

1-1-2002

Attachment and Memory : Does Attachment Experience Influence Eyewitness Testimony?

Fani Lougklou

Follow this and additional works at: <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Cognition and Perception Commons](#), and the [Cognitive Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lougklou, Fani, "Attachment and Memory : Does Attachment Experience Influence Eyewitness Testimony?" (2002). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. Paper 710.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu.

Attachment and Memory: Does Attachment Experience Influence Eyewitness Testimony?

By

Fani Lougklou

Thesis submitted to
The Graduate College
Of
Marshall University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of
M.A.
In
Psychology

Approved by:
Marc Lindberg, Ph. D.-Committee Chairperson
Elaine Baker, Ph. D.
Steven Mewaldt, Ph. D.

Marshall University Graduate College
Huntington, W. V.
2002

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Method.....	5
Results and Discussion.....	6
References.....	19
Appendix 1.....	24
Appendix 2.....	32

Abstract

In an effort to examine the relationship between internal working models of attachment (Bowlby, 1969) and eyewitness testimony for child abuse (Lindberg, Kieffer, & Thomas, 2000), college students first watched a video of a mother hitting her son on the head and knocking him to the floor. After this, they filled out the Attachment and Personality Dynamics Questionnaire (APDQ) (Lindberg & Thomas, 1998). Finally, they were tested about details in the video, their memories for inferences about the characters, and their memories for the gist. They were also given several questions about their personal experiences with the type of discipline depicted in the film as well as their attitudes on parenting. The results showed that there is a relationship between experience with abuse and attachment, recall of emotions felt by the mother and the boy and attachment, and endorsement of physical punishment and attachment.

Attachment and Memory: Does Attachment Experience Influence Eyewitness Testimony?

The purpose of the present experiment was to examine interrelationships between two major areas of research: eyewitness testimony and attachment theory. Traditionally, eyewitness testimony has focused on how suggestions can affect how much individuals recall about witnessed actions. Attachment theory, on the other hand, has emphasized the types of relationships we develop, our models of self and others, and how differences in attachment security enter into clinical symptoms and behaviors. What has been neglected is how these two areas might intersect. Specifically, when do internal working models of attachment enter into one's eyewitness testimony? How do personal experiences with abuse along with internal models of attachment relationships enter into one's memory for abusive encounters? Finally, how do personally experienced instances of abuse with one's own mother affect later internal models of attachment, and how do these intersect to form attitudes about physical punishment? Because the dominant theories of attachment pose such relationships, and because this is an area that has been relatively neglected, this study attempted to provide initial answers to these questions.

According to the Lindberg, Kieffer, and Thomas' (2000) model, there are three intersecting classes of variables that one must consider in making predictions about eyewitness testimony. These are memory processes, participant characteristics, and focus of study. Memory processes refer to processes at encoding (suggestions or perceptual sets offered to witnesses before they encode the event to be remembered, storage (manipulations occurring after exposure to the event), and retrieval (manipulations occurring at the time when the witness is asked to remember the event). Participant characteristics refer to the effects of developmental level, personal experience with the event in question, arousal level, etc. that could have a bearing on what and how much was remembered. Focus of study was said to refer to the class of dependent

variables that one is focusing on, such as memories for details versus memories for inferences and the gist, suggesting that the results of a memory experiment can be determined by how the memory is tested. The most neglected aspect of this taxonomy has been how personal experience variables and other internal working models of participants enter into eyewitness testimonies.

In order to understand how eyewitness testimony might be related to Bowlby's (1969) theory of attachment, and measures of attachment and related personality dynamics (Lindberg & Thomas, 1998), it is first necessary to discuss some theoretical implications of attachment theory. Bowlby (1969) suggested that early attachment relationships influence later development through the formation of internal working models. According to his theory, experiences of sensitive or insensitive care giving in childhood lead individuals to develop beliefs about themselves and what to expect from others. These beliefs were thought to form the basis of an internal working model of self and others. Bowlby (1969) suggested that working models act as "largely unconscious interpretive filters through which relationships and other social experiences, as well as self-understanding, are constructed" (as cited in Thompson, 1999, p. 267).

A recent study conducted by Quas, Goodman, Bidrose, Pipe, Craw, and Albin (1999) supported Bowlby's emphasis on internal working models as filters for the retention of experiences. In this study, Quas et al (1999) predicted that when children went through the stressful medical procedure of a Voiding Cystourethrogram Fluoroscopy (VCUG), children of secure parents, as measured by an adult relationship questionnaire, would more readily discuss it and report greater comfort. The results of this study supported the prediction that children who had secure attachment were less fearful and upset during and after VCUG. Furthermore,

children with fearful avoidant parents were more upset before the VCUG and were more likely to omit information about it when asked to recall. On the other hand, children with dismissing avoidant parents showed higher suggestibility and were more likely to give inaccurate, or contradictory, recalls.

Secure attachment histories have also been found to predict the kind of things children will recall. In a study by Belsky, Spritz, and Crnic (1996) children with a secure attachment remembered positive events in a puppet show more accurately than negative events.

Although these findings conform to Bowlby's (1969) suggestions that our internal working models filter what we perceive and influence the motives we attribute to others, little research has been done on how one's own experiences with physical abuse as a disciplinary method and internal working models of attachment affect how and what we remember about physical abuse and punishment of children.

In the present paradigm, participants were shown a video that was used in the earlier Lindberg et al. (2000) study. In the video, among other things, a mother appeared to hit her son and knock him to the floor after repeatedly asking him to help her and being ignored. Afterward, participants were given the Attachment and Personality Dynamics Questionnaire (APDQ) (Lindberg & Thomas, 1998). The APDQ was designed to measure attachment relationships and other aspects of personality. It has been compared with other instruments that measure attachment and it has been found to be psychometrically superior. It has been used to analyze populations of prisoners, eating disordered patients, and alcoholics. Participants were then tested for their memory of the film, their impressions about what motives were held by the figures in the film, and then they were asked questions about their beliefs about parental discipline.

First, in line with the literature on intergenerational transmission of abusive parenting (Klimes-Dougan & Kistner) we expect that there should be a strong relation between the scales of the APDQ (Lindberg & Thomas, 1998) and the participants' experience with similar types of abuse. Furthermore, insecure attachments should also be correlated with the number of times participants were reportedly hit like this.

If Bowlby (1969) and Ainsworth (1978) were correct about this hypothesis of internal working models, then one's scores on the APDQ (Lindberg & Thomas, 1998) should not only predict memory performance in the above predicted behaviors, they should also predict important dimensions of parenting behavior as well. There should also be a strong relation between the scales of measures of adult attachment (Lindberg & Thomas, 1998), and the participants' recall of inferences about maternal emotions and the emotions of the boy. Securely attached participant should report stress-related emotions (i.e. helpless) about the mother because the capacity for empathy has been consistently linked to secure attachment (Weinfeld, Sroufe, Egeland, and Carlson, 1999). Reports of sad feelings about the boy (i.e. feeling hurt) should predict low abusiveness since higher empathy is correlated with lower abusiveness (Weinfeld, et al., 1999). Thus, insecurely attached participants should be more likely to report that they would be angrier if they were the mother in the film and score high on the abusiveness scale.

Finally, according to the Lindberg et al (2000) model, one must pay special attention to interactions between memory processes, participant characteristics, and focus of study. For example, Lindberg et al. (2000) stated that although there will be interactions between personal characteristics and memories for gist, such interactions would not be present for memories for details. This would, therefore, predict that there should be no relation between the personal

characteristics of attachment or abuse history and amount of details recalled, suggestibility on memories for the details, or participant certainty about details.

In summary, several predictions can be offered by combining attachment models and the Lindberg et.al's (2000) model of the development of eyewitness testimony. First, there should be a relationship between participants' experience with abuse and the attachment and related scales of the APDQ. Second, there should be a relation between attachment and important dimensions of parenting such as beliefs in spanking and severity of punishment. Third, there should be correlations between recall of emotions felt by the mother and the boy and the scales of the APDQ. Finally, there should be no relationship between personal characteristics and memories for details.

Method

Participants

Participants included 65 males and 85 females, 18 years of age and older. All the participants were college students at Marshall University who volunteered for the study and received extra credit for participating.

Procedure

Participants gathered in a room assigned for this study and were asked to pay close attention to the film they were going to view. The film, taken from Lindberg et al (2000), was about two boys, aged 5 and 11 who came home from school and read a note their mother left them. The note told them to keep the living room clean and eat snacks in the kitchen. The boys ignored her note. When the mother came home, she asked the youngest boy to help her with the groceries. After he kept playing his video game and ignored her, she grabbed him by the arm and hit him in the face, the blow apparently sending him to the floor, then she pulled him to the

kitchen and hit him again. After viewing the film, participants were given 55 minutes to complete the Attachment and Personality Dynamics Questionnaire (APDQ) (Lindberg & Thomas, 1998). The APDQ (Appendix 1) has 30 scales designed to measure attachment to mother, father, and partner as well as other personality traits. Next the memory questionnaire (Appendix 2) was given to each participant. The questions on the film had both open and closed-ended questions to assess the participants' reaction to the mother and the boy and it also had one leading question that can help us determine which attachment strategy is more susceptible to suggestibility. When the participants completed the questionnaire, they were debriefed.

Results and Discussion

Personal Experience with Abuse. The participants' responses on how often they were hit as the boy was in the film by their own mothers (mom hit) were scored with "over four times a month" receiving a score of 1 and "never hit" a score of 4. The number of times they reported being hit by mother, dad, and caretaker were the dependent variables predicted in the regression analysis that used the scales of the APDQ as predictors. The results of the regression analyses are presented in Table 1.1.

Reports of being hit like the boy by their mothers were predicted by the following scales: Abuser, Ambivalent Mom, Codependent Partner, Jealousy, Peer Relations, Mistrust, and Withdrawal/Engagement. The abuser scale (i.e. I feel like hitting those people who are close to me) was the first variable entering the model with an $r^2 = .29$. It has been found that punitive parenting is related to disruptions in the development of empathy (Klimes-Dougan & Kistner, 1990). Compared to their nonabused counterparts, abused toddlers observed in a daycare center responded with anger, and physical attacks (Klimes-Dougan & Kistner, 1990). By the second year of life, the reactions of abused children already resemble the behavior of their abusive

parents (Klimes-Dougan & Kistner, 1990). This is seen in other literature as well. For example, Eron et al. (1974) found that children of highly punitive parents are more aggressive. Furthermore, physical punishment is linked to antisocial behavior from early childhood through adolescence (Parke & Slaby, 1983). Therefore, the fact that reports of maternal hitting were related to endorsements of abusiveness was expected and lends support to the construct validity of the scale.

The Ambivalent Mother (i.e. arguments with my mother were a love-hate kind of thing) and the Codependent Partner (i.e. I change my feelings to make my partner happy) scale also predicted the number of times participants were reportedly hit like the boy themselves. This has been found in the attachment literature with children. Children with ambivalent attachment have been found to have mothers who were inconsistent to their child's needs (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Generally, maltreated children experience distortions in parent-child interactions, in addition to incidents of abuse (Crittenden, 1981). In the Ainsworth Strange Situation, these children tend to be angry and anxious when their mothers leave the room. When she returns they display their ambivalence by clinging to her and then pushing her away (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Cassidy's (1994) study on attachment and emotion regulation found that ambivalent attachment is associated with hypervigilance and by affect enhancement. This attachment classification has a maximizing strategy by engaging in heightened expressions (Collins & Read, 1990). However, physical aggression and its link to ambivalent attachment needs to be explored more since most literature focuses on maltreatment and disorganized attachment (Lyons-Ruth & Jacobvitz, 1999).

The variable Jealousy (I worry that my partner will find somebody else) was correlated with the other predictor variable but not with the dependent variable. It is possible that they were acting as suppressor variables.

Peer relationships (i.e. my friends will always be there when I need them) also predicted the number of times the participants reported that they were hit like the boy in the film. Family environments high in conflict and characterized by harsh discipline have been found to lead to antisocial behavior and tend to undermine social competence (Patterson et al., 1989). Furthermore, rejected children interact with peers with greater conflict, hostility, and impulsive behavior (Rubin et al., 1990).

Moreover, mistrust (i.e. it is good to be suspicious about the motives of others) was correlated with the participants' reports of maternal abuse. Abused children often see hostile intent where it does not exist. This conforms to the findings by Dodge, Bates, and Pettit (1990) who found that preschoolers whose parents physically punished them were more likely to give aggressive solutions to social problems in which intentions were unclear. Noncoercive child rearing fosters accurate appraisals of others' intentions and nonaggressive approaches to solving social problems (Weiss et al., 1992).

Finally, perceived maternal abuse was predicted by the withdrawal/ engagement scale (i.e. I do not want others to know what is going on in my life). It has been found that abused children with ambivalent attachment internalize their feelings putting them in risk for depression (Main, 1990). This was also found in a study by Allen et al. (1998) that related internalizing strategies with maternal insecurity. In addition, child-mother interactions are more likely to be characterized by avoidance of problem solving and by high levels of dysfunctional anger. Thus, physically abused children seem to have more difficulty getting their upset feelings relieved in the attachment relationship, keeping everything inside (Kobak & Cole, 1994).

Participants' responses on how many times they were hit by their fathers (dad hit), on the other hand, were only predicted by the avoidant attachment-father scale (i.e. When I got really mad at my father, I felt cold and rejecting towards him) with an $r^2 = .13$.

There are several studies that might clarify as to why only that scale predicted paternal hitting and not the same scale that predicts maternal abuse. It has been suggested that fathers promote the child's security in different ways than mothers. According to Cox et al. (1992), reciprocity during play, and the father's sensitive support of the child's exploration are the major variables predicting secure attachment. In other research by Belsky (1993), security of attachment to fathers was associated with paternal play and problem solving interactions. It is possible that when the father is abusive, the child's major coping strategy is to simply avoid him. Avoidance could be seen as an effective way of escaping the abuse.

The final dependent variable was how many times participants were hit by a caregiver, other than the parents. The scales that predicted the times hit by a secondary caregiver were Ambivalent Mother (i.e. arguments with my mother were a love-hate kind of thing) and Obsessive-Compulsive (i.e. once I start thinking about a problem, I think about it over and over again) scales with an $r^2 = .14$.

There is no research to address the effects of abusive nonparental caregiving. More research is needed to look at what links abusive secondary caregiving with ambivalence towards the mother and obsessive-compulsive behavior.

In conclusion, three dependent variables dealing with experienced abuse and attachment to the abuser were explored in this study; reports of mother hit, father hit, and caregiver hit. The mother hit variable was related to five scales on the APDQ, with the Abuser, Ambivalent Mom, Codependent Partner, Peer Relations, Mistrust, and Withdrawal/Engagement. The Jealousy scale

acted as a suppressor variable. The Father hit variable was related to only one scale-the Avoidant Father scale. The caregiver abuse data were predicted by the Ambivalent Mother and Obsessive-Compulsive scales.

Intergenerational issues in parenting: The present study also attempted to explore the intergenerational issues of parenting with the questions “How firmly do you believe in spanking?”, and “How hard did Marc deserve to be hit?”. The “spank” question was answered by subjects on a four-point Likert scale ranging 1=strongly disbelieve, 2=disbelieve, 3=believe, 4=strongly believe. The results of the stepwise regression, which may be seen on Table 1.2, revealed that past experience of being hit by one’s own mother and the APDQ scales of Abuser, Low Sexual Arousal, and Shame all predicted one’s belief in spanking.

The fact that participants who had been hit by their own mothers believed more strongly in spanking agrees with studies that demonstrated a link between a mother’s own experience with childhood abuse and her display of hostile behavior toward her child (Lyons-Ruth, & Block, 1996; Lyons-Ruth, Zoll, Connell, & Grunebaum, 1989). There is also ample evidence that a large proportion of parents who have had children removed from them for maltreatment were victims of the same types of maltreatment themselves (Altemeier, O’Connell, Vietze, Andler, & Sherrod, 1982).

The result showing that participants scoring high on the Abuser scale of the APDQ were more likely to believe in spanking as an acceptable form of parent-child discipline also fits well with the child abuse literature. Research shows that mothers who are abusive are often unable to formulate alternative disciplinary measures to corporal punishment (Azar, Robinson, Hekiman, & Twentyman, 1984). As Gelles (1987) proposed, “physical punishment is a necessary precursor to physical abuse”, suggesting that physically abusive tendencies are juxtaposed to, if not

preceded by the use of physical punishment. A low level of general sexual arousal was also found to be a predictor, but there was no significant correlation found here suggesting that it was added to the model as a moderating variable.

Furthermore, our data revealed that participants who would support the spanking of a child also scores lower in levels of shame as predicted by the APDQ. This was also found by Holden, Miller, and Harris (1999) who found less maternal guilt among mothers who reported spanking their child at least once per week than in mothers who never spanked or only spanked occasionally.

The question on how hard they thought Marc should have been hit was answered on a four point Likert scale with the choices 1= much harder, 2= somewhat harder, 3= somewhat less hard, and 4= not hit at all. Results of this regression (Table 1.3) showed that participants who thought the boy should have been hit harder were predicted by past experience of being hit by one's own mother, Secure Partner, Female, Abuser, low levels of Shame, and high levels of Denial.

As in the previous model on spanking, people who reported being hit by their mothers in the past were also more likely to say that the boy in the video should have been hit harder vs. not at all. Other studies have shown evidence of the parent-to-child transmission of the use of physical punishment. Furthermore, abusive parents often do not realize the harsh reactions of their children to physical punishment because of their own unresolved past history of being abused (Rogosch, Cicchetti, Shields, & Toth, 1995).

Insecure Partner was also a predictor of participants who thought that Marc should have been hit harder. It has been found that secure partnerships moderated the effects of previous experiences of maltreatment thereby reducing the risk of transmission of aggression and abuse

(Egeland, Jacobvitz, & Sroufe, 1988; Main, & Goldwyn, 1984). Therefore, people with insecure partners would be more likely to report that the boy should have been hit harder vs. not hit at all.

The data from the present study also showed that females reported that the boy should have been hit harder. This supports the findings of Day, Peterson, & McCracken (1998) who reported that although many feel that the male is more often the disciplinary figure, mothers used corporal punishment more than fathers. Starrels (1994) also found that while mothers are more often in the role of child nurturer, they are also the main source of discipline and rule enforcement.

As in the previous model on spanking, abusers are not only likely to support spanking as a form of punishment, but according to our data they are more likely to believe in hitting. This has also been found by Egeland, Jacobvitz, and Paptola (1987) who reported that mothers in a physically abusive test group supported spanking more intensely and more frequently than non-abusive mothers in a similar group.

Low levels of Shame on the APDQ were also found to predict who would favor hitting. Holden, Miller, and Harris (1999) found less maternal guilt among mothers who reported spanking their child at least once per week, suggesting that not only would these parents be more apt to hit, they would also be in support of hitting harder.

Denial was the final scale that predicted the how hard hit question. Past studies have shown that many abusive parents or parents who might be found to hit harder are often in denial about their own past experience with maltreatment and thereby transfer the aggression to their own children (Rogosch et al., 1995; Main, & Goldwyn, 1984).

In summary, the data for this study yielded two models on parenting and discipline. Predictors of people believing more strongly in spanking as an acceptable form of punishment were people who had been hit by their own mothers, Abusers, and scored low on the Shame scales. Participants who thought the child in the video should have been hit harder for disobeying his mother were predicted by past experience of being hit by one's own mother, Insecure partner, Female, Abuser, low Shame, and Denial.

Recall of Details. No significant regression models were found for the following dependent variables: What did Mom's note say, recall of room items, Incorrect note items recalled, Why the boys were late, How many drops of blood, What chores were the boys to do, Incorrect chores recalled, What did the older boy leave to do, and Did the mother hit the older boy. Furthermore, no significant regression models were found for the following tests of certainty of answers: How sure of what the note said, how sure of why the boys were late, how sure of what chores the boys were to do, and how sure of what the older boy did. Finally, neither the scales of the APDQ nor the personal experience of getting hit like the boy in the film predicted who would be more suggestible. This was explored by analyzing how many drops of non-existent blood they reported seeing in the film. Were many participants cognizant of the fact that they had been given a leading question about blood? This leading question asked, "What was the mother saying as she was taking Marc to the kitchen to wipe the blood coming from his bloody nose?" Only 8 participants responded that there was no blood, while 149 either thought there was blood or did not think it was an important detail to point out.

One thing that has been the source of much frustration to clinicians has been when one witnesses abuse, but for some reason does not report it. To get at this variable, those who reported that the mother hit the boy were given a score of 1(N=119) and those who did not report

that the mother hit the boy were assigned a score of 0 (N=38). Stepwise regressions using the scales of the APDQ were then used as independent variables to predict what were the characteristics of the participants who reported and those who did not report the younger boy getting hit. The results can be seen in Table 1.8. It was found that the participants most likely to not report abuse were those with high scores on ambivalent father, high on codependent mother, and they were hit like this when they were younger. The obsessive-compulsive variable was a moderator for the other variables. These data could be thought of as an extension of the findings of the Lindberg, Keiffer, and Thomas (2000) study where it was found that mixed messages decreased the probability of reporting. Here, it was found that if one had a mixed insecure attachment style and a remembered history of similar discipline, then they were less likely to report the mother hitting the child. In summary, whether one reported that the mom hit the boy was predicted by participants' scores on the scales of ambivalent father, codependent mother, and whether they were hit by their own mother.

Emotions Reported. In two of the questions on the questionnaire, participants were asked to list emotions the characters would have felt. First, participants were asked to list all feelings that would have been felt by the mother during the film. Those who reported more feelings for the mother tended to be female and scored higher on the anxiety scale of the APDQ, agreeing with statements such as “I feel that something bad is about to happen”, and “I use a lot of energy worrying about my problems”. Those listing more emotions for the mother also scored higher on the secure father scale. However, this scale did not correlate significantly with the number of emotions reported and probably acted as a moderator variable, improving the reliability of gender and anxiety (Table 1.4).

Research has supported the significance of gender as a predictor of empathy. In a study by Hunt (1990) girls reacted with greater empathy than boys when they were shown slides and told stories. Eisenberg & Lennon (1983) found women were more likely to report “feeling distressed at another’s distress (Myers, 1996)”. Gender differences in empathy could be a result of differences in sensitivity to nonverbal cues. Using a two second silent film clip of the face of an upset woman, Hall (1984) found that women were able to guess more accurately whether the woman was criticizing someone or talking about her divorce. Hall concluded that women were better at decoding others’ emotional messages (Myers, 1996). The significance of anxiety as a predictor of number of feelings recalled for the mother is not clear and needs further study.

Next, participants were asked to list all feelings that would have been felt by the boy during the film. Those who reported more emotions for the boy scored higher on the secure partner scale of the APDQ. They were more likely to agree with such statements as “My partner is there when I need to talk about a problem”, and “When I am upset my partner helps me deal with it”. Those reporting more feelings for the boy also scored lower on the abusiveness scale, disagreeing with statements such as “I feel like hitting people who are close to me”, and “some people deserve to be put in their place”. As was the case for the question about the mother, participants reporting more feelings with the boy scored higher in anxiety. However, here anxiety did not correlate significantly and, therefore, was probably a moderator variable (Table 1.5)

It makes sense that those who recalled more emotions would score higher on at least one of the security scales because the capacity for empathy has consistently been linked to secure attachment (Weinfield, Sroufe, Egeland, and Carlson, 1999). In a study by Sroufe, children who were securely attached as infants were rated by preschool teachers at age four as being more

empathic (Berk, 2000). Liable and Thomson (1998) found securely attached preschoolers scored higher on two assessments of emotional understanding (Thomson, 1999). This ability of secure children to be “sensitive to another’s emotional cues” may be developed in early relationships and carried into later ones (Weinfield, Sroufe, Egeland, & Carlson, 1999). Weinfield et al. (1999) suggested that the parental responsiveness that is believed to lead to secure attachment also gives rise to empathy. It is also possible that another result of this type of parenting is a lower likelihood of becoming an abuser. If this is the case, the fact that higher empathy was correlated with lower abusiveness is not surprising. Troy and Sroufe (1987) found that children with avoidant histories were more likely to “victimize” other children in play while children with secure histories were never victimizers (Weinfield, Sroufe, Egeland, & Carlson, 1999).

Participants were also asked to rate feelings of the mother and boy on Likert scales. In one set of questions, participants were asked to rate how angry they would have been if they were the mother and how angry they would have been as the boy. They were asked to give their answer on a scale of 1 to 4, as follows: 1=Not at all angry, 2= Somewhat angry, 3=Angry, 4=very angry. Although there was no significant model for the boy, there was a significant model for the mother. The regression model (Table 1.6) found that those who said they would have been very angry if they were the mother scored higher on the abusiveness scale, were female, and were more likely to report being hit like this themselves by their own mother. Because gender did not significantly correlate with anger, it probably represents a moderator variable that improved the predictability of the abusiveness scale. Furthermore, insecurely attached children of various ages have been found to show more anger and aggression in school, with playmates, and toward mothers (Weinfield, Sroufe, Egeland, & Carlson, 1999). Since

abuse is a predictor of disorganized attachment, the fact that these participants had been hit like this themselves could be a factor in explaining their aggression.

In another set of questions, participants were asked to rate from 1 to 4 how much the mother appeared to love the boy and how much the boy loved the mother. Although no significant model emerged for the boy, Likert ratings on mother love did. Those who rated the mother as more loving of the boy scored higher on the family suppression of feelings scale of the APDQ, agreeing with statements such as “People in my family had firm expectations for how we were supposed to feel”, and “It was good to keep your feelings to yourself in our family”. They were also more likely to have been hit by their mothers themselves (Table 1.7).

This study asked three sets of questions. The first set looked at the relationship between participants’ experience with abuse and the scales of the APDQ. The results showed that there is a relationship between the two variables. Participants who had been hit by their mothers tend to be abusive, have an insecure attachment towards their mother, maybe less socially competent and not be able to trust people, and keep their feelings to themselves. Those who reported having been hit by their fathers have an avoidant attachment towards their fathers.

The second question examined the relationship between attachment and beliefs in spanking and severity of punishment. Those who believed in spanking reported being hit by their mothers, they tend to be abusive, and have no guilt. Those who thought that the boy deserved to be hit harder, also had experience with abuse, are insecurely attached to their partners, tend to be abusive, deny their behavior, and show no guilt.

Finally, we predicted that there should be correlations between recall of emotions felt by the mother and the boy and the scales of the APDQ, and there should not be a relationship between personal characteristics and memories for details. There is a correlation between

feelings felt by the mother and attachment. The number of emotions reported for mom was predicted by the Gender, and Secure Father scales. Females with secure attachments towards their father reported more emotion for mom. The participants with secure partner attachment who reported low abusiveness also reported more emotions for the boy.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Walls, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: a psychological study of the strange situation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Allen, J. P., Moore, C. M., Kuperminc, G. P., & Bell, K. L. (1998). Attachment and adolescence psychological functioning. Child Development, 69, 1406-1419.
- Altemeier et al. (1984). Prediction of childhood abuse: a prospective study of feasibility. Child Abuse and Neglect, 8(4), 393-400.
- Azar, S. T., Robinson, D. R., Hekimian, E., & Twentyman, C. T. (1984). Unrealistic expectations and problem solving ability in maltreating and comparison mothers. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52 (4), 687-691.
- Belsky, J. (1993). Promoting father involvement: An analysis and critique. Journal of Family Psychology, 7, 287-292.
- Belsky, J., Spitz, B., & Crnic, K. (1996). Infant attachment security and affect-cognitive information processing at age 3. Psychological Science, 7, (2), 111-114.
- Berk, L. E. (2000). Child Development. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Disruption of affectional bonds and its effects on behavior. Canada's Mental health Supplement, 59, (12).
- Cassidy, J. (1994). Emotion regulation: Influences on attachment relationships. In N. A. Fox (Ed.). The development of emotion regulation: Biological and biobehavioral considerations. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 59, 228-249.
- Cassidy, J. (1998). Attachment and object relations theories and the concept of independent behavioral systems: commentary. Social Development, 7, (1), 120-126.

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

Cox, M. J., Owen, M. T., Henderson, V. K., & Margand, N. A. (1992). Prediction of infant-father and infant-mother attachment. Developmental Psychology, 28, 474-483.

Crittenden, P. M. (1981). Abusing, neglecting, problematic, and adequate dyads: Differentiating by patterns of interaction. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 27, 201-208.

Day, R. D., Peterson, G. W., & McCracken, C. (1998). Predicting spanking of younger and older children by mothers and fathers. Journal Marriage and the Family, 60, 91, 79-94.

Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Pettit, G. S. (1990). Mechanisms in the circle of violence. Science, 250, 1678-1683.

Egeland, B., Jacobvitz, D., & Sroufe, L. A. (1988). Breaking the cycle of abuse. Child Development, 59, (4), 1080-1088.

Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., Huesman, L. R., & Lefkowitz, N. M. (1974). The convergence of laboratory and field studies of the development of aggression. In J. DeWit & W. Hartup (Eds.), Determinants and Origins of Aggressive Behavior. The Hague: Mouton.

French, D. C., & Waas, G. A. (1985). Behavior problems of peer-neglected and peer-rejected elementary age children: Parent and teacher perspectives. Child Development, 56, 246-252.

Gelles, R. J. (1987). The family and its role in the abuse of children. Psychiatric Annals, 17 (4), 229-232.

Holden, G. W., Miller, P. P., & Harris, S. D. (1999). The instrumental side of corporal punishment: Parents' reported practices and outcome expectancies. Journal of marriage and the Family, *61* (4), 908-919.

Klimes-Dougan, B., & Kistner, J. (1990). Physically abused preschoolers' responses to peers' distress. Developmental Psychology, *26*, 599-602.

Kobak, R. R., & Cole, C. (1994). Attachment and metamonitoring: Implications for adolescence autonomy and psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti (Ed.), Rochester Symposium on Development and Psychopathology: Disorders of the Self. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

Laible, D. J., & Thompson, R. A. (1998). Attachment and emotional understanding in preschool children. Developmental Psychology, *34*, (5), 1038-1045.

Lindberg, M. A., Keiffer, J., & Thomas, S. W. (2000). Eyewitness testimony for physical abuse as a function of personal experience, development, and focus of study.

Lindberg, M. A., & Thomas, S. W. (1998). Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association, Chicago IL.

Lyons-Ruth, K., & Block, D. (1996). The disturbed caregiving system: Relations among childhood trauma, maternal caregiving, and infant affect and attachment. Infant Mental Health Journal, *17*, (3), 257-275.

Lyons-Ruth, K., & Jacobvitz, D. (1999). Attachment disorganization; unresolved loss, relational violence, and lapses in behavioral and attentional strategies. In J. Cassidy & P. H. Shaver (Eds.), Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications. New York: The Guilford Press.

Lyons-Ruth, K., Zoll, D., Connel, D., & Grunembaum, H. U. (1989). Family deviance and family disruption in childhood: Associations with maternal behavior and infant maltreatment during the first 2 years of life. Development and Psychology, 1, (13), 219-236.

Main, M. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of attachment organization: Recent studies, changing methodologies, and the concept of conditional strategies. Human Development, 33, 48-61.

Main M., & Goldwyn, R. (1983). Predicting rejection of her infant from mother's representation of her own experience. Implications of the abused-abusing intergenerational cycle. Child Abuse and Neglect, 8, (2), 203-217.

Myers, D. G. (1996). Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Parke, R. D., & Slaby, R. G. (1983). The development of aggression. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology: Socialization, Personality, and Social Development. New York: Wiley.

Patterson, G. R., DeBaryshe, B. D., & Ramsey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective on antisocial behavior. American Psychologist, 44, 331.

Quas, J. A., Goodman, G. S., Bidrose, S., Pipe, M. E., Craw, S, & Albin, D. S. (1999). Emotion and memory: Children's long-term remembering, forgetting, and suggestibility. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 72, 235-270

Rogosch, F. A., Cicchetti, D., Shields, A., & Toth, S. L. (1995). Parenting dysfunction in child maltreatment. Bornstein M. H. (ed). Handbook of Parenting: Applied and Practical Parenting, 4. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rubin, K. H., LeMare, L., & Lollis, S. (1990). Social withdrawal in childhood: Developmental pathways to peer rejection. Peer Rejection in Childhood, 18, 1-68.

Starrels, M. E. (1994). Gender differences in parent-child relation. Journal of Family Issues, 15, (1), 148-165.

Thompson, R. A. (1999). Attachment in infancy and childhood. Cassidy, J & Shaver, P. R. (Eds). Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications. New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 1999.

Weiss, B., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Pettit, G. S. (1992). Some consequences of early harsh discipline: Child aggression and a maladaptive social information processing style. Child Development, 63, 1321-1335.

Weinfield, N., Sroufe, L. A., Egeland, B., & Carlson, E. (1999). Handbook of Attachment Theory, Research and Clinical Application, 68-88. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Appendix 1

Mom hit	Intercept	101.77***	6.95	0.68	
	Abuser	6.89***	-0.34	0.12	0.09
	Ambivalent Mom	10.16***	-0.36	0.11	0.13
	Codependent Partner	11.43***	-0.56	0.11	0.16
	Jealousy	19.27***	0.6	0.13	0.21
	Peer relations	6.23**	-0.26	0.1	0.23
	Mistrust	6.04**	-0.33	0.13	0.16
	Withdrawal Engagement	4.07*	-0.28	0.14	0.28
	<u>Predictor</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>SEB</u>	<u>r²</u>
Dad Hit	Intercept	459.24***	4.42	0.2	
	Avoidant	21.28***	-0.42	0.09	0.13
Care hit	Intercept	587.46	4.67	0.19	
	Ambivalent mothr	14.46	-0.24	0.06	0.1
	Obsessive-compulsive	4.9	-0.14	0.06	0.13

1.2 Believe in Spanking

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Predictor</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>SEB</u>	<u>r2</u>
Spanking	Intercept	53.36***	4.1	0.56	
	Mom Hit	13.06***	-0.31	0.08	0.11
	Abuser	16.79***	0.59	0.14	0.16
	Sexual Arousal	7.12**	-0.39	0.14	0.22
	Shame	4.4*	-0.37	0.17	0.24

1.3 Characteristics of people who thought hit harder

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Predictor</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>SEB</u>	<u>r²</u>
How Hard	Intercept	34.65***	2.54	0.05	
	Mom hit	53.48***	0.37	0.06	0.29
	Secure partner	10.11**	0.18	0.08	0.34
	Gender	9.84**	-0.26	0.09	0.37
	Abuser	12.07**	-0.3	0.12	0.41
	Shame	10.11*	0.37	0.08	0.43
	Denial	4.8*	-0.17		0.45

1.4 Who reports or does not report abuse?

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Predictor</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>SEB</u>	<u>Model r²</u>
No recall	Mom hit	7.25**	0.12	0.04	0.05
	Ambivalent father	4.43*	-0.12	0.06	0.08
	Obsessive Compulsive	9.54**	0.22	0.07	0.11
	Codependent mother	5.73*	-0.21	0.09	0.15

1.5 Feelings felt by the mother

Variable	Predictor	F	B	SEB	Model r2
Number of Emotions Reported For Mom	Intercept	941.8***	21.06	0.69	
	Gender	7.5**	0.54	0.2	0.04
	Anxiety	7.73**	0.58	0.21	0.08
Mom Stress	Secure father	6.3*	0.28	0.11	0.12
	Intercept	89.3***	4.78	0.51	
	Gender	11.60***	0.47	0.14	0.04
	Sexual Arousal	4.46*	0.28	0.13	0.07
	Codependent Mom	8.96**	-0.49	0.16	0.11
	Anxiety	4.22*	0.3	0.15	0.14
Non-Feelings Words	Intercept	2.18	0.36	0.24	
	Codependent Mom	16.16***	0.37	0.09	0.08
	Avoidant father	7.11**	-0.15	0.06	0.11
	Trust	3.29*	0.15	0.07	0.13

1.6 Feelings felt by Marc

Variable	Predictor	F	B	SEB	r²
Number of Emotions Reported For Boy	Intercept	799.94***	22.39	0.79	
	Secure Partner	5.41*	0.36	0.16	0.06
	Abuser	7.95**	-0.63	0.22	0.09
	Anxiety	6.89**	0.61	0.23	0.14
Upset	Intercept	76.14***	4.34	0.5	
	Sexual Arousal	8.11**	0.37	0.13	0.03
	Codependent Mom	6.77**	-0.4	0.15	0.06
	Gender	5.57*	0.33	0.14	0.1
Sad	Intercept	112.56***	4.77	0.45	
	Abuser	21.92***	-0.58	0.12	0.08
	Ambivalent Mom	9.28**	0.34	0.11	0.15
	Religious Practices	4.49*	-0.2	0.09	0.18

1.7 Angry with Marc

<u>Predictor</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>SEB</u>	<u>r2</u>
Inercept	12.28***	1.64	0.47	
Abuser	9.74**	0.38	0.12	0.08
Gender	8.52**	0.36	0.12	0.13
Hit by Mom	5.5*	-0.18	0.08	0.16

1.8 Mother loved Marc

<u>Predictor</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>SEB</u>	<u>r2</u>
Intercept	69.17***	4.16	0.5	
Hit by Mom	12.69***	-0.33	0.09	0.06
family Suppression	6.85**	-0.37	0.14	0.1

Appendix 2

APDQ6

Thank you for agreeing to fill out this survey for Marshall University. Do not put your name on this, as all responses will be confidential. (We are interested in averaging your responses with others at this point in time).

The word "partner" refers to your most important spouse, fiancé, steady date or a significant romantic interest in your life. If you are not currently involved in such a relationship, think about your most significant past partner and answer the questions with that relationship in mind. If you never had a steady or meaningful relationship in your life, leave the questions on partners blank.

Questions about your family, mother, and father refer to the family you grew up in. When answering questions about members of your family, think about who or what was true, typical, or most important while you were growing up (during the school age years). If you didn't have a mother or father figure, leave those questions blank. Although it may seem as if you are answering the same questions over and over, you are not. It is just that the same question is asked about different people.

Write your answers on the scoring sheets by filling in the appropriate circle. When you get to item 201, please start on the next answer sheet with # 1. Please use the following scale to estimate how often these statements apply to you.

A = never B = sometimes C = often D = always

1. When my mother felt sad for days, I did too.
2. When it comes to anger, those close to me have a short fuse.
3. If I don't trust other people then I will not be disappointed.
4. I like to withdraw from people when I am stressed.
5. I satisfy my partner's sexual needs.
6. I feel scared.
7. I felt bad when I did not include my father in things.
8. I need a close relationship with my partner.
9. When I had an argument with my mother, I got very angry.
10. Some people deserve to be hit.
11. The same thoughts run through my head for days.
12. I am worthless.
13. When I have an argument with my partner, I get very angry.
14. My father had hostile feelings towards me.
15. Family rules were unclear.
16. I liked being taken care of by my mother.
17. I go to great lengths to prevent my partner from being angry with me.
18. My family followed rules.
19. I worry that my partner will find somebody else.
20. It was good to keep your feelings to yourself in our family.
21. I had a safe secure relationship with my father.
22. I like to be the best at things.
23. I change my feelings to make my partner happy.

A = never B = sometimes C = often D = always

24. I feel better about myself when I win.
25. A higher power/God is important to me.
26. My partner and I have a special sexual connection.
27. I was more committed than my mother in our relationship.
28. My family did things the same way each time.
29. I had a good relationship with my father.
30. I tried to please my mother.
31. I feel good when I change my partner for his/her own good.
32. I feel fearful
33. I do not amount to much as a person.
34. My father tried to change me for my own good.
35. I can usually depend on other people when I need them.
36. I like to get away from everyone when there is too much confusion.
37. My mother got angry with me.
38. I try to figure out what my partner wants.
39. I created an image of who I thought I was supposed to be in my own family.
40. It is important for me to be right.
41. I tried to like the same things that my mother did.
42. My father and I were close in every way.
43. I feel like a punching bag for other people.
44. My family made decisions the same way every time.
45. I feel uncomfortable with my friends.
46. I am distracted in conversations with others because I am thinking about something else that is important.
47. I feel like hitting those people who are close to me.
48. When I was stressed, I liked to stay away from my father.
49. It was good to keep feelings from my family.
50. It is important for me to know what my partner is doing.
51. I feel resentful because I can not pursue my own interests.
52. I needed a close relationship with my father.
53. My partner makes me angry.
54. I went to great lengths to get my mother to like me.
55. A disagreement with my partner ends in a shouting match.
56. I like to be alone when I am troubled.
57. I had a safe secure relationship with my mother.
58. I feel guilty for not taking care of my family's duties.
59. My partner gets hostile feelings towards me.
60. I say I am fine when I am really not.
61. Being by myself without my father was painful.
62. When my partner feels sad for days, I do too.
63. After an argument with my father, I tried to avoid him.
64. I try harder in our relationship than my partner.

A = never B = sometimes C = often D = always

65. I feel tense.
66. I miss what others say because I am working on something else in my head.
67. I went to great lengths to prevent my mother from being angry with me.
68. I had the greatest father in the world.
69. I like to do things right or not do them at all.
70. I am turned on if I see a pornographic movie.
71. People in my family had firm expectations for how we were supposed to feel.
72. It is important for me to achieve.

73. I wish others would not call or talk to me when I am upset.
 74. When it comes to anger I am patient.
 75. When someone is mean to me I feel like hitting them.
 76. I liked being taken care of by my father.
 77. Other people should work hard.
 78. I worry about what my partner is doing during the day.
 79. I am turned on sexually when I see someone in a magazine half undressed.
 80. It is good to trust other people.
 81. Being by myself without my partner is painful.
 82. My anger is a good cover-up for other feelings that I have.
 83. If I am really upset, my partner is not good at helping me deal with it.
 84. I trust other people.
 85. My mother did not fully understand me.
 86. I have a hard time getting my mind off of problems.
 87. I say I am happy when I really am not.
 88. Other people feel better about themselves when they win.
 89. I tried to please my father.
 90. After an argument with my partner, I try to avoid him/her.
 91. It was important to look good in my family.
 92. I worry about being left alone without my partner.
 93. I was more committed than my father in our relationship.
 94. When it comes to anger, I have a short fuse.
 95. I tried harder in our relationship than my mother.
 96. My family believed that family rules should not change.
 97. My partner is there when I need to talk about a problem.
 98. When I got angry with my father, I liked to get away from him for awhile.
 99. I do not want others to know what is going on in my life.
 100. My feelings for my father were confusing.
 101. A higher power/God is not important to me.
 102. When I was stressed, I liked to stay away from my mother.
 103. My church/place of worship is important to me in my life.
 104. When I had an argument with my father, I got very angry.
 105. My partner and I are close in every way.
 106. I am afraid of losing control.
 107. I tried to like the same things my father did.
 A = never B = sometimes C = often D = always
108. Some people deserve to be put in their place.
 109. I say I am not angry when I really am.
 110. My partner is sexually appealing to others.
 111. When I was really upset, my mother was not good at helping me deal with it.
 112. Some people deserve to be criticized.
 113. A higher power/God guides my life.
 114. I try to like the same things that my partner does.
 115. I changed my feelings to make my mother happy.
 116. Emotional extremes were frowned upon in my family.
 117. I go to great lengths to get my partner to like me.
 118. I have fun with friends.
 119. When I was upset, my father helped me deal with it.
 120. It is good to be suspicious about the motives of others.
 121. I am easily turned on sexually.
 122. My mother had hostile feelings towards me.
 123. I wish others would leave me alone.
 124. My partner does not fully appreciate me.
 125. Sex is best when it is accompanied by warm feelings.

126. I had the greatest mother in the world.
 127. I should work hard.
 128. I worried about being left alone without my mother.
 129. When I got really mad at my father, I felt cold and rejecting towards him.
 130. Arguments with my mother involved a shouting match.
 131. I hate it when my partner is around people who might flirt.
 132. My friends know how I feel.
 133. It is good to keep a stiff upper lip even when I hurt inside.
 134. Once I start thinking about a problem, I think about it over and over again.
 135. Basically I am good.
 136. I have pressed for and gotten sex even though my partner wasn't interested at the time.
 137. Being by myself without my mother was painful.
 138. I am very concerned about details.
 139. I went to great lengths to get my father to like me.
 140. I am more strongly committed in our relationship than my partner.
 141. I feel afraid, but do not know why.
 142. I went to great lengths to prevent my father from being angry with me.
 143. I tried to figure out what my mother wanted.
 144. My partner does not understand me fully.
 145. Others are turned on sexually when they see someone in a magazine half undressed.
 146. I use a lot of energy trying to get people to do what I want them to do.
 147. After an argument with my mother, I tried to avoid her.
 148. I feel ashamed when I feel sad, rejected, fearful, lonely, dependent or hurt.
 149. I feel comfortable with my friends.

A = never B = sometimes C = often D = always

150. I try to change my partner for his/her own good.
 151. I needed a close relationship with my mother.
 152. Other people like me.
 153. If I have an argument with my partner, I want to run away from them for awhile.
 154. It is hard to get some things out of my mind.
 155. Keeping busy helps me ignore my feelings.
 156. When I had an argument with my mother, I wanted to run away from her for awhile.
 157. I changed my feelings to make my father happy.
 158. I avoid people who do not do what I expect them to do.
 159. My feelings for my partner are confusing.
 160. My mother was there when I needed to talk about a problem.
 161. When my father felt sad for days, I did too.
 162. I enjoy playing or going out with my friends.
 163. Sex with my current partner is good.
 164. When I am upset, my partner helps me deal with it.
 165. I think about every little detail of a problem, and then think about it again and again.
 166. My mother and I were close in every way.
 167. When bad feelings come to me, I want to be by myself.
 168. It is hard to know what my partner wants.
 169. Arguments with my mother were like a love-hate kind of thing where feelings went back and forth.
 170. I feel better about myself when I lose.
 171. I tried harder in our relationship than my father.
 172. I get angry when others flirt with my partner.
 173. My father was there when I needed to talk about a problem.
 174. I go from one thing to another trying to be satisfied.
 175. I am concerned with being moral.
 176. I like sex.
 177. I want to be alone.

178. My partner and I are equally committed in our relationship.
 179. My mother tried to change me for my own good.
 180. I think about sex with others.
 181. It is easy to ask my friends for help.
 182. I can think about the same person or thing for days.
 183. When I got angry with my mother, I liked to get away from her for awhile.
 184. I worry about little things.
 185. My father did not fully understand me.
 186. Sometimes I fear getting too close to my partner.
 187. It was hard to know what my mother wanted.
 188. I worried about being left alone without my father.
 189. My mother was supportive when I had a problem.
 190. My partner gets angry with me.
 191. It is best to avoid situations that I can not control.
 A = never B = sometimes C = often D = always

192. I attend a place of worship/church.
 193. Family rules were clear.
 194. When I am sick or upset, I like to be with my partner.
 195. I had a good relationship with my mother.
 196. My partner satisfies my sexual needs.
 197. I repeat the same habits over and over.
 198. I am a bad person.
 199. My friends will always be there when I need them.
 200. A disagreement with my mother ended in a shouting match.

GO TO NEXT ANSWER SHEET AND PUT QUESTION 201 ON 1, 202 ON 2 ETC.

A = never B = sometimes C = often D = always

201. When I had an argument with my father, I wanted to run away from him for awhile.
 202. I feel bad when I do not include my partner in things.
 203. When I was upset, my mother helped me deal with it.
 204. If I get angry with my partner, I like to get away from him/her for awhile.
 205. I felt good when I changed my father for his own good.
 206. I feel ashamed when I have to stand up for myself.
 207. I need to know where my partner is.
 208. I wish others would come over and visit when I am upset.
 209. When I got really mad at my mother, I felt cold and rejecting towards her.
 210. I have a lot to be ashamed of.
 211. My father was supportive when I had a problem.
 212. When I get angry, I explode.
 213. Arguments with my partner are like a love-hate kind of thing where feelings go back and forth.
 214. I felt bad when I did not include my mother in things.
 215. A disagreement with my father ended in a shouting match.
 216. I use a lot of energy worrying about my problems.
 217. My partner is supportive when I have a problem.
 218. I talk about what turns me on sexually with my partner.
 219. Arguments with my partner involve a shouting match.
 220. My feelings for my mother were confusing.
 221. I make my partner angry.
 222. I feel that something bad is about to happen.
 223. When I get really mad at my partner, I feel cold and rejecting towards him/her.
 224. If people would just change a little bit then most of my problems would go away.
 225. I try to please my partner.
 226. I tried to figure out what my father wanted.

227. I avoid situations that I can not control.
228. When I was really upset, my father was not good at helping me deal with it.
229. It is important for me to know what my partner is doing.
A = never B = sometimes C = often D = always
230. When I am angry, I take it out on others.
231. My partner has a bad temper.
232. I have a lot of good friends.
233. When I was sick or upset, I liked to be with my mother.
234. I like being taken care of by my partner.
235. I hate it when someone does something the wrong way.
236. If someone treats you too well, it is wise to be suspicious of them.
237. If I was answering the above questions about my relationship with my mother, based on our present relationship, I would still respond the same way.
238. If I was answering the above questions about my relationship with my father, based on our present relationship, I would still respond the same way.
239. If I was answering the above questions about my relationship with my family, based on our present relationship, I would still respond the same way.
240. Your sex: a) Male b) Female
241. Your age: a) 17-21 b) 22-35 c) 36-49 d) 50-65 e) 66+
242. Did either of your parents die while you were growing up?
a) mother b) father c) both d) neither
243. Were your parents divorced? a) Yes b) No
244. If yes on parental death or divorce, how long ago was it? a) 0-2yrs b) 3-5 c) 8-12 d) 13-20 e) 21+
245. If yes on parental death or divorce, who did you live with? a) mother b) father
c) relative d) friends e) others
246. How long did you live in a single parent home? a) 0 b) 1-2 yrs c) 2-5 yrs d) 6-10 yrs e) 11+ yrs
247. How many brothers and/or sisters do you have?
a) 0 b) 1 c) 2 d) 3 e) 4 or more
248. Were you the:
a) oldest b) middle c) youngest
249. Your father's education a) 3-11 grade b) high school grad. c) some college d) college grad e) graduate school.
250. Your mother's education a) 3-11 grade b) high school grad. c) some college d) college grad e) graduate school.
251. Your race: a) Hispanic b) Black c) Native American d) White e) other
252. Are you married? a) Yes b) No c) Divorced d) widowed
253. If not married, are you currently in a relationship? a) Yes b) No
254. If yes, to above questions(#264 or #265) how long? a) 0-6mo b) 7mo -1yr c) 1-2 yrs
d) 2-4 yrs e) 5+ yrs
255. Your religion a) Christian b) Jewish c) Muslim d) other religion not listed e) no religion
256. Family income growing up a) \$1,000 - \$10,000 b) \$11,000 - \$20,000 c) \$21,000 - \$50,000 d) \$51,000 - \$100,000 e) \$100,000+
257. Family income now a) \$1,000 - \$10,000 b) \$11,000 - \$20,000 c) \$21,000 - \$50,000 d) \$51,000 - \$100,000 e) \$100,000+

258. Your education a) 3-11 grade b) high school grad. c) some college d) college grad
e) graduate school.

259. Friends and relatives visit me a) less than once per week, b) 1-2 times per week c) 3-5 times per
week d) 6-9 times per week e) 10+ times per week

260. Friends and relatives call or write me a) less than once per week, b) 1-2 times per week c) 3-5 times
per week d) 6-9 times per week e) 10+ times per week

Please use this scale to rate the following statements.

Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

261 In most ways my life is close to my ideal.

262 The conditions of my life are excellent.

263 I am satisfied with my life.

264 So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.

265 If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

266 Overall, I am a happy person.

267 I smile a lot compared to others.

268 I feel happy with what life has given to me.

269 I feel happy.

270 I am sad.

271 I find life worth living.

272 I have found inner harmony.

273 There is always a bright side to any negative event.

274 People consider me a happy person.

275 I have always been happy.

276 I find myself indulged in happy experiences.

277 My physical health is good.

1. Write the three main things you remember happening in the film in order of importance.

A.

B.

C.

2. Overall, how good a person was the younger boy Marc?

Very Bad	Somewhat Bad	Somewhat Good	Very Good
1	2	3	4

3. Overall, how good a person was the mother?

Very Bad	Somewhat Bad	Somewhat Good	Very Good
1	2	3	4

4. List all the feelings that would have been felt by the mother during this film

5. List all the feelings that would have been felt by the boy Marc during the film

6. How many times a month did your mother hit you like this when you were growing up? Circle your answer.

a) over 4 times a month b) 1-4 times a month c) fewer than 1 time per month d) she never hit you like this

7. How many times a month did your father hit you like this when you were growing up? Circle your answer.

a) over 4 times a month b) 1-4 times a month c) fewer than 1 time per month d) he never hit you like this

8. How many times a month did another caretaker hit you like this when you were growing up? Circle your answer.

a) over 4 times a month b) 1-4 times a month c) fewer than 1 time per month d) they never hit you like this

9. What did the mother's note say?

10. How sure are you of your answer about the mother's note?

Very Sure 1	Somewhat Sure 2	Somewhat Unsure 3	Very Unsure 4
-------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------

11. What was the mother saying as she was taking Marc to the kitchen to wipe the blood coming from his bloody nose?

12. Why were the boys late?

13. How sure are you of your answer?

Very Sure 1	Somewhat Sure 2	Somewhat Unsure 3	Very Unsure 4
-------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------

14. What chores were the boys supposed to do when they got home?

15. How sure are you of your answer about the chores?

Very Sure 1	Somewhat Sure 2	Somewhat Unsure 3	Very Unsure 4
-------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------

16. What did the older boy go to do?

17. How sure are you of your answer on what the older boy went to do?

Very Sure 1	Somewhat Sure 2	Somewhat Unsure 3	Very Unsure 4
-------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------

18. How hard did Marc deserve to be hit?

Much Harder 1	Somewhat harder 2	Somewhat less hard 3	Not hit at all 4
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------

19. Recall as many things in the room that you can

20. How many times did the mother hit Marc?

21. How many times did she hit the other boy?

22. Why did the mother hit Marc?

23. If you were Marc, list the things you would have done differently

24. If you were the mother, list the things you would have done differently

25. How many drops of blood fell from Marc's nose?

0 1 2 3 4 5+

26. How much control should the mother have had over what Marc was doing?

Less	Somewhat	More	Much
Control	More Control	Control	More Control
1	2	3	4

27. List all the things Marc did that disobeyed his mother

28. How sure are you of your answer?

Very	Somewhat	Somewhat	Very
Sure	Sure	Unsure	Unsure
1	2	3	4

29. How much did the mother appear to love Marc?

Not love	Love just	Love a	Love
At all	A little	Fair amount	a lot
1	2	3	4

30. How much did Marc appear to love his mother?

Not love	Love just	Love a	Love
At all	A little	a fair amount	a lot
1	2	3	4

31. how much should the mother trust her boys?

Not at	trust	trust a	trust a
All	less	little more	lot more
1	2	3	4

32. How angry would you have been at Marc if you were the mother?

Not at all	Somewhat	Angry	Very
Angry	angry		Angry
1	2	3	4

33. How angry would you have been at the mother if you were Marc?

Not at all	Somewhat	Angry	Very
Angry	Angry		Angry
1	2	3	4

34. How firmly do you believe in spanking?

Strongly disbelieve	Disbelieve	Believe	Strongly Believe
In spanking	In spanking	In Spanking	In Spanking