; two t-tests to compare the groups on the selection variables (i.e., the physical violence subscale of the CTS & the ISANP); and a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to compare the groups on the remaining two subscales of the CTS.

In order to test hypotheses concerning the differences between abused women and nonabused women on quality of attachment, depressive symptomatology, and attributions, a series of MANOVAs were performed. Univariate F tests were interpreted only if the multivariate F test was significant at the .001 level. The hypothesis regarding relationship satisfaction was tested using a t-test.

Supplementary Analyses

A series of analyses of covariance were performed in order to further the understanding of the differences between abused and nonabused women. By partialling out attachment variables (measured by the CRQ and the RAQ), the relationship between abuse and depressive symptomatology, attributions, and relationship satisfaction is made clearer. By partialling out depressive symptomatology (measured by the STSS and the BDI), relationship attributions (measured by the RAM) and relationship satisfaction (measured by the DASS),

the relationship between abuse and attachment is made clearer. These results are reported only if they add to the information obtained from the MANOVAs.

Results

Table 2 shows the correlations obtained between the romantic attachment ratings based on Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) measure and West and Sheldon-Keller's (1992) attachment dimensions, depressive symptomatology measured by the BDI and the STSS and attributions measured by the RAM.

Ratings of the secure measure correlated negatively with fear of losing the relationship, and positively with availability of partner, and use of partner for support. Women who rated themselves high in security did not fear or worry about the relationship ending. They also perceived their partners to be available and responsive and asked their partners for support when needed. Ratings of the secure measure also correlated negatively with the BDI, meaning that women who rated themselves high in security, rated themselves low in terms of depressive symptomatology. Finally, ratings of the secure measure correlated negatively with stability and globality, meaning that women who rated themselves high in security made unstable and specific attributions for negative partner behaviour.

Ratings of the fearful-avoidant measure correlated positively with fear of losing the relationship, and negatively with availability of partner, and use of partner for support. Women who rated themselves high in fearful-avoidance had little confidence in the future of their romantic relationship, did not perceive their partners to be available and responsive and did not ask their partners for support when needed. Ratings of the fearful-avoidant measure also correlated

positively with the BDI and the STSS. Women who identified with the fearful-avoidant pattern saw themselves as exhibiting a high degree of depressive symptomatology and silencing behaviours. Finally, ratings of the fearful-avoidant measure did not significantly correlate with any of the attribution dimensions.

Ratings of the preoccupied measure correlated positively with fear of losing the relationship, meaning that women who identified with the preoccupied pattern, feared or worried about the dissolution of the relationship. The ratings of the preoccupied measure did not correlate with either the BDI or the STSS. Finally, ratings of the preoccupied measure correlated positively with globality, meaning that women who saw themselves as being preoccupied, made global attributions for negative partner behaviour.

Ratings of the dismissing-avoidant measure correlated positively with fear of losing the relationship, and negatively with availability of partner, and use of partner for support. Women who rated themselves high in dismissingness, like the women who rated themselves high in fearful-avoidance, worried about their relationship coming to an end, did not perceive their partners to be available and responsive and did not ask their partners for support when needed. The ratings of the dismissing-avoidant measure also correlated positively with the BDI, meaning that women who identified with the dismissing-avoidant pattern saw themselves as exhibiting a high degree of depressive symptomatology. This was in direct contradiction to what was expected. It was hypothesized that the dismissing-avoidant measure would be negatively correlated with both measures of depression. Finally, ratings of the dismissing-avoidant measure did not significantly correlate with any of the attribution dimensions.

None of the romantic attachment measures were significantly correlated with the proximity seeking dimension, the separation protest dimension or locus

of causality.

Ensurance of Two Distinct Groups Based Solely on Experience of Abuse

Abused women and nonabused women were compared on the following demographic characteristics: family income, religious affiliation, level of education, number of months married or dating, number of children living at home, age and whether or not English was their first language. T-tests and chi-squared tests revealed that there was no significant difference between the two groups on any of the demographic variables.

A manipulation check however, found differences in the amount of abuse experienced by both groups. T-tests performed on the violence subscale of the CTS and the ISANP showed that abused women experience more physical abuse ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 6.06$) than nonabused women ($M = 0.0$, $SD = 0.0$), $t(65) = 4.41$, $p < .001$, and more emotional abuse ($M = 40.56$, $SD = 17.96$) than nonabused women ($M = 7.35$, $SD = 7.96$), $t(65) = 10.55$, $p < .001$. Furthermore, a MANOVA performed on the reasoning and verbal aggression subscales of the CTS showed that abused women experience fewer reasoning tactics from their partner ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 2.5$) than do nonabused women ($M = 7.89$, $SD = 3.14$), $F(1,64) = 20.09$, $p < .001$ and more verbal aggression tactics ($M = 19.69$, $SD = 6.27$) than do women whose partners were nonabusive ($M = 6.45$, $SD = 6.08$), $F(1,64) = 63.07$, $p < .001$.

Differences in Quality of Attachment

Means and standard deviations for the four romantic attachment measures and the five attachment dimensions are presented in Table 3. A MANOVA performed on the attachment measures shows that abused women rated themselves as being less secure ($F(1,52) = 6.61$, $p < .05$) and more fearful ($F(1,52) = 9.57$, $p < .01$) than did nonabused women. Abused women also

expressed a greater fear of losing the relationship ($F(1,52) = 24.81, p < .001$), perceived their partner to be less available ($F(1,52) = 30.97, p < .001$) and used their partner for support ($F(1,52) = 20.72, p < .001$) to a lesser degree than did nonabused women. There was no difference between abused and nonabused women in the degree to which they were preoccupied with their romantic relationship. There were also no differences in the degree to which abused and nonabused women sought to be around their partners or saw their partners as a secure base.

Differences in Depression

Means and standard deviations for the BDI and the STSS are presented in Table 4. A MANOVA performed on these two measures of depression shows that abused women experienced more severe depressive symptomatology than nonabused women ($F(1,65) = 17.91, p < .001$) and reported more silencing behaviour than nonabused women ($F(1,65) = 60.36, p < .001$).

Differences in Attributions

Means and standard deviations for the three types of causal attributions are presented in Table 4. A MANOVA performed on the attribution measures shows that abused women make more stable ($F(1,58) = 31.31, p < .001$) and more global ($F(1,58) = 20.49, p < .001$) attributions, than nonabused women.

Differences in Relationship Satisfaction

The mean and standard deviation for the DASS is presented in Table 4. A t-test performed on the relationship satisfaction measure shows that abused women are less satisfied with their relationships than nonabused women ($t(65) = -7.32, p < .001$).

Supplementary Analyses

Controlling for attachment, as assessed by the four romantic attachment

scales, there was a continued significant difference between abused and nonabused women in regards to depressive symptomatology ($F = 5.48, p < .05$), silencing behaviours ($F = 24.51, p < .001$), relationship satisfaction ($F = 30.71, p < .001$), stability of attributions ($F = 10.93, p < .01$), and globality of attributions ($F = 6.13, p < .05$).

Controlling for attachment, as measured by West and Sheldon-Keller's attachment dimensions, there was a continued significant difference between abused and nonabused women in regards to silencing behaviours ($F = 10.25, p < .01$), and relationship satisfaction ($F = 5.9, p < .05$). Differences between abused and nonabused women in depressive symptomatology approached significance ($F = 2.87, p < .1$).

Controlling for depressive symptomatology, silencing behaviours, relationship satisfaction, and attributional measures, differences between abused and nonabused women on measures of attachment were no longer significant.

Discussion

Overview of Results

The purpose of the present research was to use attachment theory as a way of examining the experiences of abused women and to compare abused women with nonabused women on measures of attachment, depressive symptomatology, attributions and relationship satisfaction. By examining the quality of attachment of abused women, the present study contributed to the existing knowledge regarding attachment theory.

Attachment Theory as a "Guide." The present research used attachment theory as a way of examining the experience of abused women. With this in

mind, hypotheses regarding the relationships between attachment and depressive symptomatology, and between attachment and attributions were tested. Although not every one of the specific hypotheses were supported, there was evidence that the quality of attachment was correlated with depressive symptomatology and with attributions for negative partner behaviour. Specifically, the more securely attached women were, the less depressive symptomatology they reported and the more likely they were to attribute negative partner behaviours to specific and unstable factors. Examination of the results for ratings of the insecure attachment patterns showed that the more preoccupied women were, the more likely they were to attribute negative partner behaviours to global factors. The more fearfully attached women were, the more depressive symptomatology and silencing behaviours they reported. Finally, the more dismissingly attached women were, the more depressive symptomatology they reported.

The finding that the dismissing-avoidant measure was positively correlated with the BDI is in direct opposition to what was expected. This finding can perhaps be explained by focusing on the dismissing individual's model of others. Theoretically, dismissing-avoidant individuals have a negative model of others in that they perceive others to be unreliable and rejecting. Believing that others are unaccessible as sources of emotional support could possibly result in overwhelming feelings of being totally alone. It is perhaps this feeling of loneliness and the belief that one can only depend upon oneself that contributes to feelings of depression. Although previous studies have stressed the impact of model of self on depressive symptomatology (Beck, 1979), emphasizing high self-esteem, self-assurance and positive self-image as negative correlates of depression, the present study suggests that model of other may

also contribute to depressive symptomatology.

Carnelly, Pietromonaco and Jaffe (1994) offer partial support for this idea. In a study examining the correlations between depression, working models of others and relationship functioning, these researchers showed that mildly depressed college women, in contrast to nondepressed college women, evidenced greater preoccupation and greater fearful avoidance in a dating relationship. Carnelly and her colleagues extrapolate from these results and suggest that depressed individuals hold a negative model of self and both positive and negative models of others. In a second study Carnelly et al. suggest that experiencing clinical depression may be linked specifically to fearful avoidance (i.e., a negative model of self and a negative model of others).

In summary the correlations between attachment and depressive symptomatology and between attachment and attributions provide preliminary support for the idea that attachment theory is a useful theoretical perspective that can guide research with abused women. The present study shows that attachment theory provides a way of integrating some of the emotional and cognitive facets of an abused woman's experience. More specifically, her experience of depressive symptomatology and silencing the self behaviours are associated with the fearful pattern of attachment, and her tendency to attribute negative partner behaviours to stable and global factors is negatively associated with the secure pattern of attachment.

Comparing Abused and Nonabused Women. Previous research has accumulated a wealth of descriptive information regarding abused women. The present research attempted to augment past research by comparing abused women with nonabused women. With this in mind, hypotheses regarding the differences between abused and nonabused women on measures of

attachment, depressive symptomatology, attributions and relationship satisfaction were tested. Results provide support for all four sets of hypotheses.

In terms of the quality of attachment, there were significant differences between abused and nonabused women. Abused women rated themselves as significantly less secure and significantly more fearful-avoidant than nonabused women. They also worried over the relationship ending to a greater degree than nonabused women, perceived their partners as less available and used their partners for emotional support to a lesser degree than nonabused women.

Fearful-avoidant attachment is defined by negative models of both the self and others. These negative expectations of the self and of others may help explain abused women's experience of attachment. Both the negative model of self and the negative model of others likely accounts for abused women worrying over or fearing that their relationship will end. A negative model of self may lead to feeling unsure about one's ability to make it on one's own and to feeling afraid of what life would be like outside of the relationship. A negative model of others may lead to uncertainty regarding future relationships and the fear that other people may be just as abusive, or even more abusive than their current partner.

The negative model of others also likely accounts for abused women's lack of use and perceived availability of their partners. By the very nature of being in a relationship with an abusive man, women may have learned that their partners cannot be depended upon for emotional support and that they cannot trust them in times of need.

In terms of depressive symptomatology and silencing behaviours, there were significant differences between abused and nonabused women. Abused women received a mean score on the BDI, which was indicative of moderately

severe depressive symptomatology (Baumgart & Oliver, 1981), and a mean score on the STSS, which reflected a strong tendency for the women to conform to the norms of the "good woman" by silencing their needs, wishes and desires in favour of their partner's (Jack & Dill, 1992). The mean STSS score for abused women in the present study was also almost exactly the same as the mean STSS score for abused women in Jack and Dill's study. Nonabused women, on the other hand, received a mean score on the BDI which indicated a lack of depressive symptomatology (Baumgart & Oliver, 1981), and a mean score on the STSS, which reflected a weak tendency for the women to conform to the norms of the "good woman" (Jack & Dill, 1992). The finding that abused women in the present study experienced a high degree of depressive symptomatology is consistent with previous research (Mitchell & Hodson, 1983; Rounsaville, 1978).

In terms of attributions for the negative behaviour of partners there are significant differences between abused and nonabused women. Abused women were more likely to attribute negative partner behaviour to stable and global factors. They tend then, to see their partner's negative behaviour as unlikely to change and as affecting most or many facets of their own life. By contrast, nonabused women were more likely to explain the negative behaviour of partners by attributing it to unstable and specific factors. In terms of the locus dimension, both abused and nonabused women looked towards their partners as the ones who caused the negative behaviour. The finding that abused women attribute negative partner behaviour to external and stable factors is consistent with previous research (Cantos, Neidig & O'Leary, 1993).

Looking at the different attributions of abused and nonabused women, one is left wondering about what exactly it is about being abused that produces attributions to stable and global factors? Perhaps it is the stability and

globality of the abuse itself? Women who have lived with abusive men for many years have learned that the threat of abuse is always present. Although abused women hope that their partner will change, and that the abuse will subside and eventually stop, the experience for most women is exactly the opposite. Abuse usually escalates and gets worse over time (Walker, 1984). Abuse is a continuing aspect of their life and one that affects every realm of their existence. Is it any wonder then, that abused women make stable and global attributions for something that is consistent and pervasive?

In terms of relationship satisfaction there were significant differences between abused and nonabused women. Abused women were less satisfied with their relationship than nonabused women. Based upon previously presented arguments regarding relationship satisfaction this finding is not surprising. Nowhere in the literature on wife abuse is there any mention of the women expressing contentment with their relationships. Abused women want their intimate relationships to be different. They want to feel respected and loved, not used and degraded.

To summarize, abused women exhibited high depressive symptomatology and silencing behaviours, made external, stable and global attributions for their partner's abusive behaviour and were not satisfied with their relationships. Adding to the previous research on abused women, the present study also shows that abused women worried about or had little faith in the continuance of their relationship, did not see their partner as reliably accessible and therefore did not ask for their partner's emotional support and nurturance.

Contributions to Previous Attachment Research. The present study contributes to the growing area of attachment theory by examining correlations between the quality of attachment in a specific romantic relationship, as

assessed in a manner formulated by Bartholomew (1990), and attachment dimensions, as assessed by West and Sheldon-Keller (1992). Ratings of security were negatively correlated with West and Sheldon-Keller's feared loss dimension and positively correlated with their availability and use dimensions. A woman who sees herself as securely attached in a romantic relationship, has a tendency to not worry about or fear that her romantic relationship will end. She also has faith in the availability of her intimate partner and has a tendency to ask him for emotional support when needed. These findings are similar to Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) finding that secure individuals show a high degree of intimacy and level of involvement in romantic relationships.

Ratings of fearful-avoidant attachment were positively correlated with West and Sheldon-Keller's feared loss dimension and negatively correlated with their availability and use dimensions. A woman who sees herself as fearfully attached in a romantic relationship, has a tendency to worry about the future of that relationship. She also has a tendency to perceive her partner as unavailable and does not ask him for support when needed. These findings are similar to a number of results reported by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). For example, these researchers show that fearful-avoidant individuals rate significantly low on intimacy, level of romantic involvement, reliance on others and use of others as a secure base when upset, all of which are theoretically similar to low use and availability of attachment figure.

Ratings of preoccupied attachment were positively correlated with West and Sheldon-Keller's feared loss dimension. A woman who sees herself as being preoccupied with her romantic relationship, has a tendency to worry about the future of that relationship. This finding is not directly related to any of the results reported by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991), but is consistent with their

theoretical description of preoccupation. Preoccupied individuals need the acceptance of others in order to accept themselves. Without a relationship to validate and centre themselves within, preoccupied individuals feel lost.

Finally, ratings of dismissing-avoidant attachment, like fearful-avoidant attachment, were positively correlated with West and Sheldon-Keller's feared loss dimension and negatively correlated with their availability and use dimensions. A woman who sees herself as dismissingly attached, has a tendency to worry about the end of her romantic relationship. She also has a tendency to perceive her partner as unavailable and responsive to her needs and therefore, does not ask him for support when needed. These findings are similar to a number of results reported by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). For example, these researchers show that dismissing-avoidant individuals, like fearful-avoidant individuals rate significantly low on intimacy, level of romantic involvement, reliance on others and use of others as a secure base when upset, all of which again, are theoretically similar to low use and availability of attachment figure.

The finding that dismissing attachment is positively related to feared loss, is a surprising result. One would think that because dismissing individuals deny their attachment needs (Bartholomew, 1990), that they would not worry about or contemplate the future of their intimate relationships? This seemingly contradictory finding is left to future researchers to contemplate.

Recent research (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Duggan & Brennan, 1994; Whiffen et al, 1994) has explored the differences between the two avoidant attachment patterns, fearful and dismissing, advanced by Bartholomew (1990). The present study extends this research and shows that the fearful-avoidant and dismissing-avoidant patterns in a romantic relationship are different in only one respect. Fearful-avoidance is positively related to silencing

the self, whereas dismissing-avoidancy is not. This suggests that the tendency for some women to put their needs aside, to silence themselves and to be a "good women" in favour of caring for others is another way of differentiating between the two avoidant patterns. Women who see themselves as fearful-avoidant in romantic relationships, silence themselves, whereas women who see themselves as dismissing-avoidant in romantic relationships do not. Bartholomew (1990) alludes to this when she says "adults with an active fear of close relations may inhibit the social expression of negative affect in order to avoid alienating others" (p. 167). From a theoretical perspective, this is likely due to the fearful-avoidant woman's negative self model and the dismissing-avoidant woman's positive self model.

Limitations

First, the small number of abused women who agreed to participate is a concern. A sample size of 20 greatly reduces the power of any statistical analyses. Setting the alpha level at .05 and the beta level at .8 (both conventional levels) and with hopes of achieving an effect size of .75 standard deviations, each group should have been composed of approximately 30 women (Shavelson, 1988). Furthermore, any analysis designed to detect smaller effect sizes needs sample sizes of much more than 30 women. Many of the analyses were also performed on less than 20 women due to the fact that some women failed to complete all of the questions. It is therefore useful to think of the present research as exploratory in nature. Although firm conclusions may not be made, some definite trends were identified.

The second limitation of the present study is one that most research with abused women must address. Participants were not randomly selected from the population of abused women. The women selected themselves as possible

participants, first by attending a local counselling or community centre, and then by choosing to participate. This therefore limits the generalizability of the results. There is no way to assure that the abused women who participated in the present study are representative of all abused women.

One reason some women chose not to participate in the present study was related to the length and negative content of the questionnaire package. Many women declined participation in the study due to the length of the questionnaire package. These women did not have the 30 to 45 minutes needed to complete the study. Furthermore, some women who began completing the questionnaires, stopped after a period of time, claiming that the questionnaires were too depressing and that there was too much of a negative slant to the package.

The present study is also limited in its usefulness due to the fact that only retrospective self-report measures were used. Some people may not be very accurate in observing themselves or in remembering past events and experiences. A more reliable picture therefore, of the experience of abused and nonabused women could have been obtained by employing a number of different types of measures, such as peer-reports, observational measures, and interviews as well as self-report measures.

A final limitation of the present study is that it is correlational in nature. It is therefore impossible to draw conclusions regarding causality. The present study paints a picture of the experience of abuse and of the various patterns of attachment, but it cannot state firm definitive conclusions regarding how abuse affects the process of attachment. It can also not state conclusively that abuse causes depressive symptomatology, silencing the self behaviours, stable and global attributions for negative partner behaviour and low relationship

satisfaction among women.

The present study though, is based on the stance that being in a relationship with an abusive man *affects* the woman in a distinctive and predictable way. The present study assumes that due to the experience of abuse, women develop specific attachment feelings, thoughts and behaviours, depressive symptomatology and silencing behaviours, attributional styles and feelings of satisfaction in regards to their relationship. Nowhere in the study is this assumption directly addressed. The supplementary analyses though, that were performed in order to further the understanding of the differences between abused and nonabused women, indirectly confronts this assumption.

The experience of abuse is related to depressive symptomatology, silencing behaviours and relationship satisfaction, even after attachment measures have been controlled for. This leads one to assume that the relationships between abuse and depressive symptomatology (as assessed by the BDI and the STSS), and between abuse and relationship satisfaction are fairly robust. It is very likely that depressive symptomatology and low relationship satisfaction are predictable effects of living with an abusive man, though future studies would have to assess this directly.

The experience of abuse is not related to attachment variables, after measures of depressive symptomatology, relationship attributions and relationship satisfaction have been controlled for. This leads one to assume that the relationship between abuse and specific attachment patterns and dimensions is not very stable. It is affected by other important variables. It is left to future studies to clarify how the experience of abuse affects the quality of attachment in romantic relationships. This could be accomplished by employing a longitudinal measure of abused women's attachment. By following a number

of couples throughout the course of their relationships, it would be possible to identify those relationships which become abusive and to then assess attachment at regular intervals.

Future Directions

The present study examined the quality of attachment of women in romantic relationships, paying particular attention to the differences in attachment between abused and nonabused women. This study looked at the quality of these women's attachment at one point in time - while they were presently involved in a romantic relationship. This study does not address the possible changes in the women's attachment that may occur due to being in that relationship, and particularly due to being in a relationship with an abusive man. How was attachment experienced at the beginning of their relationships? How would one describe the quality of these women's attachment five, ten or twenty years in the future? How does the experience of abuse effect an individual's model of themselves? of others?

Indirect support for this line of research can be found in the victimization literature, which suggests that individuals respond to being a victim by re-evaluating specific expectations regarding themselves and their world. They change their model of self and other in order to understand and cope with the process of victimization (Janoff-Bulman & Frieze, 1983). Furthermore, Horowitz, Wilner, Marmar & Krupnick (1980) claim that the trauma of victimization activates negative self-images (cited in Janoff-Bulman & Frieze, 1983). This suggests that the quality of attachment for abused women may *change* to either preoccupied or fearful-avoidant over a period of time.

Further support for examining possible changes in the quality of attachment of abused women comes from attachment literature. Collins and

Read (1994) cite a number of conditions under which one would expect modification in working models. Experiences that are long in duration and emotionally significant are particularly powerful at eliciting change. Abuse usually occurs over a period of months or years and is definitely emotionally significant for most women.

The question of attachment changing over a period of time due to the experience of abuse should be answered, if the experience of abused women is to be completely understood.

Changing the quality of attachment also has implications for counselling. How can the counsellor help the woman to experience felt security in future relationships? Are there different approaches that counsellors need to adopt for women with different patterns of insecure attachment? These and other questions could be addressed by studying women who have left abusive partners and by paying particular attention to the cognitive changes regarding themselves and others that these women make. How do they think about themselves differently? How do they think about others differently? Encouraging individuals to perceive life events differently, to think differently about others and their expectations, and to alter their beliefs about themselves have always been important in the counselling process.

Changing cognitions is particularly significant in the area of depressive symptomatology. In counselling depressed women, Jack (1991) looks to attachment theory and suggests that women can move out of depression by making a number of cognitive shifts; shifts that involve model of self and model of others. Jack suggests that encouraging depressed women to uncover their voice and to explore themselves and others from a different perspective is essential to the healing process. Extending Jack's research on how women

move out of depression to abused women seems to be a logical next step.

Although counsellors and clinicians who work with abused women may already employ the approach discussed by Jack, very little research has systematically examined the process of counselling with abused women.

Concluding Comments

The usefulness of employing attachment theory as an organizational model for studying close relationships is presented by Hazan and Shaver (1994). These researchers show that attachment theory is able to incorporate a vast range of findings on close relationships and is helpful as an overriding guide in answering a variety of questions. A goal of the present study was to illustrate that attachment theory is a useful theoretical guide in studying the experience of abused women.

By showing that quality of attachment is related to depressive symptomatology and attributions for negative partner behaviour, both of which are important elements of abused women's experience, this goal has been met. Of course, there are many other aspects that can be studied when examining the experience of abuse, such as specific emotional responses like anger, guilt and shame, the woman's coping mechanisms, her support systems, and the effect of the abuse on other family members, notably children. The connection between these aspects of an abused woman's experience and attachment theory will be left to future research. The groundwork has been laid though, for using attachment theory as an organizational framework for the study of experiences of abused women.

References

- Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Alexander, P. (1992). Application of attachment theory to the study of sexual abuse. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60, 185-195.
- Andrews, B., & Brewin, C. (1990). Attributions of blame for marital violence: A study of antecedents and consequences. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 757-767.
- Bahr, S., Chappell, C.B., & Leigh, G. (1983). Age at marriage, role enactment, role consensus, and marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 795-803.
- Battered Women's Support Services (1993). Violence Against Women in Relationships in British Columbia: A Fact Sheet. Vancouver: BWSS.
- Barron, R. (1991). Factors which enable women to leave their abusive partners. Unpublished master's thesis. Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7, 147-178.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 226-244.
- Bartholomew, K., & Thompson, J. (in press). The application of attachment theory to counselling psychology, Counselling Psychologist.
- Baumgart, E., & Oliver, J. (1981). Sex ratio and gender differences in depression in an unselected population. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 37, 570-574.
- Beasley, R., & Stoltenberg, C. (1992). Personality characteristics of male spouse abusers. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 23, 310-317.

- Beck, A.T. (1979). Cognitive Therapy of Depression. New York: Guilford Press.
- Beck, A.T., Steer, R., & Garbin, M. (1988) Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory: Twenty-five years of evaluation. Clinical Psychology Review, 8, 77-100.
- Beck, A.T., Ward, C., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 4, 892-898.
- Bernard, J., & Bernard, M. (1984). The abusive male seeking treatment: Jekyll and Hyde. Family Relations, 33, 543-547.
- Bowker, L. (1993). A battered woman's problems are social, not psychological. In R. Gelles & D. Loseke (Eds.). Current Controversies on Family Violence, London: Sage.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss: Vol 1. Attachment. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment and loss: Vol 2. Separation, anxiety and anger. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and loss: Vol 3. Loss, sadness and depression. New York: Basic Books.
- Bradbury, T., & Fincham, F. (1990). Attributions in marriage: Review and critique. Psychological Bulletin, 107, 3-33.
- Brennan, K., & Shaver, P. (in press). Dimensions of adult attachment and the dynamics of romantic relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships.
- Brennan, K., Shaver, P., & Tobey, A. (1991). Attachment styles, gender, and parental problem drinking. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8, 451-466.

- Bulman, R., & Wortman, C. (1977). Attributions of blame and coping in the "real world": Severe accident victims react to their lot. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 351-363.
- Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women (1991). Wife Assault: A Fact Sheet. Ottawa: CACSW.
- Carnelly, K., Pietromonaco, P., & Jaffe, K. (1994). Depression, working models of others, and relationship functioning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, 127-140.
- Cantos, A., Neidig, P., & O'Leary, K. (1993). Men's and women's attributions of blame for domestic violence. Journal of Family Violence, 8, 289-302.
- Collins, N. (in press). Attachment style differences in patterns of explanation, emotion, and behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.
- Collins, N., & Read, S. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 644-663.
- Collins, N., & Read, S. (1994). Cognitive representations of attachment: The structure and function of working models. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), Attachment Processes in Adulthood. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Duggan, E., & Brennan, K. (1994). Social avoidance and its relation to Bartholomew's adult attachment typology. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11, 147-153.
- Dutton, D., & Painter, S. (1983). Traumatic Bonding: The development of emotional attachments in battered women and other relationships of intermittent abuse. Victimology: An International Journal, 6, 139-155.

- Dutton, D., & Painter, S. (1993). Emotional attachments in abusive relationships: A test of Traumatic bonding theory. Violence and Victims, 8, 105-120.
- Else, L., Wonderlich, S., Beatty, W., Christie, D., & Staton, R. D. (1993). Personality characteristics of men who physically abuse women. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 44, 54-58.
- Feeney, J., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 281-291.
- Feeney, J., Noller, P., & Callan, V. (1994). Attachment style, communication and satisfaction in the early years of marriage. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.). Attachment Processes in Adulthood. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Fields, N. (1983). Satisfaction in long-term marriages. Social Work, 28, 37-41.
- Fincham, F., & Bradbury, T. (1992). Assessing attributions in marriage: The relationship attribution measure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 457-468.
- Frieze, I., (1979). Perceptions of battered wives. In I. Frieze, D. Bar-Tal & J. Carroll (Eds.), New Approaches to Social Problems, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gelles, R. (1976). Abused wives: Why do they stay. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 659-668.
- Gelles, R. (1993). Through a sociological lens: Social structure and family violence. In R. Gelles & D.Loseke (Eds.). Current Controversies on Family Violence, London: Sage.
- Gelles, R., & Harrop, J. (1989). Violence, battering and psychological distress among women. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4, 400-420.
- Gelles, R., & Straus, M.A. (1988). Intimate Violence. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Grayson, P. (1980). Personality and satisfaction with their relationship by married and cohabiting couples. Psychological Reports, 47, 555-558.
- Griffin, D., & Bartholomew, K. (1994a). Models of the self and other: Fundamental dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 430-445.
- Griffin, D., & Bartholomew, K. (1994b). The metaphysics of measurement: The case of adult attachment. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.). Attachment Processes in Adulthood. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as attachment process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 511-524.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. Psychological Inquiry, 5, 1-22.
- Heider, F. (1958). The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley.
- Henderson, A. (1994). He loves me; he loves me not: Attachment and separation resolution of abused women. Unpublished master's thesis. Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B. C.
- Hendrick, S. (1981). Self-disclosure and marital satisfaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 1150-1159.
- Hilberman, E., & Munson, K. (1978). Sixty battered women. Victimology: An International Journal, 2, 460-470.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1988). Causal attributions in marital violence: Theoretical and methodological issues. Clinical Psychology Review, 8, 331-344.
- Horowitz, M., Wilner, N., Marmar, C., & Krupnick, J. (1980). Pathological grief and the activation of latent self-images. American Journal of Psychiatry, 137, 1137-1162.

- Hudson, W., & McIntosh, R. (1981). The assessment of spouse abuse: Two quantifiable dimensions. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 873-885.
- Jack, D. (1991). Silencing the Self: Women and Depression. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Jack, D., & Dill, D. (1992). The silencing the self scale: Schemas of intimacy associated with depression in women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16, 97-106.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1979). Characterological versus behavioural self-blame: Inquiries into depression and blame. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1798-1809.
- Janoff-Bulman, R., & Frieze, I. (1983). A theoretical perspective for understanding reactions to victimization. Journal of Social Issues, 39, 1-17.
- Kaplan, A. (1986). The "self-in-relation": Implications for depression in women. Psychotherapy, 23, 234-242.
- Keelan, J. P., Dion, K. L., & Dion, K. K. (1994). Attachment style and heterosexual relationships among young adults: A short-term panel study. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11, 201-214.
- Kelley, H. (1972). Attribution theory in social interaction. In E. Jones, D. Kanouse, H. Kelley, R. Nisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.). Attribution: Perceiving the Causes on Behaviour. New York: General Learning Press.
- Kelly, E. L., & Conley, J. (1987). Personality and compatibility: A prospective analysis of marital stability and marital satisfaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 27-40.
- Kirkpatrick, L., & Davis, K. (1994). Attachment style, gender, and relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, 502-512.

- Kirkpatrick, L., & Hazan, C. (1994). Attachment styles and close relationships: A four-year prospective study. Personal Relationships, 1, 123-142.
- Kobak, R., & Hazan, C. (1991). Attachment in marriage: Effects of security and accuracy of working models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 861-869.
- Kurz, D. (1993). Physical assaults by husbands: A major social problem. In R. Gelles & D. Loseke (Eds.). Current Controversies on Family Violence, London: Sage.
- MacEwan, K., Barling, J. (1993). Type A behaviour and marital satisfaction: Differential effects of achievement striving and impatience/irritability. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55, 1001-1010.
- MacLeod, L. (1987). Battered but not Beaten: Preventing Wife Battering in Canada. Ottawa: CACSW.
- Miller, D., & Porter, C. (1983). Self-blame in victims of violence. Journal of Social Issues, 39, 139-152.
- Mills, T. (1985). The assault on the self: Stages in coping with battering husbands. Qualitative Sociology, 8, 103-123.
- Mitchell, R., & Hodson, C. (1983). Coping with domestic violence: Social support and psychological health among battered women. American Journal of Community Psychology, 11, 629-654.
- Noller, P., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Marital communication in the eighties. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 832-843.
- O'Leary, K. (1993). Through a psychological lens: Personality traits, personality disorders, and levels of violence. In R. Gelles & D. Loseke (Eds.). Current Controversies on Family Violence, London: Sage.

- Painter, S., & Dutton, D. (1985). Patterns of emotional bonding in battered women: Traumatic bonding. International Journal of Women's Studies, 8, 363-375.
- Rodgers, K. (1994). Wife Assault in Canada. Canadian Social Trends, Autumn, 3-8.
- Rounsaville, B. (1978). Theories in marital violence: Evidence from a study of battered women. Victimology: An International Journal, 3, 11-31.
- Sarason, I., Levine, H., Basham, R., & Sarason, B. (1983). Assessing social support: The social support questionnaire. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 127-139.
- Scharfe, E., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Reliability and stability of adult attachment patterns. Personal Relationships, 1, 23-43.
- Scharfe, E., & Bartholomew, K. (in press). Accommodation and attachment representations in young couples. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships.
- Shavelson, R. (1988). Statistical Reasoning for the Behavioural Sciences. Needan Heights, Mass: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shaver, P., & Brennan, K. (1992). Attachment styles and the "big five" personality traits: Their connections with each other and with romantic relationship outcomes. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 536-545.
- Simpson, J. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 971-980.
- Simpson, J., Rholes, W., & Nelligan, J. (1992). Support seeking and support giving within couples in an anxiety-provoking situation: The role of attachment styles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 434-446.

- Spanier, G. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 15-28.
- Stahly, G. (1978). A review of select literature of spousal violence. Victimology: An International Journal, 2, 591-607.
- Straus, M. (1990). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics scales. In M. Straus & R. Gelles (Eds.), Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8145 Families (p. 29-47). New Brunswick USA: Transition.
- Strube, M. (1988). The decision to leave an abusive relationship: Empirical evidence and theoretical issues. Psychological Bulletin, 104, 236-250.
- Strube, M., & Barbour, L. (1983). The decision to leave an abusive relationship: Economic dependence and psychological commitment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 785-793.
- Strube, M., & Barbour, L. (1984). Factors related to the decision to leave an abusive relationship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 837-844.
- Walker, L. (1983). Victimology and the psychological perspectives of battered women. Victimology: An International Journal, 8, 82-104.
- Walker, L. (1984). The Battered Woman Syndrome. New York: Springer.
- Walker, L. (1993). The battered woman syndrome is a psychological consequence of abuse. In R. Gelles & D. Loseke (Eds.). Current Controversies on Family Violence, London: Sage.
- Weissman, M. (1987). Advances in psychiatric epidemiology: Rates and risks for major depression. American Journal of Public Health, 77, 445-451.

- Weissman, M., & Klerman, G. (1987). Gender and depression. In R. Formanek & A. Gurian (Eds.). Women and Depression: A Lifespan Perspective. New York: Springer Publishing.
- West, M., & Sheldon-Keller, A. (1992). The assessment of dimensions relevant to adult reciprocal attachment. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 37, 600-606.
- West, M., Sheldon, A., & Reiffer, L. (1987). An approach to the delineation of adult attachment. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 175, 738-741.
- Whiffen, V., Thompson, J., Blain, M., & Johnson, S. (1994) Romantic attachment in a community sample of couples. Unpublished manuscript. University of Ottawa, Ont.
- Wortman, C. (1976). Causal attributions and personal control. In J. Harvey, W. Ickes, & R. Kidd (Eds.). New Directions in Attribution Research. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Yllo, K. (1993). Through a feminist lens: Gender, power and violence. In R. Gelles & D. Loseke (Eds.). Current Controversies on Family Violence, London: Sage.

Table 1Demographic Characteristics of Sample

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Income		
< \$10,000	6	9.1
\$10,000 - \$25,000	10	15.2
\$25,000 - \$40,000	24	36.4
\$40,000 - \$55,000	11	16.7
\$55,000 - \$70,000	12	18.2
< \$70,000	3	4.5
Number of Children		
0	7	10.8
1	21	32.3
2	22	33.8
3	13	20.0
4	2	3.1
Religion		
Catholic Christian	25	39.1
Fundamental Christian	6	9.4
Protestant Christian	12	18.8
Buddhist	1	1.6
Muslim	1	1.6
Agnostic / Atheist	6	9.4
Other	13	20.3

Table 1 (continued)

Demographic Characteristics of Sample

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Education		
some high school	7	10.9
completed high school	11	17.2
some college	12	18.8
completed college	18	28.1
some university	2	3.1
completed university	10	15.6
some post graduate	2	3.1
completed post graduate	2	3.1
Language		
English	61	91.0
Non English	6	9.0
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Age (years)	31.69	5.58
Number of months married	96.47	56.05
Number of months dated	25.5	24.64

Note. With the exception of "number of months dated", sample sizes vary from 60 to 67.

Table 2

Attachment, Depressive, and Attributional Correlates of the Four Attachment Style Ratings

		Correlates									
Attachment Style		Attachment dimensions				Depressive symptoms			Attribution components		
		Proximity Seeking	Separation Protest	Feared Loss	Availability	Use	BDI	STSS	Locus Stability	Globality	
Secure		.26	-.02	-.41**	.50**	.41**	-.40**	-.26	-.05	-.35*	-.30*
Fearful-											
Avoidant		-.11	-.04	.51**	-.47**	-.43**	.47**	.36**	.06	.24	.28
Preoccupied		.14	-.04	.41**	-.17	-.11	.19	.11	.09	.10	.39**
Dismissing-											
Avoidant		-.26	-.14	.35**	-.29*	-.36**	.29*	.24	.07	.18	.18

Note. Sample sizes vary from 55 to 67.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations on Attachment Variables for Abused and Nonabused Women

Variable	Group			
	Abused Women (<i>n</i> = 14)		Nonabused Women (<i>n</i> = 40)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Attachment style ratings				
Secure	4.14 _a	2.35	5.60 _b	1.61
Fearful-Avoidant	4.50 _a	2.25	2.73 _b	1.70
Preoccupied	3.50 _a	2.44	2.70 _a	1.49
Dismissing-Avoidant	3.50 _a	2.28	2.55 _a	1.52
Attachment dimensions				
Proximity seeking	7.29 _a	2.64	7.38 _a	1.93
Separation protest	7.71 _a	3.27	6.70 _a	2.12
Feared loss	8.64 _a	3.08	5.20 _b	1.86
Availability	7.21 _a	3.26	11.83 _b	2.44
Use	9.43 _a	3.23	12.93 _b	2.17

Note. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .05$.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations on Depressive Symptomatology, Attributional, and Relationship Satisfaction Variables for Abused Women and Nonabused Women

Variable	Group			
	Abused Women		Nonabused Women	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Depressive Symptoms				
BDI	18.70 _a	9.40	9.30 _b	7.84
STSS	99.15 _a	17.19	70.26 _b	12.34
Attributions				
Locus	19.53 _a	3.86	18.34 _a	4.37
Stability	17.58 _a	4.31	10.56 _b	4.61
Globality	19.53 _a	3.52	13.61 _b	5.16
Relationship satisfaction	24.20 _a	7.72	37.32 _b	6.25

Note. Sample sizes vary from 19 to 20 for abused women and from 41 to 47 for nonabused women. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .001$.

Appendix A
Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

When a research project is undertaken at Simon Fraser University, the researcher must obtain informed consent from all participants. This page describes the research project so that you can decide whether you would like to participate.

If you decide to participate in the project after reading this page, please read and sign the following page. **I cannot use your answers to the questionnaires for the research project unless you return the following page, complete with your signature, along with the questionnaires.**

This research project, entitled "Intimate Relationships: Thoughts, Feelings and Behaviours Evoked by Conflict" is about women's intimate and romantic relationships with men and their thoughts, feelings and behaviours surrounding their partner. Particular emphasis is placed upon times of conflict, so painful memories may be evoked during the research project. If at any time during or after completing the questionnaires you feel upset or anxious, you are encouraged to inform the chief researcher who will talk with you regarding your feelings and who will refer you, if necessary, to appropriate support services.

Your participation is completely voluntary and you are free to discontinue your participation at any time.

Participation in the project involves completing several questionnaires. The questionnaires ask for some general information about you, overall information about your relationship and specific information about what you think about your partner, how you feel about your partner and how you behave with him. The package of questionnaires takes about 30 to 45 minutes to complete.

Your answers are confidential. **Do not put your name on any of the questionnaires.** If you participate in the project, your consent form, with your name on it, will be immediately separated from your questionnaires once the questionnaire package is returned. In order to insure your anonymity, your name will not be used in the reporting of data and results. Completed questionnaires and consent forms will be secured in a locked cabinet. The chief investigator and senior supervisor will be the only individuals to view your questionnaire package.

If you have concerns or questions about the project, you may contact either the chief researcher (Anita Bloy - 291-4350) or Dr. Janny Thompson, Senior Supervisor, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6 (291-4195).

If, after reading the above description, and looking at the enclosed questionnaires, you wish to participate in the project, please read and complete the following page. Return the signed copy with your questionnaires.

INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

I understand that I may withdraw my participation from the project at any time. I understand that I can ask questions about the project or voice any concerns that I may have at any time by contacting the chief researcher (named below) or Dr. Janny Thompson (291-4195). I understand that participating in the project involves completing a questionnaire package (described on the previous page) and that my anonymity will be maintained at all times. If, at any time, I find that answering the questionnaires is stressful, I know that I can share my thoughts and feelings with the chief researcher and that she will attend to my needs, referring me, if necessary, to appropriate support services. I am also aware that copies of the results of the study may be obtained by contacting the chief researcher at the conclusion of the study.

I agree to participate in the research project entitled "Intimate Relationships: Thoughts, Feelings and Behaviours Evoked by Conflict":

NAME (Please print): _____

ADDRESS: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

WITNESS: _____

DATE: _____

Chief researcher: Anita Bloy, Education Department, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6 (291-4350) or (420-9000)

BECK INVENTORY

On this questionnaire are groups of statements. Please read each group of statements carefully. Then pick out the one statement in each group which best describes the way you have been feeling the PAST WEEK, INCLUDING TODAY. Circle the number beside the statement you picked. If several statements in the group seem to apply equally well, circle each one. Be sure to read all the statements in each group before making your choice.

1. 0 I do not feel sad.
1 I feel sad.
2 I feel sad all the time and I can't snap out of it.
3 I feel so sad or unhappy that I can't stand it.
2. 0 I am not particularly discouraged about the future.
1 I feel discouraged about the future.
2 I feel I have nothing to look forward to.
3 I feel that the future is hopeless and that things cannot improve.
3. 0 I do not feel like a failure.
1 I feel I have failed more than the average person.
2 As I look back on my life, all I can see is a lot of failures.
3 I feel I am a complete failure as a person.
4. 0 I get as much satisfaction out of things as I used to.
1 I don't enjoy things the way I used to.
2 I don't get real satisfaction out of anything anymore.
3 I am dissatisfied or bored with everything.
5. 0 I don't feel particularly guilty.
1 I feel guilty a good part of the time.
2 I feel guilty most of the time.
3 I feel guilty all the time.
6. 0 I don't feel I am being punished.
1 I feel I may be punished.
2 I expect to be punished.
3 I feel I am being punished.
7. 0 I don't feel disappointed in myself.
1 I am disappointed in myself.
2 I am disgusted with myself.
3 I hate myself.

8. 0 I don't feel I am any worse than anybody else.
1 I am critical of myself for my weaknesses or mistakes.
2 I blame myself all the time for my faults.
3 I blame myself for everything bad that happens.
9. 0 I don't have any thoughts of killing myself.
1 I have thoughts of killing myself, but I would not carry them out.
2 I would like to kill myself.
3 I would kill myself if I had the chance.
10. 0 I don't cry any more than I used to.
1 I cry more than I used to.
2 I cry all the time now.
3 I used to be able to cry, but now I can't cry even though I want to.
11. 0 I am no more irritated now than I ever am.
1 I get annoyed or irritated more easily than I used to.
2 I feel irritated all the time now.
3 I don't get irritated at all by the things that used to irritate me.
12. 0 I have not lost interest in other people.
1 I am less interested in other people than I used to.
2 I have lost most of my interest in other people.
3 I have lost all of my interest in other people.
13. 0 I make decisions about as well as I ever could.
1 I put off making decisions more than I used to.
2 I have greater difficulty in making decisions than before.
3 I can't make decisions at all anymore.
14. 0 I don't feel I look any worse than I used to.
1 I am worried that I am looking unattractive.
2 I feel that there are permanent changes in my appearance that make me look unattractive.
3 I believe that I look ugly.
15. 0 I can work about as well as before.
1 It takes an extra effort to get started at doing something.
2 I have to push myself very hard to do anything.
3 I can't do any work at all.
16. 0 I can sleep as well as usual.
1 I don't sleep as well as I used to.
2 I wake up 1-2 hours earlier than usual and find it hard to get back to sleep.
3 I wake up several hours earlier than I used to and cannot get back to sleep.

17. 0 I don't get more tired than usual.
1 I get tired more easily than I used to.
2 I get tired from doing almost anything.
3 I am too tired to do anything.
18. 0 My appetite is no worse than usual.
1 My appetite is not as good as it used to be.
2 My appetite is much worse now.
3 I am too tired to do anything.
19. 0 I haven't lost much weight, if any, lately.
1 I have lost more than 5 pounds.
2 I have lost more than 10 pounds.
3 I have lost more than 15 pounds.

I am purposely trying to lose weight by eating less. Yes ___ No ___

20. 0 I am no more worried about my health than usual.
1 I am worried about physical problems such as aches and pains; or upset stomach; or constipation.
2 I am very worried about physical problems and it's hard to think of much else.
3 I am so worried about my physical problems that I cannot think about anything else.
21. 0 I have not noticed any recent change in my interest in sex.
1 I am less interested in sex than I used to.
2 I am much less interested in sex now.
3 I have lost interest in sex completely.

SSQSR

The following questions ask about people in your environment who provide you with help or support. Each question has two parts. For the first part, list all the people you know, excluding yourself, whom you can count on for help or support in the manner described. Give the persons' initials, their relationship to you (see example), Do not list more than one person next to each of the numbers beneath the question.

For the second part, circle the number that corresponds to how satisfied you are with the overall support you have.

If you have had no support for a question, check the words "No one," but still rate your level of satisfaction. Do not list more than nine persons per question.

Please answer all the questions as best you can. All your responses will be kept confidential.

EXAMPLE

Who do you know whom you can trust with information that could get you in trouble?

_____ No one	1)T.N. brother	4)T.N. father	7)
	2)L.M. friend	5)L.M. employer	8)
	3)R.S. friend	6)	9)

PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE AND BEGIN

1. Whom can you really count on to be dependable when you need help?

____ No one 1) 4) 7)
 2) 5) 8)
 3) 6) 9)

How satisfied?

very 6 5 4 3 2 1 very
 satisfied dissatisfied

2. Whom can you really count on to help you feel more relaxed when you are under pressure or tense?

____ No one 1) 4) 7)
 2) 5) 8)
 3) 6) 9)

How satisfied?

very 6 5 4 3 2 1 very
 satisfied dissatisfied

3. Who accepts you totally, including both your worst and your best points?

____ No one 1) 4) 7)
 2) 5) 8)
 3) 6) 9)

How satisfied?

very 6 5 4 3 2 1 very
 satisfied dissatisfied

4. Whom can you really count on to care about you, regardless of what is happening to you?

_____ No one 1) 4) 7)
 2) 5) 8)
 3) 6) 9)

How satisfied?

very 6 5 4 3 2 1 very
 satisfied dissatisfied

5. Whom can you really count on to help you feel better when you are feeling generally down-in-the-dumps?

_____ No one 1) 4) 7)
 2) 5) 8)
 3) 6) 9)

How satisfied?

very 6 5 4 3 2 1 very
 satisfied dissatisfied

6. Whom can you count on to console you when you are very upset?

_____ No one 1) 4) 7)
 2) 5) 8)
 3) 6) 9)

How satisfied?

very 6 5 4 3 2 1 very
 satisfied dissatisfied

RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE**PLEASE READ DIRECTIONS!!!**

1) Following are descriptions of four general relationship styles that people often report. Please read each description and **CIRCLE** the letter corresponding to the style that *best* describes you or is *closest* to the way you generally are in your close relationships.

- A.** It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.
- B.** I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.
- C.** I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.
- D.** I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

2) Please rate each of the above relationship styles according to the *extent* to which you think each description corresponds to your general relationship style.

	Not at all like me		Somewhat like me			Very much like me	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style A.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style B.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style C.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

If you are not presently in a steady romantic relationship, please turn to the next page.

2. People sometimes report that their relationship styles differ depending on the people they are with. Thus you may feel that your style varies with different friends, family members, or romantic partners.

Think of your present romantic relationship. Please rate to what extent each of the four styles is descriptive of the way you are in that relationship.

	Not at all like me			Somewhat like me			Very much like me	
Style A.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Style B.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Style C.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Style D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

3. Your relationship style may also be similar to or different from the style of your partners in romantic relationships. Again think of the relationship you are currently in and rate, according to **your** opinion, to what extent each description fits your romantic partner.

	Not at all like him/her			Somewhat like him/her			Very much like him/her	
Style A.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Style B.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Style C.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Style D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Circle one: Male Female

DYADIC SATISFACTION SCALE

Answer the following questions based on your relationship with your partner.

	All the Time	Most of the Time	More Often Than Not	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
1. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Do you confide in your mate?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Do you ever regret that you married (or lived together)?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. How often do you and your partner quarrel?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. How often do you and your mate "get on each others' nerves"?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Every Day	Almost Every Day	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
8. Do you kiss your mate?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

9. The dots on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy", represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the dot which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Extremely Unhappy	Fairly Unhappy	A Little Unhappy	Happy	Very Happy	Extremely Happy	Perfect

10. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship?

_____ I want desperately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.

_____ I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all I can to see that it does.

_____ I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.

_____ It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can't do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed.

_____ It would be nice if it succeeded, but I refuse to do any more than I am doing now to keep the relationship going.

_____ My relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going.

RECIPROCAL ATTACHMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS

On the following pages you will find a series of statements. In each instance, you are asked to rate how strongly you agree that the statement is typical of you.

Look at the following examples:

	strongly disagree		strongly agree			
1. At parties, I like to talk to everyone..	1	2	3	4	5	

	strongly disagree		strongly agree			
2. I like to spend most of my time alone...	1	2	3	4	5	

The person by answering the first statement with a "5" indicated that he/she strongly agreed with the statement "At parties, I like to talk to everyone". In the second example, the person disagreed with the statement "I like to spend most of my time alone". You might have circled different numbers in the space next to each statement.

In this questionnaire, you will find questions about your relationship to one special person in your life. We call this special person your "attachment figure". By attachment figure, we mean the person you are living with or romantically involved with.

The questions about your relationship with your attachment figure begin on the next page. Please think about each question and answer carefully, but do not worry if some questions are hard to answer exactly. Do the best you can and trust your own judgments.

Remember, this questionnaire is not a test; there are no right or wrong answers. The questions simply describe your relationship with your attachment figure. Thank you for your help.

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

	1 strongly disagree	2 disagree	3 partially agree and partially disagree	4 agree	5 strongly agree
1.	I turn to my attachment figure for many things, including comfort and reassurance.....1 2 3 4 5				
2.	I don't object when my attachment figure goes away for a few days..... 1 2 3 4 5				
3.	I'm confident that my attachment figure will try to understand my feelings.....1 2 3 4 5				
4.	I worry that my attachment figure will let me down.....1 2 3 4 5				
5.	I resent it when my attachment figure spends time away from me.....1 2 3 4 5				
6.	I have to have my attachment figure with me when I'm upset.....1 2 3 4 5				
7.	When I'm upset, I am confident my attachment figure will be there to listen to me.....1 2 3 4 5				
8.	I feel abandoned when my attachment figure is away for a few days.....1 2 3 4 5				
9.	I have a terrible fear that my relationship with my attachment figure will end.....1 2 3 4 5				
10.	I talk things over with my attachment figure.....1 2 3 4 5				
11.	I'm afraid that I will lose my attachment figure's love.....1 2 3 4 5				
12.	I feel lost if I'm upset and my attachment figure is not around.....1 2 3 4 5				
13.	I'm confident that my attachment figure will always love me.....1 2 3 4 5				
14.	Things have to be really bad for me to ask my attachment figure for help.....1 2 3 4 5				
15.	When I am anxious I desperately need to be close to my attachment figure.....1 2 3 4 5				

Silencing the Self Scale

Please circle the number which best describes how you feel about each of the statements listed below:

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

- | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 1. | I think it is best to put myself first because no one else will look out for me. | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | I don't speak my feelings in an intimate relationship when I know they will cause disagreement. | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | Caring means putting the other person's needs in front of my own. | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | Considering my needs to be as important as those of the people I love is selfish. | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | I find it is harder to be myself when I am in a close relationship than when I am on my own. | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | I tend to judge myself by how I think other people see me. | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | I feel dissatisfied with myself because I should be able to do all the things people are supposed to be able to do these days. | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
8. When my partner's needs and feelings conflict with my own, I always state mine clearly.				
1	2	3	4	5
9. In a close relationship, my responsibility is to make the person happy.				
1	2	3	4	5
10. Caring means choosing to do what the other person wants, even when I want to do something different.				
1	2	3	4	5
11. In order to feel good about myself, I need to feel independent and self-sufficient.				
1	2	3	4	5
12. One of the worst things I can do is to be selfish.				
1	2	3	4	5
13. I feel I have to act in a certain way to please my partner.				
1	2	3	4	5
14. Instead of risking confrontations in close relationships, I would rather not rock the boat.				
1	2	3	4	5
15. I speak my feelings with my partner, even when it leads to problems or disagreements.				
1	2	3	4	5
16. Often I look happy enough on the outside, but inwardly I feel angry and rebellious.				
1	2	3	4	5

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
17. In order for my partner to love me, I cannot reveal certain things about myself to him/her.				
1	2	3	4	5
18. When my partner's needs or opinions conflict with mine, rather than asserting my own point of view I usually end up agreeing with him/her.				
1	2	3	4	5
19. When I am in a close relationship I lose my sense of who I am.				
1	2	3	4	5
20. When it looks as though certain of my needs can't be met in a relationship, I usually realize that they weren't very important anyway.				
1	2	3	4	5
21. My partner loves and appreciates me for who I am.				
1	2	3	4	5
22. Doing things just for myself is selfish.				
1	2	3	4	5
23. When I make decisions, other people's thoughts and opinions influence me more than my own thoughts and opinions.				
1	2	3	4	5
24. I rarely express my anger at those close to me.				
1	2	3	4	5
25. I feel that my partner does not know my real self.				
1	2	3	4	5

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------

26. I think it's better to keep my feelings to myself when they do conflict with my partner's.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

27. I often feel responsible for other people's feelings.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

28. I find it hard to know what I think and feel because I spend a lot of time thinking about how other people are feeling.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

29. In a close relationship I don't usually care what we do, as long as the other person is happy.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

30. I try to bury my feelings when I think they will cause trouble in my close relationship(s).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

31. I never seem to measure up to the standards I set for myself.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

If you answered the last question with a 4 or 5, please list up to three of the standards you feel you don't measure up to:

RELATIONSHIP ATTRIBUTION MEASURE

This questionnaire describes several things that your partner might do. Imagine your partner performing each behaviour and then read the statements that follow it. Please circle the number that indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement, using the following rating scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6
strongly disagree	disagree	somewhat disagree	somewhat agree	agree	strongly agree

1. Your partner criticizes something you say.

My partner's behaviour is due to something about him (e.g. the type of person he is, the mood he was in)

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

The reason my partner criticizes me is not likely to change.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

The reason my partner criticizes me is something that affects other areas of our relationship.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

2. Your partner begins to spend less time with you.

My partner's behaviour is due to something about him (e.g. the type of person he is, the mood he was in)

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

The reason my partner is spending less time with me is not likely to change.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

The reason my partner is spending less time with me is something that affects other areas of our relationship.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

3. Your partner compliments you.

My partner's behaviour is due to something about him (e.g. the type of person he is, the mood he was in)

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

The reason my partner compliments me is not likely to change.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

The reason my partner compliments me is something that affects other areas of our relationship.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

4. Your partner does not pay attention to what you are saying.

My partner's behaviour is due to something about him (e.g. the type of person he is, the mood he was in)

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

The reason my partner is not paying attention to what I am saying is not likely to change.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

The reason my partner is not paying attention to what I am saying is something that affects other areas of our relationship.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

5. Your partner is cool and distant.

My partner's behaviour is due to something about him (e.g. the type of person he is, the mood he was in)

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

The reason my partner is cool and distant is not likely to change.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

The reason my partner is cool and distant is something that affects other areas of our relationship.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

THE CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE

No matter how well a couple get along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with each other, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. Couples also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences. You are going to read some things that you and your partner might do when you have an argument or fight. Focusing on your partner's behaviour, circle how many times (never, once, twice, 3-5 times, 6-10 times, 11-20 times, or more than 20 times) your partner has used the following tactics, over the last six months.

1. Discussed an issue calmly.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

2. Got information to back up his side of things.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

3. Brought in, or tried to bring in, someone to help settle things.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

4. Insulted or swore at you.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

5. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

6. Stomped out of the room, or house, or yard.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

7. Cried.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

8. Did or said something to spite you.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

9. Threatened to hit or throw something at you.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

10. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked an object.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

11. Threw something at you.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

12. Pushed, grabbed or shoved you.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

13. Slapped you.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

14. Kicked, bit or hit you with a fist.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

15. Hit, or tried to hit you with an object.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

16. Beat you up.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

17. Choked you.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

18. Threatened you with a knife or gun.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

19. Used a knife or fired a gun.

never	once	twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	more than 20 times
-------	------	-------	--------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------

INDEX OF PARTNER BEHAVIOUR

This questionnaire is designed to measure specific things that happen in relationships. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by placing a number beside each one as follows:

- 1 - Never
- 2 - Rarely
- 3 - Occasionally
- 4 - Frequently
- 5 - Very Frequently

-
1. My partner belittles me. _____
 2. My partner demands obedience to his whims. _____
 3. My partner becomes very upset if dinner, housework or laundry is not done when he thinks it should be. _____
 4. My partner is jealous and suspicious of my friends. _____
 5. My partner tells me I am ugly and unattractive. _____
 6. My partner tells me I really couldn't manage or take care of myself without him. _____
 7. My partner acts like I am his personal servant. _____
 8. My partner insults or shames me in front of others. _____
 9. My partner becomes very angry if I disagree with his point of view. _____
 10. My partner is stingy in giving me enough money to run our home. _____
 11. My partner belittles me intellectually. _____
 12. My partner demands that I stay home to take care of the children. _____
 13. My partner feels that I should not work or go to school. _____
 14. My partner is not a kind person. _____
 15. My partner does not want me to socialize with my female friends. _____
 16. My partner demands sex whether I want it or not. _____
 17. My partner orders me around. _____
 18. My partner has no respect for my feelings. _____
 19. My partner treats me like a dunce. _____

Background Information

1. Age at your last birthday? _____
2. What is your yearly family income? (include monies from both partners, if living together) (check one)
- < \$10,000. _____
- \$10,000 - \$25,000. _____
- \$25,000 - \$40,000. _____
- \$40,000 - \$55,000. _____
- \$55,000 - \$70,000. _____
- > \$70,000. _____
3. Is English your first language? _____ yes _____ no
- If you checked "No" what is your first language and country of origin?
- _____
4. What is your religious background? (check one)
- Catholic Christian _____
- Fundamental Christian _____
- Protestant Christian _____
- Buddhist _____
- Muslim _____
- Agnostic/Atheist _____
- Other _____
5. What is your present occupation? _____

6. What is your highest level of education? (check one)

some high school _____

completed high school (grade 12 diploma) _____

some college _____

completed college (certificate, diploma) _____

some university _____

completed university (BA, BSc, BEd, etc.) _____

some post graduate studies _____

completed post graduate studies _____

(MA, MSc, MEd, PhD, etc) _____

7. What is the current status of your relationship? (check one)

together as a couple (married or cohabiting) _____

together as a couple, though living apart
(i.e., dating) _____

separated for less than 1 month (recently
left or broken off the relationship) _____

separated for more than 1 month _____

divorced/widowed _____

8. If you checked "7a" (together as a couple (married or cohabiting)), how long have you been living with your partner? _____ months

If you checked "7b" (together as a couple, though living apart), how long have you been dating your partner? _____ months

9. How many children (if any) live at home with you? _____