

The Criminological Scale of Affectional Attachment:

A Measure of Hirschi's Construct of Attachment in a Variety of Close Interpersonal Relationships as A Source of Social Control

By Alison Marganski, Ph.D.¹

Abstract

This article examines a measure of affectional attachment derived from Hirschi's (1969) social control theory and pertinent to other criminological theories: the Criminological Scale of Affectional Attachment (CSAA). The CSAA looks at the most critical element of a social bond, namely attachment, in a variety of close interpersonal relationships (i.e., parent, sibling, peer and intimate partner). In particular, it considers several dimensions of attachment and assesses their reliability in providing a comprehensive measure of affectional attachment for each relationship. Unlike existing attachment scales, the CSAA is not psychologically driven but rather motivated by and framed for criminological research. It is the first scale of its kind aimed at providing a simple and standard means of investigating attachment as a criminological construct. It is also one of the first to allow for testing multiple relationships rather than focusing on one or two alone. Evaluation of the CSAA reveals that internal consistency reliability is demonstrated. The CSAA is particularly relevant for studies interested in social control and crime and can be modified to fit any interpersonal relationship.

¹ Alison Marganski, Ph.D. is currently an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Virginia Wesleyan College. Correspondence may be sent to: Alison Marganski, Department of Sociology & Criminal Justice, Virginia Wesleyan College, 1584 Wesleyan Drive, Norfolk/Virginia Beach, VA 23502. Email: amarganski@wvc.edu

INTRODUCTION

Little research exists on the criminological construct of attachment, which is considered to be an important source of informal social control (Hirschi, 1969) as well as a critical element in the establishment of self-control (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990) and social capital (Sampson & Laub, 1993). By and large, research on attachment has been grounded in psychology (i.e., Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bowlby, 1969; Bowlby, 1988) with scales primarily geared toward assessing patterns of attachment in children and observing their interactions with caregivers (e.g. Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Crittenden, 1992; Smyke & Zeanah, 1999; Waters & Deane, 1985); adult attachment scales have also been developed to analyze attachment configurations (e.g. Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; George, Kaplan, & Main, 1996; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). In both criminological and psychological perspectives, attachment is conceptualized as affectionate or emotional ties to individuals. Yet the ways in which attachment is operationalized fundamentally differs for each perspective in accordance with respective theoretical principles and propositions. Rather than classifying individuals according to attachment style, the criminological standpoint examines the relative strength of attachment (e.g. weak or strong, low or high, etc.), usually in adolescence or adulthood, as perceived by individuals and how attachment relates to restraint (or lack thereof) from natural criminal tendencies. It also recognizes attachment as a dynamic concept, changing over persons and time (Hirschi, 1969; Sampson & Laub, 1993), rather than something static. Accordingly, criminological research often considers an array of relationships (e.g. parent, peer, and intimate partner) in influencing behavior over different periods in time; it does not focus on the maternal relationship formed during infancy alone. Thus, the development of a criminological scale would be beneficial in recognizing these unique attachment conceptions. It would also allow for singular comparisons in multiple relationship domains (e.g. parental, sibling, intimate, and peer) and offer a comprehensive means of investigating interpersonal relationships when studying delinquency and criminal behavior, which permits for exploration into the influence or importance of relationships at a given developmental stage (e.g. adolescence or adulthood).

This paper will begin by examining attachment as a construct derived from propositions and principles underlying social control theory (Hirschi, 1969) and other relevant crime-based theories including a general theory of crime (see Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990) and the age-graded theory of informal social control (see Sampson & Laub, 1993). It will also touch on the underlying differences between criminological and psychological views of attachment to establish a rationale for the development of a criminological construct that is unique from its psychological counterpart. Thus, the study does not intent to measure the psychological construct, as much research has already done this; instead, it seeks to explore attachment as found in criminological theory while presenting justification for such an exploration and subsequently propose measures of attachment as a criminological construct, and assess the reliability of such measures. The formation of the Criminological Scale of Affectional Attachment (hereafter CSAA) will also be discussed, followed by tests on the reliability of measures in providing an overall measure of attachment in several interpersonal relationship domains with the goal of presenting a simple and logical scale for use in future criminological research.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Social Control Theory (Hirschi, 1969)

Social control theory, better known as “social bond” theory, focuses on social relationships and how they influence conformity. Hirschi (1969) argues that everyone is inclined towards capricious and criminal behavior due to inborn animalistic drives, and it is the quality of our social bonds that determine whether or not we act on these natural urges. Since everyone is equally motivated to engage in such primitive behavior, it is ultimately the presence of strong bonds which serves to restrain such behavior; the absence of these frees one to partake in it. The primary element of a bond, namely attachment, is recognized as the most important and affects all other elements in a bond (i.e., commitment, involvement, and belief). Hirschi (1969) contends that attachment to caregivers, and eventually others, is necessary for internalizing norms and operates as a mechanism in controlling misbehavior. Intrinsic to this is the conviction that individuals with strong attachments develop sensitivity to the opinions of others and by doing so, would not want to disappoint those to whom they are attached or risk the loss of relationships by engaging in behavior deemed inappropriate. As a result, they refrain from misconduct. However, individuals with weak or broken attachments are free of constraints and therefore, are more predisposed to act on impulsive desires.

In his study, Hirschi (1969) examined youths’ attachment to parents and peers and engagement in juvenile delinquency. He discovered that strong attachment generally relates to conformity while weak attachment relates to delinquency. Although his theory was formulated with the intentions of explaining juvenile delinquency, it has now been deemed suitable in explaining a wide range of behaviors since it is internally consistent, logically coherent, parsimonious, and non-tautological (Akers, 1999). Subsequent research has tested his theoretical predictions on attachment and crime using different samples and relationships and produced similar findings (e.g., Benda & Corwyn, 2002; Foshee, Bauman, & Fletcher Linder, 1999; Lackey & Williams, 1995). Still, no standard scale or measure of such attachment has consistently been used from study to study, making it more difficult to compare “attachment” from one study to the next.

Research also predominantly concentrates on one or two particular relationships, but rarely explores multiple relationships. Since different relationships have been found important (e.g. parent, sibling, intimate, and peer) and some may bear more weight at different stages of life (i.e., childhood, adolescence, adulthood), attachment should be explored in multiple relationship domains and if possible, over time. Studying attachment in one relationship alone as it relates to social control or crime can overlook attachment in other important relationships and potentially hinder a complete understanding of how relationships impact behavior.

A General Theory of Crime (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990)

The importance of attachment is signaled in a general theory of crime (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1993; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Under this theoretical premise, low self-control, derived partly from a child’s traits and to a larger extent by parent-child interactions, is responsible for risk taking behavior. Since opportunities to commit crime as seen as limitless (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1993), self-control is necessary in preventing antisocial behavior. In this theory, parent-child attachment is described as crucial aspect in the establishment of it. Parent-child attachment also relates to effective parental management (i.e.

ability to monitor, recognize, and punish poor behavior). To successfully instill self-control, parents must be concerned with their children's well-being. As stated by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), "all that is required to activate the system is affection for or investment in the child" (p. 98). To elaborate on their statement, parents need to show warmth and affection towards their children, in addition to supervising and disciplining them in an appropriate and consistent manner, to produce conforming children; doing so cultivates empathy. The importance of this parent-child relationship is so strong that even children born with a considerable amount of traits known to increase the risk of negative behavior can establish self-control with proper socialization and adequate control. Conversely, poor parenting practices increase the risk of producing uncaring and impulsive offspring. Despite indifference to children or inconsistent and inappropriate practices, one's fate is not set in stone. Some individuals may be able to gain constraints in other ways and with other people.

Age-Graded Theory of Informal Social Control (Sampson & Laub, 1993)

In an age-graded theory of informal social control, attachment to an intimate partner (as well as to an employer/employment) has offered reason for criminal desistance. Sampson and Laub (1993) maintain that social experiences and relations can change individuals. Additionally, they contend that sources of informal control vary over the life course such that the value or importance of relationships may shift or undergo change in different stages of life, which, in turn, may lead to shifts or modifications in behavior. For instance, one's family may serve as the primary influence of behavior in childhood and early adolescence, followed by peers in later adolescence, then intimate partners in adulthood. Other researchers have also found attachment to change over the same persons over time (e.g. Glueck & Glueck, 1974; West & Farrington, 1973). At later life stages, social events emerge (e.g. marriage, careers, children) and may also account for changes in conduct regardless of earlier criminal propensity. This has been substantiated in the research base (e.g. King, Massoglia, & Macmillan, 2007; Laub & Sampson, 2003; Laub, Nagin, & Sampson, 1998; Paternoster & Brame, 1997; Ronka, Oravala, & Pulkkinen, 2002).

A Comparison of Criminological & Psychological Constructs

Without question, the majority of research on attachment has developed from Bowlby's (1969, 1973, 1979 1980) theory of maternal attachment. This psychological theory is concerned with how attachment develops. It also focuses on attachment styles as well as cognitive schemes. This theory adamantly argues that all people are naturally predisposed to form close relationships to satisfy basic human needs. Because infants are helpless when born, they engage in proximity seeking (or attachment) behaviors for survival – they search for protection, guidance, and care (Bowlby, 1969). The responses received by children from caregivers shape attachment and ultimately serve as the basis for subsequent emotional health and future relationship well-being.

Looking into more detail, children develop something known as internal working models (Bowlby, 1969, 1973), which are expectations of who will serve as attachment figures (i.e. who to turn to in a time of need) and what type of treatment will be received. These models are used to predict caregiver availability and responsiveness when seeking protection, guidance, or care. They become incorporated into one's personality and determine how one thinks, feels, and acts in later relationships (Bowlby, 1979). Adequate care that meets

emotional needs establishes secure attachment fundamental to healthy development and the capacity to form subsequent relationships while inconsistent or unresponsive care causes disrupted attachment, which hinders trust in later relationships. Therefore, initial attachment has a stable and continuing impact in life. Ainsworth and colleagues (1978) have proposed different attachment typologies that reflect working models (i.e. secure, avoidant, anxious/ambivalent), and research has verified the notion of attachment stability in adult intimate relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

While both the criminological and psychological constructs correspond by casting attachment in a similar light of socialization and emotional connectedness, they differ in notable ways. First, the criminological view asserts that attachment is an internal form of control over natural criminalistic tendencies (Hirschi, 1969). Everyone is motivated towards crime but attachments determine whether or not we act. Conversely, the psychological view contends that attachment serves to meet our inborn desire for closeness in relationships and caregiver treatment early in life impacts feelings of security and dependability in those around us throughout life. Second, the criminological view holds that attachment can vary over persons and time whereas the psychological view sees the initial attachment to a caregiver remaining stable over persons and time. Third, the strength of our social attachment is ultimately responsible for our behavior in the criminological position while the attachment style predicts one's demeanor in the psychological one. Differences between these views should be acknowledged.

Dimensions of Attachment

Since, according to social control theorists, we have a natural predisposition for animalistic behavior and deviant impulses, we must ask why we do not engage in them rather than why we do. Control theorists have signaled that attachment promotes moralistic behavior (Durkheim, 1961). In the absence of attachment, effective controls are lost and accordingly, allow one to engage in deviant and/or criminal behavior.

These assumptions were tested based on a sample of students drawn from the Richmond Youth Project (see Hirschi, 1969). In *Causes of Delinquency* (1969), Hirschi predicted that attachment, defined as strong bonds of affection for conventional persons, would make one less likely to engage in a criminal act while weak or non-existing attachment would allow one to become involved in it. In this study, parental and peer attachment were investigated, among other variables. Parental attachment was deemed to be the most important for the emotional bond between parent and child was considered to help the child internalize norms. It was comprised of close supervision and proper discipline, intimacy of communication, and affectional identification in the form of respect and trust. Peer attachment was also examined and involved affectional identification for conventional best friends. The results of Hirschi's study (1969) indicated that strong attachment serves as a deterrent to committing crime.

Examining the numerous questions posed in the study, the concepts of emotional closeness, emotional involvement, admiration, and trust emerge as underlying Hirschi's (1969) notion of affectional attachment. For example, emotional closeness is reflective of intimacy of communication, and was measured in the study by asking respondents questions such as whether they shared their thoughts and feelings with a parent and whether the

respondent's parent seemed to understand him/her (it also asked if the respondent can tell others how they feel and if they valued best friends' opinions on important matters they shared). Emotional involvement or close parental supervision was measured by asking the respondent whether his/her parents spent time talking with him/her, attended events, and were aware of his/her activities (outside of the parent relationships, questions also asked the respondent who they spend time with). Admiration is a form of affectional identification that involved whether the respondent would like to be the kind of person that his/her parent is (the respondent was asked the same question for peers; that is, whether he/she would like to be the kind of person his/her best friends are), and trust involved whether the respondent thought his/her parent would stick by his/her side if they were in trouble (or whether the respondent's best friends would). In short, emotional closeness, emotional involvement, admiration, and trust are important in the construct of affectional attachment across different relationships.

THE CRIMINOLOGICAL SCALE OF AFFECTIONAL ATTACHMENT (CSAA)

The CSAA was designed to provide a simple measure of affectional attachment in interpersonal relationships (see Appendix A). It intends to offer a uniform and common way to measure it across a variety of relationships. The CSAA is broken down into subscales of Parental Attachment, Sibling Attachment, Best Friend Attachment, and Intimate Partner Attachment. The scales used to measure all relationships are identical, which permits for individual relationship examinations as well as side-by-side comparisons across different interpersonal relationships. Four individual measures in each scale compose attachment and serve to provide an overall measure of it for those interested in a standard measure to use in studies on attachment and conformity or deviance/crime. The CSAA can also examine one attachment while controlling for others and even offer a total attachment score.

Administration & Measurement

The CSAA is geared towards adolescents and adults. It is a self-report measure that examines the strength of various interpersonal attachments and permits for comparisons in the same study. According to Hirschi (1969), attachment is considered to be the most critical dimension of a social bond and influences the development of other aspects of a bond; without it, a bond cannot exist. Items measuring emotional closeness, emotional involvement, admiration, and trust were used to represent attachment.²

In this study, subjects were asked about their attachment to a parent, sibling, best friend, and intimate partner. The respondent was first asked whether he/she has had a parent, sibling, best friend, and intimate partner, (0 = No, 1 = Yes) and then about measures of attachment in recent enduring relationships (again, subject were asked to think about relationships from the past year or more). A parent was defined as a primary caregiver or person responsible for taking care of the respondent while growing up. The primary caregiver was used rather than both parents since 1) family compositions may have changed over time and the primary parent intends to represent a stable figure present over time, and 2) it has been found unnecessary to

² These measures are similar to some of the questions contained in Hirschi's (1969) original instrument asking whether the respondent's parent seemed to understand him/her (i.e., emotional closeness), whether the respondent's parent took the time to communicate with him/her about rules/whereabouts (i.e., emotional involvement), whether the respondent would like to be the kind of person that his/her parent is (i.e., admiration), and whether the respondent's parent would stick by the respondent's side if they were in trouble (i.e., trust).

measure attachment to both parents, as it is rare for a relationship with one parent to differ drastically from a relationship with the other (Hirschi, 1969). If desired, however, the scale can be used to measure attachment with the other parent as well. A sibling was defined a brother and/or sister, whether biologically related or acquired into the family (the closest in age served as the reference but the scale can be used to measure attachment to other siblings as well), a best friend was defined as someone that one often hangs out with, and an intimate partner was defined as someone whom one has been dating or romantically involved with.

If the respondent answered affirmatively to having a relationship, he/she was asked to rate how emotionally close or connected he/she felt to that person (i.e. emotional closeness), how much he/she liked to spend time with that person (i.e. emotional involvement), how much he/she looked up to that person (i.e. admiration), and how much he/she trusted that person to be loyal and faithful to him/her (i.e. trust). Each of these attachment dimensions were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from very little to very much. These measures are also similar to ones used in previous research testing social control theory or affection (e.g. Benda & Corwyn, 2002; Henry, Moffitt, Caspi, Langley, & Silva, 1994; Simons & Johnson, 1998).

Data Analyses

Data used for this survey came from a larger survey as part of an investigation of the role of attachment in the link between early family violence experiences and recent self-reported violent behavior. The study, approved by the Institutional Review Board, was conducted with a sample of undergraduate students 18 to 28 years of age who were enrolled in social science courses at a large, diverse Northeast university. The response rate for the survey was high; 95% of 427 students who were asked to participate in the study did so (N = 404). Of all the surveys collected, 32 were discarded due to mostly incomplete data or exceeding age restrictions. This left a total of 372 surveys (i.e., 92.1% of the surveys collected from students), which comprised the sample size.

Data revealed that the respondents were close in demographics to the college population. Slightly over half of the respondents in the study were female (57.8%), and the participants comprised a racially/ethnically diverse group (i.e. 26.7% White, 17.0% Black, 26.1% Hispanic/Latino, 16.2% Asian, and 14% Other). The mean age of participants was 20.2 years (standard deviation = 2.01 years). The majority of participants described their financial status as average (54%), while less reported their being below average (21.3%) or above average (24.7%). Most students reported to be B students (56.5%), with some reported being A (25.4%) or C/D (18.1%) students.

In regard to interpersonal relationships, most respondents reported having a parent (100%), a sibling (88.2%), a best friend (98%), and an intimate partner (83.9%). Attachment in all of these relationships was moderate to high; parental attachment was highest, but little overall variation was present. Table 1 presents the four measures of attachment in each interpersonal relationship. Tests were then conducted to examine issues associated with multicollinearity, but no evidence was found for this, indicating that they are indeed measuring different aspects of attachment.

Table 1 Adult Attachment Type (N = 372)

Variable	Mean (Standard Deviation)	%
Best Friend		
% Yes		97.6
Attachment to a Best Friend		
Emotional Closeness	4.09 (.93)	
Involvement	4.14(.82)	
Admiration	3.58(1.10)	
Trust	4.29(.91)	
Intimate Partner		
% Yes		83.9
Attachment to an Intimate Partner		
Emotional Closeness	4.17(1.03)	
Involvement	4.34(.85)	
Admiration	3.77(1.11)	
Trust	3.82(1.21)	
Parent		
% Yes		100.0
Attachment to a Parent		
Emotional Closeness	4.04(1.11)	
Involvement	3.73(1.07)	
Admiration	4.16(1.09)	
Trust	4.43(.96)	
Sibling		
% Yes		88.2
Attachment to a Sibling		
Emotional Closeness	3.70(1.18)	
Involvement	3.63(1.16)	
Admiration	3.47(1.23)	
Trust	4.05(1.10)	

Data Reduction

In order to examine attachment, factor analyses were used. Prior to conducting them, exploratory analyses were performed to test the reliability of four factors (i.e., emotional closeness, emotional involvement, admiration, and trust) in measuring attachment in four interpersonal relationships: parent, sibling, best friend, and intimate partner. Cronbach’s alpha was computed and revealed good reliability for the four measures in measuring attachment to a parent ($\alpha = .894$), sibling ($\alpha = .895$), best friend ($\alpha = .813$), and intimate partner ($\alpha = .882$).

Due to the high alpha levels, factor analyses were conducted to determine if an underlying structure exists for the four variables measuring attachment for each relationship with the intentions of creating new variables that account for the dimensions of attachment. Principal components analysis was chosen as the method and performed for each relationship with the goal of extracting a single factor for each, which would be of use in studies examining multiple relationships and the influence on each some dependent variable like crime. This analysis was chosen because it can systematically reduce a number of independent variables to

a smaller, more coherent set of variables or single variable representative of a linear combination of the original variables (refer to Dunteman, 1989). Reducing the number of variables entered in multivariate analyses saves the degrees of freedom.

Table 2 displays the factor loadings accompanying each analysis. For attachment to a parent, the resulting factor had an eigenvalue of 3.03 and accounted for 75.8% of the total variance of the observed variables; for attachment to a sibling, the resulting factor had an eigenvalue of 3.04 and explained 76.1% of the total variance of the observed variables; for attachment to a best friend, the resulting factor had an eigenvalue of 2.59 and accounted for 64.7% of the total variance of the observed variables; for attachment to an intimate partner, the resulting factor had an eigenvalue of 3.00 and accounted for 75.1% of the total variance of the observed variables. Each of these factors was standardized. They were then used for statistical analyses in another study.

Table 2 Component Loadings for Attachment

	Loading
Attachment to a Parent	
Admiration	.892
Emotional Closeness	.884
Involvement	.857
Trust	.849
Attachment to a Sibling	
Emotional Closeness	.897
Involvement	.886
Admiration	.871
Trust	.834
Attachment to a Best Friend	
Emotional Closeness	.859
Admiration	.798
Involvement	.781
Trust	.776
Attachment to an Intimate Partner	
Emotional Closeness	.899
Involvement	.865
Trust	.852
Admiration	.850

Interestingly, the loadings were all close and clustered together. The highest loadings for a sibling, best friend, and intimate partner were all emotional closeness; only attachment to a parent had admiration as the highest component.

DISCUSSION

The intentions of this paper are to provide insight as to why the criminological construct of attachment is unique and warrants its own separate investigation, especially since limited research attempts to examine this construct. The psychological concept of attachment has been meticulously researched and is by no means devalued or denounced here, but rather introduced to contrast criminological attachment and how it differs. Given the distinguishing

difference inherent in the theoretical frameworks, a case is made for the development of a scale centering on social control investigations. Analyses of the criminological components of affectional attachment revealed that all aspects were important. It also showed that emotional closeness is perhaps the most critical element in peer, sibling, and intimate relationships while admiration may be the most important in parental ones.

There are some limitations to note here. For one, the study involves a college sample, which is obviously different than the high school sample Hirschi (1969) had used. Social control theory tests have predominantly studied youth and not adults. Another limitation arises from the fact that a convenience sample was used. Therefore, more testing is needed in future research to see if social bonding applies in similar ways to this age group and across other groups. Last, a limitation of this study is that the criminal behavior of those to whom the respondent was attached was not inquired. Further research would benefit from exploring this, and the analysis here is simply a base to get started on criminological attachment research. It is recommended that any future works investigate the conventionality to whom the attachment is exploring.

Nevertheless, it is reasoned that creating and implementing a new attachment scale like the one presented here would serve beneficial in criminological research. Undoubtedly, the development is warranted, and can be done. Yet, it must be noted that limitations to such a scale exist. For instance, in any testing of attachment and its relation to another variable or variables of interest, temporal order may become an issue. It is therefore recommended that this scale is best used with caution and when the timing of other variables can be determined. With further and future testing of such a scale, those examining applicable theories may employ a standardized scale to draw conclusions not only across various relationships, but also across studies.

In short, attachment as a criminological concept has received minimal attention, which has resulted in hampering comparisons and building cumulative knowledge. With the presumptions set forth by social control theory as well as a general theory of crime and an age-graded theory of informal social control, it is argued that a criminological scale is necessary. Using similar conceptualizations and operationalizations such as those proposed in this paper can facilitate a larger understanding into the role of attachment in behavior.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. 1978. *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Akers, R.L. 1999. *Criminological theories: Introduction and evaluation*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Armsden, G., & Greenberg, M. T. 1987. The Inventory of Parent & Peer Attachment: Relationships to well being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*. **16** (5), 427-454.
- Benda, B.B., & Corwyn, R.F. 2002. The effect of abuse in childhood and in adolescence on violence among adolescents. *Youth and Society*. **33** (3), 339-365.
- Bowlby, J. 1969. *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. 1973. *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation, anxiety, and anger*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. 1979. *The making and breaking of affectional bonds*. New York, NY: Tavistock Publications Limited.
- Bowlby, J. 1980. *Attachment and loss: Vol. 3, Loss*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. 1988. *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and a healthy human development*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. 1991. Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. **61** (2), 226-244.
- Crittenden, P. M. 1992. Quality of attachment in the preschool years. *Development & Psychopathology*. **4** (2), 209-241.
- Dunteman, G.H. (1989). *Principal components analysis*. Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and application of the Sociology of Education*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Foshee, V.A., Bauman, K.E., & Fletcher Linder, G. 1999. Family violence and the perpetration of adolescent dating violence: Examining social learning and social control processes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. **61** (2), 331-342.
- George, C., Kaplan, N., & Main, M. 1996. Adult attachment interview. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkley (3rd ed.).

- Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. 1974. *Of delinquency and crime: A panorama of years of search and research*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hischi, T. 1990. *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. 1987. Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. **52** (3), 511-524.
- Henry, B., Moffitt, T.E., Caspi, A., Langley, J., & Silva, P.A. 1994. On the “remembrance of things past”: A longitudinal evaluation of the retrospective method. *Psychological Assessments*. **6** (2), 92-101.
- Hirschi, T. 1969. *Causes of delinquency*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. R. 1993. Commentary: Testing the general theory of crime. *Journal of Research on Crime & Delinquency*. **30** (1): 47-54.
- King, R. D., Massoglia, M., & Macmillan, R. 2007. The context of marriage and crime: Gender, the propensity to marry, and offending in early adulthood. *Criminology*, **45** (1): 33-65.
- Lackey, C., & Williams, K.R. 1995. Social bonding and the cessation of partner violence across generations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **57** (2), 295-305.
- Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. 2003. *Shared beginnings, divergent lives: Delinquent boys to age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Laub, J. H., Nagin, D. S., & Sampson, R. J. 1998. Trajectories of change in criminal offending: Good marriages and the desistence process. *American Sociological Review*, **63** (2): 225-238.
- Paternoster, R., & Brame, R. 1997. Multiple routes to delinquency? A test of developmental and general theories of crime. *Criminology*. **35** (1): 49-84.
- Ronka, A., Oravala, S., & Pulkkinen, L. 2002. I met this wife of mine and things got onto a better track: Turning points in risk development. *Journal of Adolescence*. **25** (1): 47-63.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. 1993. *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Simons, R.L., & Johnson, C. 1998. An examination of competing explanations for the intergenerational transmission of domestic violence. In Y. Danilei (Ed.), *International handbook of multigenerational legacies of trauma*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Smyke, A. T., & Zeanah, C. H. 1999. *Disturbances of Attachment Interview*. Tulane University School of Medicine: Section of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry.

Waters, E., & Deane, K. 1985. Defining and assessing individual differences in attachment relationships: Q-methodology and the organization of behavior in infancy and early childhood. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Ed.), *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*. **50** (1-2): 41-65.

West, D.J., & Farrington, D.P. 1973. *Who becomes delinquent? Second report of the Cambridge study in delinquent development*. London, England: Heinemann Educational.

APPENDIX A

The Criminological Scale of Affectional Attachment³

Please answer the questions in this survey truthfully and to the best of your ability. **CIRCLE** the appropriate answer for each question that applies (or write it in if a line is provided).

- You will now be asked some questions regarding your RELATIONSHIPS to others.

1. A BEST FRIEND is someone that you share similar interests to, often hang out with, and consider trustworthy and dependable. Have you ever had a best friend?

Yes		No*			
<i>*If answered No, skip to the Question # 2. If answered Yes, please continue with the box below.</i>					
Now I want you to think about your current or most recent best friend.					
How emotionally close or connected do you feel with your best friend?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you like spending time with your best friend?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you look up to or admire your best friend?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you trust your best friend to be faithful/loyal to you?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much

2. An INTIMATE PARTNER is someone whom you are going out with, dating, or romantically involved with. This can include a dating partner, girlfriend, boyfriend, fiancé, wife, or husband. Have you ever had an intimate partner?

Yes		No*			
<i>*If answered No, skip to the Question # 3. If answered Yes, please continue with the box below.</i>					
Now I want you to think about your current or most recent intimate partner.					
How emotionally close or connected do you feel with your intimate partner?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you like spending time with your intimate partner?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much

³ The scale presented is a part of a larger survey containing various items that measured early experiences of family violence and recent adult violent behavior.

How much do you look up to or admire your intimate partner?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you trust your intimate partner to be faithful/loyal to you?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much

3. A PARENT refers to a primary caregiver; it is the person who was responsible for taking care of you and raised you while growing up, regardless of whether or not he/she is biologically related. Although you may have more than one parent, I want you to think about your primary caretaker or person who has taken care of you.

Now I want you to think about your current relationship with your parent. If your parent is no longer living, please provide information on the relationship that existed with him/her.					
How emotionally close or connected do you feel with your parent?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you like spending time with your parent?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you look up to or admire your parent?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you trust your parent to be faithful/loyal to you?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much

4. A SIBLING relationship is another family relationship that may exist. This involves brothers or sisters biologically related, adopted, or acquired into the family/family household through marriage (step-brothers/step-sisters). Do you have a sibling?

Yes	No*
<i>*If answered No, skip to the Question # 11. If answered Yes, please continue with the box below.</i>	
How many siblings do you have? (please provide the number) _____	
List each sibling's AGE (numerical number) AND GENDER (male/female) in chronological order:	
Siblings' Ages	Siblings' Gender
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____
5. _____	_____
6. _____	_____
7. _____	_____
8. _____	_____
9. _____	_____
10. _____	_____

Now I want you to think about the sibling closest in age to you.					
How emotionally close or connected do you feel with this sibling?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you like spending time with this sibling?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you look up to or admire your this sibling?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much
How much do you trust your sibling to be faithful/loyal to you?	very little	a little	somewhat	quite much	very much