EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE AND ATTACHMENT STYLES AS PREDICTORS OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE AMONG STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN

FULFILMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

(PSYCHOLOGY)

OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA

BY

NATASJA KUDZAI MAGOROKOSHO

200969056

SEPTEMBER 2018

MAIN SUPERVISOR: DR M. MBERIRA

(UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA)

CO-SUPERVISOR(S): DR K. VEII

(UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA)

ABSTRACT

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) continues to occur in many settings across socio-economic, religious and cultural groups. It remains an unfortunate reality for many couples and families. Factors such as unemployment, alcohol- and drug abuse are some of the contributing factors to IPV. An absence of these factors, however fails, to explain the continued presence of IPV. Therefore, the aim of this descriptive study was to explore the role that attachment styles play in IPV in Namibia, where prevalence is still high. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to examine the possible relationship between attachment styles and IPV, as well as to determine the best predictor of IPV from the different styles of attachment, amongst Namibian university students. The research instruments used were a socio-demographic questionnaire and the Abuse within Intimate Relationships Scale (AIRS), as well as the Experience in Close Relationship Structures (ECR-R) questionnaire, all structured questionnaires. The sample consisted of 380 undergraduate students. The findings showed that there is a significant relationship between attachment styles and IPV among University of Namibia students. Specifically, there is a link between anxious attachment and IPV. Furthermore, being anxiously attached is a predictor of IPV and age and gender do not have an effect on IPV.

LIST OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

1. Exploration of attachment styles and intimate partner violence in Namibia.

Magorokosho N, Mberira M, Veii K

Poster Presentation 1st Pan African Psychology Union (PAPU) Durban, South Africa, 18-21 September 2017.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AIRS	Abuse within Intimate Relationships Scale
CDC	Center for Disease Control
DVBS	Domestic Violence Blame Scale
ECR-R	Experiences in Close Relationships Revised
GBV	Gender Based Violence
IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
MGECW	Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare
NGP	National Gender Policy
SIAPAC	Social Impact Assessment and Policy Analysis Corporation
WHO	World Health Organization

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my special appreciation and thanks to my main supervisor Dr Mara Mberira and co-supervisor Dr Kazuvire Veii. You have been tremendous mentors for me. I would like to thank you for encouraging my research and for your guidance through the process of my growth as a Researcher. Your advice on both my career and research is invaluable and lasting.

I also wish to thank the United Methodist Women, The International Ministries with Women, Children and Youth Scholarship (IMC) Program for the financial assistance that made this journey possible.

A special thanks to my family. Words cannot express how grateful I am to my mother Rose Magorokosho for all the sacrifices that you've made for me, as well as the prayers that continue to sustain me. I would also like to thank my friends who supported me in writing, and encouraged me to strive towards my goal. Last but not least I wish to express my deep appreciation to my beloved husband Munyaradzi Tambo, who was always there in times when there was no one to answer my queries.

DEDICATION

This thesis is lovingly dedicated to my mother, Rose Magorokosho, husband Munyaradzi Tambo and family for your support, encouragement, and constant love that has sustained me throughout my life.

DECLARATIONS

I, Natasja Kudzai Magorokosho, hereby declare that this study is my own work and is a true reflection of my research, and that this work, or any part thereof has not been submitted for a degree at any other institution.

No part of this thesis/dissertation may be reproduced, stored in any retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, or by means (e.g. electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior permission of the author, or the University of Namibia in that behalf.

I, Natasja, Kudzai Magorokosho, grant the University of Namibia the right to reproduce this thesis in whole or in part, in any manner or format, which the University of Namibia may deem fit.

Natasja Magorokosho	NKMagorokosho	16/09/18
Name of Student	Signature	Date

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Despite global efforts to eradicate violence in romantic relationships, Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) continues to occur in all settings across all socio-economic, religious and cultural groups; it remains an unfortunate reality for many couples and families (Breiding, Basile, Smith, Black, & Mahendra, 2015). A study by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2005 found that over one third of ever-partnered women in Namibia reported having experienced physical or sexual violence at the hands of an intimate partner at some point, with 31% reporting physical violence and sexual violence (Gracia-Moreno, Jansen, Watts, Ellsberg & Heise, 2005). One out of three women in Namibia has experienced or will experience IPV in their lifetime (Gracia-Moreno et al. 2005).

Women were traditionally thought to be the primary victims of IPV (Banks &Salmon 2013; Tjaden &Thoennes 2000). However, as more studies have examined female violence and bidirectional violence, a phenomenon where both men and female partners are perpetrators, the evidence suggests that men are also at risk (Dardis, Dixon, Edwards & Turchik, 2015; Desmarais, Reeves, Nicholls, Telhord & Fiebert, 2012). In fact, a meta-analysis and a recent literature review found that women perpetrate IPV at equal or even higher rates than men (Archer, 2000; Langhinrichsen- Rohling &Turner, 2012), although women tend to cause less injury to their partners compared to men.

1.2 Definitions of terms

Intimate Partner

One primary issue on intimate partner violence is what constitutes an "intimate partner". Based on various research and studies, the criteria for choosing what might constitute an intimate relationship have included specifics such as marital status, living conditions, and sexual orientation (Capaldi, Knoble, Shortt & Kim, 2012; Stover, 2015 & Stover, 2013). For the purpose of the present study, the operational definition of "intimate partner" will be similar to that used by Henning and Feder (2004) who defined an "intimate partner" as a current or former dating partner or spouse (p.72). However, although Henning and Feder limited their participants to individuals in heterosexual relationships, the concept "intimate partner" has for the purposes of this study, been defined as "current or former dating partner or spouse" in a heterosexual or same sex relationship.

Victims and Perpetrators

The operational definitions of victims and perpetrators have represented perhaps the most controversial of all in the field of IPV. The term victim in IPV is operationally defined as "a person that is the recipient of an act of violence by an intimate partner". There are several words used interchangeably with the word perpetrator throughout the literature, including offender, abuser, and batterer. For the purposes of the current study, "perpetrator" is conceptually defined as "a person who inflicts violence on an intimate partner".

Generally, whether couples are cohabiting, dating or married, victim and perpetrator roles have been assumed to fit along predetermined gender lines. According to Coker, Smith, McKeown and King (2000), many studies on marital violence continue to label the male as the consistent perpetrator and the female as the consistent victim, as do many studies that include dating and cohabiting couples. For the purposes of the current study, the terms "victim" and "perpetrator" will be gender neutral and will not be assumed to be static, because the roles of victim and perpetrator are interchangeable in many relationships. One partner described as a victim or perpetrator at any given time is not assumed to fill this same role throughout the relationship or across interactions.

Batterer

For the purpose of this study a batterer is a person who inflicts violent physical abuse upon a child, spouse, or other person. The term batterer is used in this study and not the description, "violent physical abuse" in order to be more succinct.

Violence

Violence is defined as, "any act that is harmful to the victim" Gelles, 2000, p.785). This definition includes acts of verbal and emotional violence. However, this definition would also include acts that were completely accidental. For the purposes of this study violence is the behavior used with the intent to harm or injure another person (Campbell & Lewandowski, 1997).

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

Garcia-Moreno et al, (2005), defines Intimate Partner Violence as any behavior within an intimate relationship that causes physical, psychological or sexual harm to those in

the relationship. It can include humiliation, intimidation and controlling behavior such as monitoring movements and restricting access to resources or healthcare, as well as physical and sexual violence such as slapping, beating, forced sex or other forms of coercion, which can result in severe injury and/or death.

IPV is also defined as actual or threatened physical, sexual, psychological, emotional or stalking abuse by an intimate partner; it can be a current or former spouse or a non-marital partner, such as a boyfriend or girlfriend and can be someone of the same or opposite sex (Spencer, Haffejee, Candy & Kaseke, 2016). In the current study focus was centered on forms of physical abuse and subcategories of psychological abuse. Sexual coercion is the act of using pressure, alcohol or drugs, or force to have sexual contact with someone against his or her will and includes persistent attempts to have sexual contact with someone who has already refused. It can be verbal or emotional, in the form of statements that make an individual feel pressure, guilt or shame. Sexual coercion falls under both physical and psychological abuse therefore it was not explored individually.

Based on the literature review in Namibia IPV is not reported separately from Gender Based Violence (GBV), therefore in this study GBV statistics are reported as a preliminary indicator of IPV (Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare (MGECW), 2008; Edwards- Jauch, 2016). According to the Social Impact Assessment and Policy Analysis Corporation (SIAPAC) and MGECW (2008), Namibia's National Gender Policy (NGP) 2010-2020 defines GBV as all acts of violence perpetrated against women, men, girls and boys on the basis of their sex which could cause them physical, sexual, psychological, emotional and/or economic harm.

However, there are forms of GBV that do not involve intimate partners therefore the reported statistics could overestimate the actual prevalence of IPV; hence should be taken with a pitch of salt.

Black (2011), states that physical IPV includes using one's body to purposely cause harm or injury, in this case to a romantic partner; for instance, punching, slapping, hitting, biting, shoving or using a weapon. Emotional and psychological IPV involve the use of verbal threats, harassing, stalking and manipulating behaviors. Financial IPV includes stealing money, controlling another's finances, requiring payment of money, running credit and not paying bills (Black, 2011).

While Sexual IPV includes five categories, namely rape (penetration of victim), victim was made to penetrate someone else, non-physically pressured unwanted penetration, unwanted sexual contact (making the victim touch genitalia) and non-contact unwanted sexual experiences (unwanted filming or exposure to pornography) Breiding et al. (2015).

1.3 Prevalence of IPV

Looking at the global prevalence rates, IPV is considered a serious problem that affects many people around the world, including over 10 million people in the United States annually (Gracia-Moreno et al. 2005). The reported IPV prevalence of 20-71% in sub-Saharan Africa has been thought to be an underestimation due to under-reporting and poor standardization of methods (Karamangi, Tumwine, Tylleskar & Heggenhougen, 2006). A population-based survey by the World Health Organization (WHO) collected data on IPV from more than 24,000 women in 10 countries including Namibia,

representing diverse cultural and geographical settings (Gracia-Moreno, Jansen, Watts, Ellsberg, & Heise, 2005). The study reported that IPV is widespread in all the countries studied and established that 36% of individuals in a long-term relationship had been subjected to physical or sexual violence (Gracia-Moreno et al. 2005).

Within the Namibian context, the Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare (MGECW) commissioned a study that reported a high prevalence of IPV. The Social Impact Assessment and Policy Analysis Corporation and the Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare (SIAPAC & MGECW, 2008) found that more than a third (34.6%) of female respondents and 16% of male respondents had been hit or slapped by their partners. SIAPAC and MGECW (2008) reported that about a third (30.3%) of female and 16% of male respondents had been pushed by partners, over 24.3% of females had been hit with fists, kicked or dragged and 17.9% of female respondents had been hurt while pregnant.

Nearly one in four women (22.3%) and one in seven men (14%) have been victims of severe physical violence by a romantic partner in their lifetime (Breiding et al. 2015) and approximately 10% of men and women have been raped by their partners or been victims of other forms of intimate partner sexual abuse during their lifetime (Breiding et al. 2015). University students represent a unique population in the field of intimate partner violence. Young men and women are most at risk of IPV (O'Leary, Tintle, & Bromet, 2014). Results from the international dating violence study, comprising a sample of 16,000 university students recruited from 21 countries, revealed a median annual rate of 26% for physical IPV caused by a romantic partner (Chan, Straus, Brownridge, Tiwari, & Leung, 2008). The relationship between dating IPV among

college students and marital IPV is important because about 30% of dating couples in college find themselves married within five years. A study conducted by Edwards- Jauch (2016), on gender based violence at the University of Namibia, reported a significantly high prevalence of IPV, consistent with the high prevalence in Namibia as a whole, 50 000 cases from 2012-2015 (12.5% per annum).

1.4 Causes of IPV

Although violence occurs in all socio-economic groups, it is more frequent and severe in lower income groups. Alcohol and substance abuse are often cited as major proximal predictors of IPV (Coker et al. 2000); alcohol and substance abuse has been theorized to influence IPV by decreasing self-regulation (Flanzer, 2005), increasing negative affective states (e.g. depression) and intensifying relational conflicts (Quigley & Leonard, 2002). In a recent meta-analysis, Capaldi et al. (2012) reported that while there is evidence that alcohol and substance abuse are linked to IPV, the association may not be straight-forward. They argue that alcohol and substance abuse are often accompanied by other antisocial behaviors.

1.5 Impact of IPV

The physical and mental health ramifications of IPV perpetration are substantial in both quantity and cost (Breiding et al. 2015) IPV has been associated with physical injury, mortality (due to injury), suicide, substance use, pregnancy complications, unhealthy weight control, sexually transmitted infections and risky sexual behavior (Plichta, 2004; Silverman, Ra, Mucci, & Hathaway, 2001). Furthermore, IPV is not only detrimental to physical and emotional well-being, but there are also devastating consequences for both the victims and society at large: for example, Morrison, Luchok, Richter and Parra-

Medina (2006), reported that studies in developing countries estimated that the socio-economic cost of IPV can lead to lost earnings due to incarceration job loss, as well as loss of tax revenues due to incarceration and death.

The stigma associated with IPV may be especially pervasive in marginalized victim populations, including men abused by women, people in same-sex relationships, or transgender individuals (Finneran & Stephenson, 2013). These victims may be particularly reluctant to report IPV to the police, resulting in a cycle of abuse in which violent partners escape the legal justice system and could become repeat offenders. Psychological factors at an individual level are often overlooked in efforts to find solutions, since extrinsic factors often appear to be the major problem although they might not address the root cause. Hence, other contributing factors such as attachment styles should be examined.

Attachment is a deep and enduring emotional bond that connects one person to another across time and space (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). According to Levine and Heller (2010), Ainsworth's work has refined the attachment styles into three distinct forms, namely secure, anxious and avoidant. A secure attachment style is characterized by low anxiety and low avoidance, an anxious attachment style is characterized by high anxiety and low avoidance and an avoidant attachment style is characterized by low anxiety and high avoidance, manifesting as discomfort with intimacy and closeness in relationships. These could result in different behaviors in adult relationships in relation to IPV. Securely attached individuals tend to have a positive view of themselves and their partners. They feel comfortable with both intimacy and independence (Bartholomew & Allison, 2006). Therefore, a securely attached individual is likely to accept a partner's

need for separation, or space, without feeling rejected or threatened, and they can be close and independent. Bartholomew & Allison (2006), proposed that individuals who are anxiously attached may aggress against their partners when they feel abandoned, rejected, or ignored, with the conscious or unconscious goal of achieving security in their relationship. In contrast, individuals who have an avoidant attachment style may be less likely to aggress against their partner. They have a tendency to withdraw and suppress emotion. However, should avoidant individuals perceive their partners as overly demanding, they may act aggressively toward their partners to achieve distance (Bartholomew & Allison, 2006). Consistent with these theoretical predictions, some studies have found associations between insecure attachment styles and intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization (Foumier, Brassard, & Shaver, 2011: Peloquin, Lafontaine, & Brassard, 2011; Yarkovsky & Fritz, 2014; Godbout, Dapse, Lussier, Sabourin, Dutton& Hebert, 2017).

According to Stoppelman (2004), a connection between violence and forms of dysfunctional attachment activated under emotional stress was reported by Bowlby in 1988. Therefore, it is necessary to explore the relationship between IPV and attachment as a possible underlying factor to explain IPV. Attachment does not have to be reciprocal. One person may have an attachment to an individual which is not shared. Equally convinced of the link between attachment and violence, Dutton and Browning (1988), characterized blaming and verbal attacks between partners as behaviors which would likely trigger fear of abandonment, a characteristic of insecure attachment seen as a precursor of IPV. By focusing on how intimacy is regulated in relationships, the attachment theory may be particularly useful in shedding light on the apparent link

between violence and intimacy (Pearson, 2006). Attachment theory proposes that adult IPV can be an exaggerated and destructive form of protest expressed toward the partner in the context of perceived separation and abandonment, or a deactivating strategy, learned as a way of coping with previous unsuccessful proximity-seeking attempts (Pearson, 2006). Finneran and Stephenson (2013) concurred that IPV is mainly used as a way of keeping the partner from becoming too intimate/distant or in response to the partner evoking internal fear and anxiety (Finneran & Stephenson, 2013). Studies in Spain (Bonache, Gonzalez-Mendez, &Khrahe, 2016) and in Kenya (Djamba & Kimuna, 2008) have found that there is a relationship between anxious and avoidant attachment styles and violent behavior in intimate relationships.

The recorded high prevalence and detrimental consequences of IPV in Namibia justify empirical efforts aimed at examining the link between attachment styles and IPV in Namibia.

1.6 Statement of the problem

According to the Ministry of Health and Social Services (MoHSS) (2014), the most pervasive form of IPV in Namibia is physical violence and there is a high prevalence. Reports from the Namibian media in the recent past have highlighted stories of young women and men being murdered or taking their own lives because of an intimate relationship that has gone sour (Hartman, 2016; Mukaiwa, 2013). However, there is an absence of a systematic attempt to examine psychological factors at the individual level in order to curb or predict intimate partner violence. Attachment theory provides an ethnological and psychoanalytic framework for revealing how human infant attachment to their caregiver's correlates to attachment styles in relationships as an adult. Therefore,

the purpose of the study was to examine the possible relationship between IPV and attachment styles as well as to determine the best predictor of IPV from the different styles of attachment.

1.7 Research objectives

- To determine if there is a relationship between attachment styles and IPV among students at the University of Namibia.
- To determine if there is a relationship between subscales of attachment styles and subscales of IPV.
- To establish which of the attachment styles is a better predictor of IPV among students at the University of Namibia.
- To establish if age and gender have an impact on IPV among students at the University of Namibia.

1.8 Significance of the study

Previously, focus has been centered on raising awareness and the understanding of external factors contributing to IPV. This does not address the individual psychological causes of IPV, thereby creating a gap in understanding the intrinsic contributing factors to IPV. This research therefore aimed at examining the relationship between attachment styles and IPV. Findings from the study could be used in the creation of effective programs that assist individuals to be aware of their attachment styles and how to have healthy relationships. Examination of the different attachment styles between individuals who exhibit and those who do not exhibit violent behavior in intimate relationships could enable prediction of violence in future relationships. As a result, mitigating

interventions can be put in place to reduce cases of violent behavior in intimate relationships.

1.9 Limitations and delimitations of the study

All participants in this study were university students; therefore, generalizing results outside a university population could be difficult. Another limitation was that the study relied on already formulated questionnaires, which are self-report in nature, and participants tend to report what they believe the researcher expects to see, or what reflects positively on their own abilities, knowledge, beliefs, or opinions. As such the data should be interpreted with caution (Denscombe, 2010). Therefore, in this study participants were given privacy whilst completing the questionnaire and anonymity was guaranteed to ensure more honest responses and reduce the effects of self-report.

1.10 Format of the thesis

A detailed review of IPV and attachment styles literature is presented in Chapter 2, following the introductory chapter. Chapter 3 deals with describing the research methodology and stating the specific aims of the study. A description of the research design, the composition of the sample and the procedure followed in collecting data is also given in Chapter 3. The statistical measures used to analyse the data are also discussed in the same chapter. The results and statistical analysis are provided in Chapter 4. In Chapter 5 the results obtained and conclusions reached from the statistical analyses are discussed comprehensively. These include the demographic characteristics as well as any significant correlations. Finally, limitations of the research study and recommendation for future studies are also presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2. Literature Review

The aim of this chapter is to give a brief overview of existing literature regarding IPV. Although the exact reason as to why IPV occurs is not known, the most prominent theories cite different explanations for IPV. These include the attachment theory, cultural theory, social learning theory, feminist theory and power theory.

Types of IPV

This study focused on two forms of IPV, namely physical and psychological abuse:

Physical violence is defined as "the intentional use of physical force with the potential for causing death, disability, injury, or harm. Physical violence includes, but is not limited to: scratching, pushing, shoving, throwing, grabbing, biting, choking, shaking, hair-pulling, slapping, punching, hitting, burning, use of a weapon (gun, knife, or other object), and use of restraints or one's body, size, or strength against another person. Physical violence also includes coercing other people to commit any of the above acts" (Breiding et al. 2015, p11). For this study, physical violence had two sub categories: overt and restrictive violence.

Psychological abuse has been defined as "acts of recurring criticism and/or verbal aggression toward a partner, and/or acts of isolation and domination of a partner" (LaViolette & Barnett, 2000, p. 101). The forms of psychological abuse include deception, emotional and verbal abuse, which have been defined as "consistently doing or saying things to shame, insult, ridicule, embarrass, demean, belittle, or mentally hurt

another person" (Nichols, 2006 p. 6). It also consists of calling someone names, withholding things such as money or affection, destruction of property, manipulation, and threatening the person.

2.1 Theoretical framework

2.1.1 Attachment Theory

The study was informed by Bowlby's and Ainsworth's theories of attachment, which explain the first relationship a person experiences (Bowlby, 1958). Attachment theory has been proposed as offering a "rich conceptual framework" for understanding the dynamics driving IPV (Dutton, 2012). This first bond is thought to lay the groundwork for future relationships. Understanding this initial bond is the first step in understanding interactions in intimate relationships. Bowlby (1979) posited an important part of healthy development was having a close and caring relationship with parents and other caregivers. Proximity to attachment figures helps infants to have increased chances of protection and survival from an evolutionary stand point (Bowlby, 1979). According to Bowlby (1973), differences in attachment styles stem from "internal working models" of the self and others that are formed through the interactions of, for example, a child with the caregiver. The higher the parental sensitivity and responsiveness to the child's needs, the more secure and healthy will be the attachment that the child develops. These internal models can be classified along two dimensions. Firstly, the model of the self which is characterized by the degree of emotional dependence on others' validation and secondly, the model of others that is characterized by expectations about the availability of others.

Linking to Bowlby's (1958) work, Ainsworth & Bell (1970) conceptualized attachment formation as the mechanism by which individuals develop secure or insecure feelings about themselves, others, and their environment. Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall (1978), developed a method for assessing a child's attachment known as the "strange situation". This experiment first separated children from their parent(s), then exposed them to the presence of a stranger, and finally reunited them with their parent(s). The child expressed proximity seeking behavior, a displayed desire or a lack of desire for closeness and the responses and behaviors were classified into patterns (Ainsworth, 1978). Two dimensions were used to determine the child's attachment behavior classifications: anxiety and avoidance. The degree of anxiety experienced from abandonment and avoidance of closeness to the stranger contributed to the classification of the individual's attachment style.

2.1.2 Childhood attachment

Through applied research, Ainsworth and Bell (1970) identified four distinct forms of attachment (secure attachment, insecure-avoidant attachment, insecure ambivalent and disorganized attachment). According to Levine and Heller (2010), Ainsworth's work has been refined into three distinct forms, namely secure, anxious and avoidant attachment. A secure attachment style is characterized by low anxiety and low avoidance. Such individuals have a positive model of the self as worthy of love and a positive model of others as generally accepting and responsive. An anxious attachment style is characterized by high anxiety and low avoidance. These individuals are said to have a negative model of the self as unworthy of love and a pre-occupation with a need for acceptance from others and positive evaluation. However, because of this negative

model of self, their expectation of others is that of being distant and rejecting. An avoidant attachment style is characterized by low anxiety and high avoidance, manifesting as discomfort with intimacy and closeness in relationships. Such individuals have a positive model of the self as worthy of love but have a negative evaluation of others as clingy, needy and dependent.

2.1.3 Adult attachment

Attachment styles have been shown to strongly influence an individual's adaptive and maladaptive behavior within relationships such as aggression and victimization (Fossati, Feeney & Carretta, 2005; Orcultt & Pickett, 2005). Building on this initial work of Bowlby, researchers also began to explore adaptive and maladaptive behavior of various types of attachment throughout an individual's life span (Mauricio, Tein, &Lopez, 2007). Main, Kaplan and Cassidy (1985), devised a procedure for assessing attachment at a later age, spanning from middle childhood to adulthood. They developed an adult attachment interview where individuals retrospectively reported attachment with either their mother or father and looked at how these attachments affected the attachment styles of their children (Main & Cassidy, 1988). Contributing to this line of research other studies explored how attachment type in childhood impacted the performance of developmental tasks at later stages in the life span (Bowlby & Ainsworth, 1991, Sroufe & Waters, 1997). In addition, Hazen and Shaver (1987), expanded on the study of attachment in adulthood by conducting research on how specific patterns of attachment influenced various aspects of romantic relationships. Hazen & Shaver (1987), took Ainsworth's three attachment patterns (secure, avoidant & ambivalent) and developed a questionnaire for adults to provide insight into attachment styles within romantic

relationships. Their findings (sample age ranged from 14 to 82) indicated that an individual's attachment style in infancy influenced their perceptions and beliefs about romantic love in adulthood. Individual attachment styles are related to their emotions in this context (Bowlby, 1988). For instance, anger maybe used to "drive off a rival, or to coerce a partner to protect a relationship which is of special value to the angry person" (Bowlby, 1988). Anger is often accompanied by a certain degree of anxiety that is determined in part by the level of the individual's concern about loss of intimacy or closeness within a relationship (Bowlby, 1988).

2.1.4 Adult Attachment and Conflict

Insecurely attached individuals often doubt their worth as an individual and blame themselves for their partner's lack of responsiveness; they are anxious or pre-occupied with the relationship and may exhibit high levels of emotional expressiveness, emotional dysregulation, worry, and impulsiveness in their relationships. People who are insecurely attached to their partners are more likely to use maladaptive, strategies to resolve conflict and view conflict as more discomforting than people who are securely attached. For instance, fewer positive conflict tactics, poorer conflict management, and increased escalation have been found to be related to insecure attachment styles (Creasey & Hesson-McIness, 2001; Creasey, Kershaw & Boston, 1999).

Insecure attachment has also been linked to poorer communication skills (assertiveness, interpersonal sensitivity, and self-disclosure; Anders & Tucker, 2000). These findings are supported by other research showing that highly anxious perpetrating spouses rate their conflicts as coercive and distressing (Feeney, Noller & Callan, 1994). Conversely, secure attachment has been associated with positive strategies for handling conflict.

Pistole (1989), reported that secure individuals were more likely to use constructive problem-solving strategies such as compromise and integration than those who were more anxiously attached. Securely attached people are also more likely to be open about expressing positive and negative feelings and show more flexibility and reciprocity when talking with their partner (Feeney, 2008). Furthermore, when a spouse is behaving negatively, securely attached individuals do not exhibit neglecting or exiting behaviours (Gaines, Work, Johnson, Youn, & Lai, 2000). Similarly, O'Connell Corcoran and Mallinckrodt (2000), found that confidence in self and others (characteristics of secure attachment) were negatively related to avoidance, and positively associated with integrating and compromising conflict strategies.

Hence, insecurely attached people lack conflict management skills, resulting in greater difficulty in resolving problems with their partner when compared to people with secure attachment. Not only do insecurely attached people have increased difficulty in resolving conflict, but they have more conflict in the relationship as well. This is supported by Besharat (2003), who discovered that couples with insecure attachment styles are more likely to have relational problems and marital conflict than couples with secure attachment styles. Likewise, Gallo and Smith's research (2001) showed that attachment style predicted the level of social support and conflict between partners. Couples who reported the most support scored below average on avoidant attachment, while couples who scored above average on anxious attachment had the most IPV.

Thus, available research supports attachment as the primary motivating force behind human connection (Feeney & Noller, 1990; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Whether a person is secure or insecure in a relationship both types of people are motivated by attachment needs to manage closeness and distance in the relationship and the ensuing

conflict. Those who are securely attached are more likely to use positive behaviours to deal with conflict and people who are insecurely attached are more likely to use negative behaviours to manage conflict. Likewise, the more secure a person feels in his/her relationship the more likely they will express secure attachment behaviours and fewer relationally aggressive behaviours; accordingly, the more insecure a person feels in the relationship the more likely they are to show fewer secure attachment behaviours and more relationally aggressive behaviours (Oka, Sandberg, Bradford, & Brown, 2014).

The link between attachment styles and IPV is supported by Pearson (2006), who showed female attachment anxiety as a specific predictor for male perpetrated violence. Henderson, Bartholomew and Dutton (2015), determined the more positive the self-model, the less likely one is to enter or stay in an abusive relationship. Their study showed high levels of pre-occupation with their intimate relationship and fear of abandonment, both categories of attachment anxiety, within the female population. Preoccupation and fearfulness are not only signs of anxious attachment; they are also demonstrated in those with a negative self-model. This study also proved IPV to be associated with a negative self-model.

2.1.5 Theories of IPV

2.1.5.1 Social learning theory

Social learning theory maintains that individuals learn social behaviors by observing and imitating other people (Bandura, 1977). Based on models initially developed by Bandura (Bandura, 1977), social learning theorists postulate that violence against intimate partners is initially acquired through modeling during childhood. Imitation of models is the most important element in how children learn. This process can be seen in the

development of language, aggression, and moral decision making. According to Malley-Morrison and Hines (2004), individuals become aggressive toward family members because their aggressive behaviors are learned through operant conditioning. Operant conditioning is the strengthening of behaviors through positive or negative reinforcement, as well as the suppression of behaviors through punishment (Malley-Morrison, 2004). Positive reinforcement is giving something pleasant after a behavior and negative reinforcement is taking away something unpleasant because of the behavior that is acceptable. Through observation of repeated violence, children begin to view violence as acceptable and appropriate in intimate relationships.

Furthermore, the social learning theory attempts to explain the presence of intergenerational transmission of violence. It is proposed that while growing up, children receive feedback from individuals around them regarding their own behaviors, from which they begin to develop standards for judging their behavior and seek out models who match these standards (Bandura, 1977). Bandura further elaborates that those children who grow up in violent/abusive behavior environments, imitate those behaviors and then repeat those behaviors in future relationships. Young adults who observed and experienced abuse when they were children are reported to be more likely to be in an abusive intimate relationship as either the abuser or victim.

Like the power theory, social learning theory proposes that methods for settling family conflicts are often learned during childhood by observing parental and peer relationships (Mihalic & Elliot, 1997). Social learning theorists emphasize that direct reinforcement of violent behavior is not required to maintain that behavior.

Instead, simply witnessing either positive or negative consequences of violent behavior may be sufficient in determining whether or not an individual will engage in future violent episodes. The theoretical limitation of this theory is that it fails to explain intimate partner violence that is not evident in individuals who grew up in households where there was IPV. It assumes that only individuals who have observed violence in their childhood will become violent in their intimate partner relationships. An alternative theory to account for individuals who do not observe violence in their childhood but are violent in their intimate relationships is attachment theory. For instance, individuals who are insecurely attached could be violent in their adult relationship regardless of the fact that they did not observe violence in their childhood.

2.1.5.2 Cultural Theory

There are several traditions and norms within the African culture that have been associated with widespread incidences of IPV in African communities. Ofei-Aboagye (1994), argues that wife battering is regarded as normal within traditional African culture. IPV against women thrives because it is tolerated or even accepted in the society. Traditionally, some African communities do not consider the beating of a wife by the husband as anything untoward, especially where the beating is "mild" and corrective. Rather, it is regarded as a normal way of life and even a sign of love in some cases.

Other cultural explanations are more mediated, pointing, for example, to the uneven distribution of power within traditional African marriages, the impact of polygamy, the acceptance of male promiscuity, the power of the extended family over a married couple, and the institution of bride price as underlying the widespread abuse of wives.

The payment of bride price to the wife's family at the time of their marriage makes it difficult for women to leave abusive husbands, unless their families of origin are willing to return the amount paid (Ofei-Aboagye, 1994).

Arguments based on culture are problematic in the African context for several reasons. Culture in Africa may vary widely among groups and regions and change over time and culture may even be contested within the same group. For example, Namibia has more than 11 tribes with some similar as well as different cultural practices. First, there exists the danger of overgeneralization by saying all "African men do this" or all "African women behave this way". To assume that all Namibian men who are violent towards their partners are influenced by cultural factors only, at the exclusion of other factors such as individual differences or psychological conditions, feeds into the Western stereotypes of Africans that at times are embedded in racism. For example, male domination of women in Western literature is associated with personal insecurity, patriarchal values, and psychological dependence among others, whereas male domination of women in Africa seems to be associated primarily with negative cultural stereotypes that depict a lack of individuality or a limited capacity for will or rational thought. Cultural theory fails to account for individual differences in African men who are gender sensitive and committed to gender equality despite their upbringing.

2.1.5.3 Feminist theory

The Feminist theory presents one of the most prominent socio-cultural perspectives on IPV. It represents a broad range of often contradictory viewpoints, as such, it is dynamic and pragmatic (Dillion, Hussain, Loxton & Rahman, 2013).

A feminist definition views IPV as a continual pattern of behaviors used to assert control over an intimate partner (Nicolaids and Paranjape, 2009). This theory incorporates diversity in terms of its approaches to IPV. Despite diversity and debate, the feminist theory holds some central convictions about the position of men and women pertaining to IPV in addition to emphasizing gender and power inequality in heterosexual relationships (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). The focus is on the societal messages that sanction a male's use of violence and aggression throughout life, and the prescribed gender roles that dictate how men and women should behave in their intimate relationships (Archer, 2000). Furthermore, the feminist theorists have long argued that gender should also be understood as a social level construct, a force that structures the social world in which men and women operate.

According to Anderson (2005), there has been success in illuminating the ways in which social structures function to maintain IPV for instance social pressures to stay with a violent partner. According to Van Rooy and Mufune (2013), the feminist theory examines the socio-cultural context in which the violent behavior occurs. In their study on IPV in Namibia, Van Rooy and Mufune explored female inequality, power imbalances between sexes and sexism stemming from society's patriarchal beliefs (Van Rooy & Mufune, 2013). The study perceived that men have an innately greater capacity for violence. This results from historic and current power differentials that keep women inferior primarily using control, including physical, sexual, economic and psychological abuse comprising of tactics of intimidation and isolation (Herrzog, 2007).

Male entitlement to power and the violence used to sustain it is often attributed to male socialization with the implicit understanding that what is learned can be unlearned.

Women have been subjugated by the greater patriarchal society and this has placed limits on their opportunities (Van Rooy& Mufune, 2013). This left women vulnerable to abuse and violence that is used by men to control them. Moreover, the theory states that traditional institutions such as marriage perpetuate the dominance over wives by husbands through the structure of husband/wife roles: the husband`s primary identity is that of provider and revolves around work; he enjoys a higher status and is the decision maker, while women carry out the role of domestic work, child care, emotional and psychological support. It is through such a system, coupled, with the acceptance of physical force as a means of control, that the wife becomes an appropriate victim of physical and psychological abuse (Van Rooy & Mufune, 2013).

However, the feminist theory has been criticized on its presumption that men have a greater capacity for violence. A growing body of research, which examines female aggression and women's capacity for violence, suggests that the feminist notion and idealized views that women are inherently less aggressive than men should be abandoned (Bair-Merritt, Crowne, Thompson, Sibinga, Trent & Campbell, 2010). The feminist theories` mixed empirical support fails to explain intimate partner violence in same sex couples. At the same time, issues of power, control and autonomy have also been identified as reasons for IPV in lesbian relationships, issues such as dependency and jealousy also exist (Bair-Merritt et al 2010).

The feminist theory typically explains women`s use of violence in the context of self-defence and retaliation for previous abuse (Dillion, Hussain, Loxton & Rahman, 2013). Yet, by doing so, a strictly feminist orientation denies that women can also feel angry and enraged without provocation in their relationships with men. Additionally, while

much of a woman's use of violence does exist within the framework of retaliation and self-defence, feminist theory does not explain why women perpetrate violence outside their intimate relationships, for instance at work, with peers, with children (Goodman, Smyth, Borges & Singer, 2009).

Feminist theories also do not adequately account for comparable rates of men and women's partner violence (Dillion et al 2013; Van Rooy& Mufune, 2013) or the large number of men living in patriarchal societies who do not abuse their partners. Mainstream feminist theory fails to explain why some men become violent while others do not. In addition, it also cannot account for individual differences among batterers, yet evidence suggests that men who engaged in frequent physical aggression had higher levels of other antisocial behavior, compared with men who perpetrated lower levels of partner aggression (Capaldi & Owen, 2001). Knowing these differences may be useful for addressing the issue of partner violence.

2.1.5.4 Intimate Partner Violence in Same- Sex Relationships

Although statistics about IPV have grown, much of the literature does not include information about same-sex relationships. It is estimated that IPV affects same-sex relationships at an equal or even greater frequency than in heterosexual relationships. The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence estimates 25-33% of same-sex couples will experience IPV in their lifetime (Peterman & Dixon, 2003). Tully (2001), states that 15-20% of all gay or lesbian couples in the United States are currently in relationships involving some form of abuse. Ristock (2003) points out rates of intimate partner violence amongst lesbians as ranging between 17-52%. Of the scarce literature

on same-sex intimate partner violence, the least documentation is on IPV in male same-sex relationships.

Within the Namibian community accurate accounts of the rates of IPV in same-sex relationships are difficult to obtain because homosexuality is not legalized. The information gathered is generally collected in one general location and typically at gay and lesbian events or businesses such as gay/lesbian bars or restaurants (Stephenson, Hast, Finneran & Sineath, 2014). This then falls under criticism as the samples are not considered representative and cannot be generalized to the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) population at large (Stephenson, Hast, Finneran & Sineath, 2014).

There is almost no protection offered for male victims of abuse; gay men seeking help from self-help groups are often disliked for being homosexual, and lesbians that have utilized the shelters provided for victims of abuse have often stated they were victimized a second time by homophobic staff (Kuehnle & Sullivan, 2003). McClennen (2005) suggests the most common resource used by those suffering from IPV is the utilization of friends.

The use of friends is often limited as both partners in same-sex relationships frequently share the same friends within their circle and risk embarrassment and the issue of friends being forced to choose sides. Furthermore, Namibia still has anti-sodomy laws on the books which would then force victims of abuse in same-sex relationships to implicate themselves as having committed a crime while attempting to get help for the abuse (Stephenson, Hast, Finneran & Sineath, 2014). Also, important to note is that IPV is a very personal issue that often brings about embarrassment and shame. This embarrassment sometimes leads to a stronger desire to remain silent about the abuse as

the LGBT community is often afraid of being viewed as abnormal and/or problematic by the heterosexual community at large.

2.1.5.5 Power Theory

Straus (as cited in Pearson, 2006), states that Power theorists claim that the roots of violence stem not only from within the culture but also from within the family structure; that is family conflict, social acceptance of violence and gender inequality. Apart from family conflict factors such as age, income and employment status play an important role in the manifestation of IPV. The power theory makes use of social structuralism in explaining violence in relationships. Basically, violence in general occurs as a reaction to socially structured stress for instance low income, unemployment, poor health and the institutionalized inequalities, socio-economic, gender and racial divides and this applies to both male and female. From this perspective IPV is understood as the outcome of a pileup of stressors associated with a perceived excess of demands over resources.

Goode (1971) proposed that the power balance between partners is often dependent upon the resources individuals contribute to the relationship. Moreover, it was hypothesized that "force and its threat can be used when other resources are unavailable or have proved ineffective" (Goode, 1971). This theory attempts to explain violence or abuse in relationships. This applies to both male and female perpetration of violence in a relationship. The limitation of this theory is that all men are exposed to similar patriarchal social structures, which fails to explain men who are from the same social structures but do not carry out violence in their intimate relationships. However, only a minority of men respond with sexual coercion (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004). Therefore, there is a need to explore these individual differences with attachment theory.

2.2 IPV among university students

Forty-two percent of IPV victims are between the ages of 18 and 24 (Durose, Harlow, Langan, Motivans, Rantala & Smith, 2005); therefore, a significant percentage of college students will experience some type of IPV during their young adult years. An analysis of nearly 40 studies on college dating violence noted that approximately 40% of female students admitted to perpetrating violence against their partners and 33% of male students admitted to perpetrating violence against their partners (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989) showing there is bidirectional violence. Furthermore, there are higher rates of violence within dating couples compared to married couples, suggesting that IPV is an important topic to investigate within a college setting.

2.3 Gender differences and IPV

An individual's gender has been shown to affect how severe they perceive instances of IPV. One large-scale investigation provided evidence for this phenomenon. Specifically, participants read a vignette about a man who abuses his girlfriend physically and she ends up calling the police. The participants then expressed the degree to which they agreed with several statements about the incident, such as whether the boyfriend should be arrested (Nicolson, 2010). Overall, 97% of the participants found that the violence that took place was not acceptable. It was notable, however, that the male participants were more negative towards the woman in the vignette compared to the female participants and more males expressed that they thought that the boyfriend should *not* be arrested. Conversely, more female participants thought that the woman was right to contact the police and thought that she should leave the relationship (Nicolson, 2010).

In another study with college students, researchers provided participants with domestic

violence vignettes that varied by the race of the couple, where the husband battered his wife (Locke & Richman, 1999). Overall, regardless of the race of the couple in the vignette, female participants had more sympathy for the wife. The female participants also held the husband more responsible for the abuse, and they rated the abusive incident as more severe compared to male participants. This suggests that participants' genders might surpass the influence of race in determining blame (Locke & Richman, 1999). In a different study, Bryant and Spencer (2003) analyzed how college students attribute blame in IPV. Participants completed both the Domestic Violence Blame Scale (DVBS) and the Conflict Tactics Scale, which assessed their prior exposure to IPV. Compared to female participants, male participants scored higher on the DVBS and on the scale the husband was the perpetrator and the wife was the victim. Also, participants with prior exposure to IPV from their families blamed the IPV less on the victim and more on societal factors (Bryant & Spencer, 2003).

Doumas, Person, Elgin and Mckinley (2008), first reported that females with attachment anxiety are more likely to be a victim of male violence or abuse. Bond and Bond (2014) also found that pairing of anxious attachment in females and avoidant attachment in males was associated to IPV. Dismissing attachment is a subcategory of attachment avoidance, which, in males, has not been found to pair well with females of an opposite attachment categorization. Bond and Bond (2014) found that couples with this combination of attachment styles were nine times more likely to be in an IPV situation than couples who do not demonstrate such an attachment combination.

Bookwala and Zdaniuk (2010) studied reciprocally aggressive relationships and found high rates of pre-occupied and fearful attachment styles to be associated with aggression

by both partners. These pre-occupied and fearful attachment styles are subcategories of anxious attachment, which has been found in the other studies to be associated with intimate partner violence in relationships. Allison, Bartholomew, Mayseless and Dutton (2008), examined male perpetrated and female victimized relationship violence and determined that pre-occupied females and avoidant males, when in the same relationship, were more likely to experience intimate partner violence.

Each of the six studies showed that females with attachment anxiety were more likely to be victims of IPV. Many of these studies also linked male attachment avoidance to IPV when 'mis-paired' with female attachment anxiety. This research shows how attachment styles develop within an individual from infancy to adulthood and help to frame the behaviour of those individuals within a romantic relationship setting. While there are many causes for attachment patterns to develop in adults, it has been posited that children who witness intimate partner violence are more likely to experience negative self-models, insecure attachment styles, and get into intimate partner violence situations. Therefore, the cycle is likely to continue to the next generation if couples' treatment is not given prior to a child being born or early enough in the infant's life that attachment patterns can be adjusted. If treatment is done later in the child's life, it is important to include the child in treatment with individual counselling and play therapy to reform developing attachment patterns.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methods used to carry out the objectives of the study and outlines the research design, methods of data collection and analyses. This chapter will also include the description of the participants involved in the study as well as the ethical considerations taken.

3.1 Research design

The study employed a correlational research design. The purpose of using this design was to determine relationships between variables, in this case IPV and attachment styles, to establish which of the attachment styles predicts IPV.

The aim of the quantitative research, as opposed to a qualitative one, is to attempt to describe and report for regularities in social behavior, rather than seeking out and interpreting the meaning that people bring to their own actions.

Quantitative research seeks explanations and makes predictions, establishes, confirms or validates relationships and develops generalizations that may contribute to theory (Leedy& Ormrod, 2010).

3.1.2 Participants

The target population was all University of Namibia undergraduate students, a total of 7,670 individuals (University of Namibia Strategic & Physical Planning, 2016).

3.2 Sample

The sample size was calculated based on Yamane's formula (Yamane, 1967)

$$n = \frac{N}{1+Ne^2}$$

Where, n = the sample size

N = the size of population

e = the error of 5 percent points

By using Yamane's formula of sample size with a confidence coefficient of 95% (Yamane, 1967), the calculation from a population of 7670 came up with 380 individuals from the University of Namibia. A simple random sampling technique was used to select participants. This technique ensures that each subgroup of the population has an equal probability of being chosen. The participants were both male and female full time undergraduate students regardless of IPV history who are or have been in an intimate relationship. All individuals were from the Windhoek main campus, aged 18 years and above in order to legally consent for themselves.

3.3 Research instruments

a) The Abuse within Intimate Relations Scale (AIRS)

The AIRS is a 26 item, self-report instrument designed to identify precursors of intimate partner violence in young adult relationships (Borjesson, Aarons & Dunn, 2003). The AIRS was adopted and used as is in this study. Measurement of violence in dating couples is particularly difficult because none of the widely used, well validated measures

have been designed primarily for use with young dating couples (Borjesson, Aarons & Dunn, 2003).

The AIRS was designed for use with young adults, specifically college students. Existing, well established scales have been designed primarily for use with married or well established couples, and these scales often include items that are either irrelevant or inappropriate for use with college students, for instance the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA; Cooper& Yuille, 2003) is not only intended for use with married individuals, but includes items about criminal history and past physical and sexual assault, both of which indicate that it may not be ideal for detecting more subtle forms of violence. The AIRS scale is intended to identify precursors of violence in dating couples (Borjesson, Aarons & Dunn, 2003). Therefore, the AIRS were chosen as a measurement instrument for this study as it suits the current target population.

AIRS subscales

Three subscales on the AIRS are intended to measure different forms of psychological violence, namely The Verbal Abuse subscale measures a type of abuse characterized by language use, withdrawal of verbal interaction and voice tone. It has five items, which include." I have given my partner the silent treatment." and "I have used profanity towards my partner."

The Emotional Abuse subscale measures a level of non-physical violence that is more likely to be considered an attack on the victim's character. This subscale contains seven items, which include, "I have degraded my partner." and "I have criticized my partner." The Deceptive Behaviors subscale measures behaviors that are likely to lead to mistrust.

This scale consists of four items. which include, "I have kept secrets from my partner, and "I have lied to my partner."

Two subscales on the AIRS measure two different types of physical violence. The Restrictive Violence subscale measures physical violence that restricts the victim's movement to some extent. It contains three items which include, "I have grabbed my partner in a rough manner," and "I have grabbed my partner's arm tightly." The Overt Violence subscale measures levels of physical violence that are subtle. It contains seven items, which include, "I have pushed my partner." The estimate of internal consistency reliability is .80 on emotional abuse, .80 on deception and .73 on verbal abuse.

The scoring of the AIRS global scale was done by adding up all scores and dividing with the number of items in the questionnaire. High scores indicate the presence of violence. The scoring of the subscales was carried out as follows: to obtain the score for psychological abuse items for Emotional abuse (Items 9,10,11,12,18,22,23), Deception (Items13,16,19,17) and Verbal Abuse (Items 1,8,20,21,24) were averaged. High scores in each subscale indicate the presents of violence. To obtain the score for physical violence items for Overt violence (Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 26) and Restrictive Violence (Items 7, 25, 15) were averaged. High scores in each subscale indicate the presence of violence.

b) Experiences in Close Relationship Structures (ECR-R) questionnaire

The Experience in Close Relationship Structures (ECR-R) questionnaire is a 36 item self-report instrument designed to assess attachment styles in a variety of close relationships (Fraley, Waller, & Brenna, 2000). This instrument was adopted and used as

is in this study. The items are derived using item response theory (IRT) analyses based on most of the existing self-report measures of adult romantic attachment. The ECR-R is designed to assess individual differences with respect to attachment-related anxiety (i.e., the extent to which people are insecure vs. secure about the availability and responsiveness of romantic partners) and attachment-related avoidance, for example the extent to which people are uncomfortable being close to others vs. secure depending on others (Fraley et al, 2000).

The participants rated each item on a Likert Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) depending on their general experience in their romantic relationships. The commonly used estimate of internal consistency reliability is .90 or higher (Fairchild & Finney, 2006).

The scoring of the ECR-R global scale was done by adding up all scores and dividing by the number of items in the questionnaire. A high or low score indicates a form of attachment. The scoring of the subscales was carried out as follows the first 18 items comprise the anxiety attachment scale. Items 19 – 36 comprise the avoidance attachment scale. To obtain a score for anxiety, a person`s responses to items 1 – 18 were averaged. However, because items 9 and 11 were reverse keyed that is high numbers represent low anxiety rather than high anxiety, reverse the answers to those questions before averaging the responses. To obtain a score for avoidance, a person`s responses to items 19 – 36 were averaged. Items 20, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, and 36 were reverse keyed before averaging that is high numbers represent low avoidance and low numbers represents high avoidance.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

The participants were approached at the campus restaurants, namely the Grub, Dining hall and Independence between 12 and 3pm – these being the busiest periods when students are having their lunch. Prior to conducting the study, the participants were informed of the nature of the research and its aims. The consent form was thoroughly reviewed with all participants; the anticipated duration for completing the questionnaire was about 10 minutes. Participation in the study was voluntary and students could skip any question and discontinue participation at any point. Students who opted to participate signed a consent form that was attached to the questionnaire. Participants completed a pen and paper questionnaire that included the Experiences in Close Relationships Revised (ECR-R) questionnaire designed to assess individual differences with respect to attachment (Fraley, Waller, & Brenna, 2000) and the Abuse within Intimate Relations Scale (AIRS) questionnaire designed to identify precursors of intimate partner violence in young adult relationships (Borjesson, Aarons & Dunn, 2003).

The inclusion criterion was male and female students above 18 years who were or had been in a relationship regardless of IPV history at the time of the study. Students were required to complete and return the questionnaires after completion.

3.5 Data analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 2016 was used for data analysis. The data was skewed therefore nonparametric statistics were employed. The Spearman rank correlation was used to determine if there is a relationship between attachment styles and IPV among students at the University of Namibia, because it evaluates the linear

relationship between continuous variables. Furthermore, the binary logistic regression was used to establish which of the attachment styles predicts IPV among students at the University of Namibia. Lastly, the binary logistic regression to predict trends and to further establish if age and gender have an impact on IPV among participating students at the University of Namibia.

3.6 Research Ethics

The researcher aimed to build a body of knowledge and gain insights into students' perspectives on IPV and attachment styles. Thus, the sample of this study was selected from a population of students from the University of Namibia. Participants were informed about the aims and objectives of the study prior to completion of the questionnaire. It was further explained to them that by expressing their beliefs, they would assist the researcher in gaining an understanding and building knowledge on the subject at hand. No other benefits were promised to the participants. The participants were also made aware of their option to withdraw from the study without consequences. A consent form was developed and provided to potential participants at the University of Namibia.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter will contain descriptive statistics, results of non-parametric tests including Spearman rho correlation and binary logistic regression. These statistics (non-parametric tests) were used, because the data was skewed. Information will be provided on the demographic characteristics of the participants. This chapter will also contain the discussion of the findings.

4.1. Demographic Characteristics of the sample

The sample consisted of 380 participants of whom 58.2% were female and 41.8% male. Most participants were in the 18-25 age cohort, 88.2%. The students who participated in the study were from various faculties and schools at the university. Faculty of economics and management sciences had the most participants (29.5%) followed by the science faculty with 18.4%. (See Table 1).

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the sample

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	159	41.8
Female	221	58.2
Age Category		
18-25	335	88.2
26-35	35	9.2
36-40	6	1.6
41-50+	4	1.0
Year of Study		
1st Year	101	26.6
2nd Year	88	23.2
3rd Year	116	30.5
4th Year	75	19.7
Faculty		
Economics and Management Sciences	112	29.5
Science	70	18.4
Humanities and Social Sciences	68	17.9
Law	66	17.4

Education	48	12.6
Health Sciences	11	2.9
Military Science	5	1.3

4.2 (a). Frequency distribution of the Abuse in intimate relationship scale

As shown in Table 2, the participants reported to have abused their partners in the following ways mocked (23.9%), purposely insulted (15.5%), criticized (20.8%), ridiculed (14.5%), belittled (11.6%), degraded (8.9%) and sneered (14.5%) their partner.

Table 2: Frequency distribution of the emotional abuse scale

Items	**Never**	**Once**	**Twice or more**
9. I have mocked my partner	55.5	20.3	23.9
10. I have purposely insulted my partner	65.3	19.2	15.5
11. I have criticized my partner	53.2	25.8	20.8
12. I have ridiculed my partner	69.5	16.1	14.5
18. I have belittled my partner	70.0	18.4	11.6
22. I have degraded my partner	76.3	14.7	8.9
23. I have sneered at my partner	70.3	15.3	14.5

Most of the participants had kept secrets from partners (39.8%) and lied to partners (40.0%) (See Table 3).

Table 3: Frequency distribution of the deception scale

Item	Never	Once	Twice or more
13. I have kept secrets from my partner	34.7	25.5	39.7
16. I have betrayed my partner	65.8	19.5	14.7
19. I have deceived my partner	67.9	17.9	14.2
17. I have lied to my partner	33.9	26.1	40.0

Under verbal abuse, silent treatment (54.2%) and ignoring partner (43.4%) had the highest percentages and to a lesser extend blaming partner for things that were uncontrollable (23.2%), using profanity towards a partner (13.7%), and screaming at a partner (24.7%) (See Table 4).

Table 4: Frequency distribution of the verbal abuse scale

Items	Never	Once	Twice or more
1. I have given my partner the silent treatment	26.1	19.7	54.2
8. I have blamed my partner for things that were uncontrollable	43.2	33.7	23.2
20. I have used profanity towards my partner	72.9	13.2	13.7
21. I have screamed at my partner	51.3	23.9	24.7
24. I have ignored my partner	32.9	23.7	43.4

Table 5 shows that, most of the participants reported low percentages on the Overt violence subscale on using objects to hit a partner (2.9%), pushing a partner (7.4%), shoving a partner (5.5%), pushing matches with a partner (6.3%), forcefully pushed a partner (3.7%), physically attacked a partner (5.0%) and thrown objects while arguing with a partner (5.0%).

Table 5: Frequency distribution of the responses of participants on the overt violence subscale

Items	Never	Once	Twice or more
2. I have used an object to hit my partner	93.2	3.9	2.9
3. I have pushed my partner	78.9	13.7	7.4
4. I have shoved my partner	85.5	8.9	5.5
5. I have had pushing matches with my partner	86.8	6.8	6.3
6. I have forcefully pushed my partner	88.4	7.9	3.7
14. I have physically attacked my partner	88.7	6.3	5.0
26. I have thrown objects while arguing with my partner	89.2	5.8	5.0

Under restrictive violence (see table 6), participants reported a low percentage on the twice or more response, squeezed their partner in a forceful way (5.8%), grabbed my partner in a rough manner (7.9%) and grabbed my partner's arm tightly (11.1%).

Table 6: Frequency distribution of the responses of participants on the restrictive violence subscale

Items	Never	Once	Twice or more
7. I have squeezed my partner is a forceful way	86.3	7.9	5.8
25. I have grabbed my partner in a rough manner	80.3	11.8	7.9
15. I have grabbed my partner`s arm tightly	75.8	12.9	11.1

4.2 (b). Descriptive statistics of the Attachment subscale scale

The attachment global scale is comprised of two subscales, namely, anxiety attachment and avoidance attachment. The participants' responses indicated higher levels of avoidance compared to anxiety. Anxiety attachment subscale had a (M= 3.20, SD =1.17) while the avoidance attachment subscale had a (M= 4.08, SD= .84) see Table 7.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics of the Attachment subscale scale.

	N	Range	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Anxiety	380	5.61	3.2098	1.17111	1.371
Avoidance	380	5.83	4.0877	.84517	.714
Valid N (list wise)	380				

4.3 Bivariate data analysis

4.3.1 Objective 1a:

Objective 1a was to determine if there is a relationship between attachment styles and IPV among the participating students at the University of Namibia.

The strength and direction of the relationship between x and y were measured using the Spearman rho correlation coefficient was carried out to measure the strength and direction (positive or negative) of the relationship that exists between Attachment styles and IPV. There was a significant but weak positive correlation between attachment styles and IPV (r_s= 0.229, p<0.001) (see Table 8).

Table 8: A correlation table of IPV and Attachment

			IPV	Attachment
Spearman's rho	IPV	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.229**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	380	380
	Attachment	Correlation Coefficient	.229**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	380	380

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.3.1.2 Objective 1b

A spearman`s rank- order correlation was run to determine if there is a relationship between subscales of attachment styles and subscales of IPV. The results indicated that there was a significant but weak positive relationship between the anxiety attachment style and psychological abuse (emotional abuse (r_s=0.210, p<0.001); deception (r_s=0.210, p<0.001); Verbal abuse (r_s=0.177, p<0.001).

There is also a significant but weak positive relationship between the anxiety attachment style and physical violence (Overt violence (r_s=0.168, p=0.001); restrictive violence (r_s=0.177, p=0.001) (see Table 9).

Table 9: A correlation table with Attachment subscales and IPV subscales

			Verbal Abuse	Overt	Restrictive	Anxiety	Avoidance	Psychological	Physical
Spearman rho	Anxiety	Correlation Coefficient	.177**	.188**	.177**	1.000	.064	.239**	.207**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.001	.	.212	.000	.000
		N	380	380	380	380	380	380	380
	Avoidance	Correlation Coefficient	.076	.006	.013	.064	1.000	.064	.031
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.142	.906	.801	.212	.	.211	.546
		N	380	380	380	380	380	380	380

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.3.2 Objective 2:

To establish which of the attachment styles is a better predictor of IPV among students at the University of Namibia.

IPV, measured on a Likert scale, was not normally distributed (Kolmogorov statistic = $p \geq 0.05$). The IPV variable was recorded into a binary variable indicating the presence (Code 1) of IPV and the Absence of IPV (Code 0). The results of Binary logistic regression to establish risk factors for IPV are presented in Table 10. The model had a good fit (Nagelkerke R^2=86. 9%).

The results significantly indicated that those with Anxiety Attachment were likely to be perpetrators of IPV (OR=0.230, 95% CI:0.086-0.617, p=.003) compared to those without Anxiety attachment. The Odds Ratio (OR) is used to determine whether a particular exposure (anxiety attachment) is a risk factor for a particular outcome (IPV) and to compare the magnitude of various risk factors for that outcome. Therefore, an OR of 1 means exposure does not affect odds of outcome, an OR smaller than 1 means exposure is associated with higher odds of outcome and an OR greater than 1 means exposure associated with lower odds of outcome (Szumilas, 2010). Although the OR might seem small the p value can be significant.

4.3.3 Objective 3:

The third objective was to establish if age and gender have an effect on IPV among students at the University of Namibia.

The Binary logistic regression analysis was carried out to establish whether age and gender have an effect on IPV. The model had a good fit (Nagelkerke R^2=86.9%). Results indicated that age (OR=0.427, 95% CI: 0.166-1.1, p=0.078) and gender (OR=0.893, 95% CI: 0.368- 2.166, p=0.802) were not significant predictors of IPV (see Table 10).

Table 10: A regression analysis of attachment styles, gender, age as predictors of IPV

Predictor	B	Wald χ^2	P	Odds Ratio
Gender	0.113	0.63	0.802	0.890
Age	0.851	3.109	0.078	0.427
Attachment				

Avoidance	0.647	1.001	0.317	1.909
Anxiety	1.470	8.529	0.003**	0.230

4.4 DISCUSSION

4.4. 1 Relationship between attachment styles and IPV

The main goal of the study was to examine if there is a relationship between attachment styles and IPV among students at the University of Namibia. The findings show that there is a significant but weak positive relationship between attachment styles and IPV. Bowlby (1988) reported that successful negotiation of attachment stages provides children with a secure emotional base from which they competently lead the rest of their relational lives. Understanding the relationship between attachment styles and IPV in Namibia could prove useful in detecting individuals and couples at high risk of IPV. In addition, this information may be useful in contributing to the knowledge base on child-rearing practices. Despite the fact that cross-cultural research questions whether the secure base of attachment universally fosters relational competence (Rothbaum, Weisz, Pott, Miyake & Morelli, 2000), other researchers confirm that the secure form of attachment is normative and has similar health-related consequences across cultures (Ainsworth & Marvin, 1995). Parental warmth and emotionally supportive caregiving are associated with children developing attachment security according to several authors (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, &Wall, 1978; Rohner & Britner, 2002), whereas insensitive and inconsistent caregiving generally leads to insecure attachment (Dozier, Stoval, & Albus, 1999; Greenberg, 1999). Although these results showed a weak correlation

between attachment style and IPV, this study opens a discussion on a poorly understood dynamic in the conceptualization of IPV in Namibia.

4.4.2 Relationship between subscales of attachment styles and IPV

The correlation analysis between subscales of the attachment style and subscales of IPV showed that there was a significant but weak positive relationship between attachment anxiety and both physical violence and psychological abuse. Although this study found a weak relationship between attachment anxiety and IPV the results are consistent with other studies linking attachment anxiety to IPV especially physical violence (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). In Namibia, it appears as if most incidences of physical violence are understood from a Feminist perspective. Wife assault according to Feminist theory is a systematic form of domination and social control of women by men (Levinson, 1989). The Namibian government spends a considerable amount of resources on this issue yet the numbers of cases of IPV are increasing (Makaiwa, 2013). The current study expands on the existing literature supporting attachment theory's utility in the conceptualization of IPV. According to research (Dutton, Saunders, & Bartholomew, 1994), male batterers are more insecurely attached compared to males that are not batterers. These authors noted that male batterers are predominantly preoccupied or fearfully attached, there is no consensus in terms of how insecure attachment is related to IPV, however studies found that batterers score higher on abandonment anxiety (Holtzworth-Munroe, Stuart, & Hutchinson, 1997) and impulsivity (Cohen et al., 2003). In addition, studies have also found that male batterers have lower self-esteem than non-batterers. One of the conclusions could be that some male batterers do revert to violence because they believe that women are objects that should be submissive, on the contrary it could be that their

dependency needs on the woman/relationship coupled with low self-esteem lead to separation anxiety and partner distrust that results in, or facilitate violence. Hence, these men may benefit from intervention programs that focus on attachment style and partner distrust.

Attachment theory supports the above-mentioned research and argues that individuals who are anxiously attached may aggress against their partners when they feel abandoned, rejected, or ignored, with the conscious or unconscious goal of achieving security in their relationship (Bartholomew & Allison, 2006). These findings are broadly consistent with the study conducted by Bonache, Gonzalez- Mendez, &Khrahe (2016) and Djamba & Kimuna (2008), who also stated that there is a significant relationship between both anxious and avoidant attachment styles with violent behavior in intimate relationships. De Olivera Fonseca- Machando, dos Santos Monteiro, Haas, de Vilhena Abrao and Gomes- Sponholz (2015) also reported a positive significant relationship between IPV and anxiety.

Theoretically, IPV driven by adult attachment anxiety would be motivated by a desire to preserve the relationship in order to avoid abandonment (Mayseless, 1991). Real or perceived separations constitute threats, because the anxious person depends heavily on the relationship for assistance with affect regulation. Jealous reactions are expected, with or without provocation (Sharpsteen & Kirkpatrick, 1997). An intense fear of loss may become enacted in ways that jeopardize the relationship, through hyper activation of attachment-related behaviors (Bowlby, 1980). For example, excessive proximity seeking would be expected (Bowlby, 1982), including frequent phone calls, visits, or other attempts to gain access to the romantic partner. This type of behavior may constitute

stalking under certain conditions, such as after a breakup. Unfortunately, such efforts to preserve and regulate the relationship more often exacerbate problems. A typical sequence of behavior might include escalation and psychological abuse spiraling quickly and frequently into a loss of emotional control, with resulting impulsive violent behavior. Afterwards, the perpetrator is likely to exhibit remorse over damage done to the relationship. These behaviors may occur despite the romantic partner's best efforts to be supportive, because the perpetrator may fail to perceive the partner's responsiveness (Kesner, Julian, & McKenny, 1997). Unfortunately, those who fear abandonment may create such abandonment without recognizing what they are doing.

In light of these findings, the current study could create specific interventions that may be helpful to address this pattern of behavior, including strategies aimed at enhancing the individual`s support system and independent regulation of affect. Helping individuals understand the consequences of their behavior to their relationship would be highly motivating. In other words, efforts to learn independent emotion management skills could be framed as their contribution to improved intimacy in romantic relationships. Support group settings, especially those in which individuals are encouraged to call each other rather than their partners during times of distress, might provide alternative relationships to support them while they make changes. Independently learning to control impulses (rather than relying on others to establish boundaries for them) could also be framed as contributing to improved romantic relationships.

The current study did not find a significant correlation between the avoidant attachment style and IPV in this population; this is in contrast with several studies. Individuals with

avoidance attachment styles are generally resistant to partner dependency and uncomfortable with closeness, violence may function to create physical or emotional distance (Sommer, Babcock & Sharp, 2017); it appears as if excessive dependency needs rather than discomfort with closeness in this population increased the perpetration of IPV.

4.4.3 Attachment style as a predictor of IPV among students at the University of Namibia

Results in this study established that attachment anxiety significantly influenced IPV. Attachment theory has often been used as a theoretical framework to understand IPV (Fournier, Brassard & Shaver, 2011; Godbout, Dutton, Lussier, & Sabourin, 2009). According to Fournier and his colleagues (2011), the anxiety dimension "reflects a fear of rejection and abandonment combined with doubts about one's social value and lovability". Dutton (2007) concurs with these findings by stating that anxious attachment may be associated with violent behavior because anxiously attached individuals have difficulty regulating emotional and behavioral responses produced by fear of rejection and abandonment. Anxiously attached individuals are hypervigilant to rejection cues and have difficulty disengaging from these cues (Mikulincer, Gillath, & Shaver, 2002). Hypervigilance associated with anxious attachment also increases negative affect (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), such as feelings of frustration and anger. Therefore, by understanding this attachment style and creating customized programs targeting these areas of IPV could possibly reduce the IPV incidents.

4.4.4 The effect of age and gender on IPV among students at the University of Namibia

The results showed that there was no significant effect of age and gender on IPV in this population. Early research on IPV has predominantly focused on unidirectional violence perpetrated by men and directed toward women (Hamel, 2007). As such, in following studies, it was often assumed that perpetrators and victims of IPV formed two distinct groups, male perpetrators and female victims (Lamis, Leenaars, Jahn, & Lester, 2013).

The results in this study are consistent to Hamby` (2009) who found that both men and women use IPV for coercive control but define the use of control differently: women use control to gain autonomy in abusive relationships, whereas men use control to assert authority over their partner.

Bidirectional violence is now considered to be a common form of violence in intimate relationships (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Misra, Selwyn, & Rohling, 2012) with several empirical studies suggesting that 45 to 95% of individuals in an abusive relationship are both perpetrators and victims of partner violence (Fass, Benson, & Leggett, 2008; Lussier et al., 2013; Renner & Whitney, 2012). Studies and literature reviews have demonstrated the bidirectionality of IPV (Straus, 2011) and have revealed that women's and men`s rates of IPV perpetration are quite similar (Archer, 2000; Lussier et al., 2013). In certain cases, the rates with which women report being violent toward their male partners even exceeded men's rates (Archer, 2000; Kimmel, 2002). As such, female perpetrated violence does generate important mental health consequences in male victims (Hines & Malley-Morrison, 2001) thus supporting the necessity of research on this phenomenon.

Men's IPV typology researchers have suggested that attachment style may be more helpful in differentiating types (that may or may not differ in severity) than personality disorder traits (Babcock, Jacobson, Gottman, & Yerington, 2000). Whether one gender is more likely to exhibit one pattern over another is unknown. Adult attachment theory is applied to suggest specific interventions that are likely to be effective. These strategies are not meant to substitute for interventions found useful with male perpetrators (Aldarondo, 2002), but rather are an added framework for approaching individuals who experience difficulties responding to interventions, perhaps because of their adult attachment orientations. In addition, this approach may assist female perpetrators, for whom effective interventions are unknown. Adult attachment anxiety suggests different motivations or intentions behind IPV behavior given the complexity of this issue it is probable that one intervention does not fit all. Understanding IPV from a broader perspective may help to improve current intervention programs in Namibia.

Therefore, from the current study findings, the development of interventions targeting all age groups and gender equally could enable the prevention of IPV.

4.5 Limitations

Despite the significant contributions this study makes to our understanding of dating violence perpetration and victimization, there are notable limitations that affect the interpretation and generalizability of the results. A limitation of the present study is the exclusion of ethnicity, culture, and rural versus urban background of the participants. For example, if culture plays a role in childrearing practices, some cultural practices could contribute to insecure attachment style unknowingly. Cultures that accept that

children are supposed to be raised by the extended family in order to keep family bonds tight may encourage children to be separated from biological parents without considering the advantages or disadvantages of this practice. These children may turn into adults who struggle with abandonment/rejection issues in adult life that could set them up for IPV. Future studies may examine whether the present findings can be generalizable to same sex, rural communities and across ethnic groups in Namibia.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

IPV is a global problem (Capaldi et al, 2012), it continues to occur in all settings across all socio-economic, religious and cultural groups and it remains an unfortunate reality for many couples and families. In sum, this is one of the few studies that attempt to explain the relationship between attachment style and IPV, and the first in Namibia. Therefore this study will be useful as a baseline and reference for future studies and program implementations involving IPV and attachment styles. There is a relationship between attachment styles and IPV among University of Namibia students. Specifically, there is a link between anxious attachment and IPV. Furthermore, being anxiously attached is a predictor of IPV and age and gender do not have an effect on IPV. There is bidirectional IPV as opposed to previously agreed unidirectional IPV which viewed men as perpetrators and females as victims.

Considering these findings, it is recommended that focus be put also on the intrinsic factors of IPV such as attachment styles by introducing intervention programs tailor made for the root cause of IPV at an individual level in addition to raising awareness. These programs should include psychoeducation, support groups, therapy and networks. For example:

- Nationwide individual attachment style assessment programs in schools which teach individuals of their attachment styles at an early age could aid in self-awareness and learning of better copying and expression mechanisms.

- Raising awareness of male victims of IPV in order to reduce the stigma around it.
- Psychoeducation for single men and women on topical issues such as self-esteem, how to handle rejection, abandonment issues & separation anxiety, and distrust in relationships amongst others. This could be achieved through radio programs specifically geared toward the reduction of IPV.
- On-going couple's therapy seminars which could help couples identify their attachment styles and learn the consequences associated with anxious and avoidant attachment styles.
- It is also recommended that the implementation of a national policy for adults who have been issued a restraining order or reported for IPV to be subjected to mandatory counselling sessions which will include the evaluation of an individual's attachment style and the regulation of emotional affect that could lead to IPV, development of intervention programs that could reduce IPV.
- Further research should be carried out at a national level focusing on attachment styles and IPV taking into consideration all the relevant variables such as education, age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation and rural versus urban areas.

REFERENCES

Adams-Curtis, L., & Forbes, G. (2004). College women's experiences of sexual coercion: A review of cultural, perpetrator, victim, and situational variables. *Trauma Violence Abuse, 5*(2), 91-122.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Marvin, R. S. (1995). On the shaping of attachment theory and research: An interview with Mary D. S. Ainsworth (Fall 1994). Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 60 (2/3), 3-21.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bell, S. M. (1970). Attachment, exploration, and separation: Illustrated by the behavior of one-year-olds in a strange situation. *Child Development, 41*, 49-67.

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.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ainsworth, M. D., & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist, 46*(4), 333-341.

Aldarondo, E. (2002). Evaluating the efficacy of interventions with men who batter. In E.Aldarondo and F. Mederos (Eds.), Programs for men who batter: Intervention and prevention strategies in a diverse society. Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.

Allison, C.J., Bartholomew, K., Mayseless. O., & Dutton D.G. (2008). Love as a Battlefield Attachment and Relationship Dynamics in Couples Identified for Male Partner Violence. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29 (1), 125-50.

Anders, S. L., & Tucker, J. S. (2000). Adult attachment style, interpersonal communication competence, and social support. *Personal Relationships, 7*, 379–389.

Anderson, K.L. (2005). Theorizing gender in intimate partner violence research. *Sex Roles*, 52, 853-865.

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 651-680.

Babcock, J.C., Jacobson, N.S., Gottman, J. M., & Yerington, T.P. (2000) Attachment, emotional regulation, and the function of marital violence: differences between secure, preoccupied and dismissing violent and nonviolent husbands. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15,391–409.

Bair-Merritt, M., Crowne, S., Thompson, D., Sibinga, E., Trent, M., & Campbell, J. (2010). Why do women use intimate partner violence? A systematic review of women's motivations. *Trauma Violence Abuse, 11(4)*, 178-189.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Banks, M. V., & Salmon, K. (2013). Reasoning about the self in positive and negative ways: Relationship to psychological functioning in young adulthood. *Memory*, 21: 85-120.

Bartholomew, K., & Allison, C. J. (2006). *An attachment perspective on abusive dynamics in intimate relationships*. In M. Mikulincer & G. S. Goodman (Eds.). Romantic love: Attachment, caregiving, and sex. (pp. 102-127). New York: Guilford Press.

Besharat, M. A. (2003). Relation of attachment style with marital conflict. *Psychological Reports*, 92, 1135-1140.

Black, M.C. (2011). Intimate partner violence and adverse health consequences: Implications for clinicians. *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine*, 5, 428-439.

Bonache, H., Gonzalez-Mendez, R., & Krahe, B. (2016). Adult attachment styles, destructive conflict resolution, and the experience of intimate partner violence. *International Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 1-23.

Bond, S. B., & Bond, M. (2014). Attachment styles and violence within couples. *Journal of Nervous & Mental Disease*, *192*, 857-863.

Bookwala, J., & Zdaniuk, B. (2010). Adult attachment styles and aggressive behavior within dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 75(2), 175-190.

Borjesson, W. I., Aarons, G. A. & Dunn, M. E. (2003). Development and confirmatory factor analysis of the Abuse within Intimate Relationships Scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 18(3), 295-309.

Bowlby, J., & Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist, 46*, 331–341.

Bowlby, J. (1958). The nature of the child`s tie to his mother. *International Journal of*

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss*: Vol.3. Loss. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1979). On knowing what you are not supposed to know and feeling what you are not supposed to feel. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 24*(5), 403-408.

Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and loss: Loss: Sadness and depression (Vol. 3). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Attachment (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Basic Books

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: parent-child attachment and health human development.* New York, New York: Basic Books Inc. Publishers.

Breiding, M., Basile, K., Smith, S., Black, M., & Mahendra, R. (2015). *Intimate Partner Violence Surveillance Uniform Definitions and Recommended Data Elements.* Version 2.0 Atlanta: National Centre for Injury Prevention and Control Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Bryant, S.A., & Gale, A. (2003). Spencer University Students' Attitudes About Attributing Blame in Domestic Violence. Journal of Family Violence, 18(6), 369–376.

Campbell, J.C., & Lewandowski, L. A. (1997). Mental and physical health effects of intimate partner violence on women and children. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 20*(2), 353-374.

Capaldi, D. M., Knoble, N. B., Shortt, J. W., & Kim, H. K. (2012). A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse, 3*(2), 231–280.

Capaldi, D.M., & Owen, L.D. (2001). Physical aggression in a community sample of at-risk young couples: Gender comparisons for high frequency, injury, and fear. Journal of Family Psychology, 15, 425–440.

Chan, K.L., Straus, M. A., Brownridge, D.A., Tiwari, A., & Leung, W.C. (2008). Prevalence of dating partner violence and suicidal ideation among male and female university students worldwide. *Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health*, *53*, 529-537.

Cohen, D. (2003). Male honor and female fidelity: Implicit cultural scripts that perpetuate domestic violence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84(5), 997-1010.

Coker, A. L., Smith, P. H., Bethea, L., King, M. R., & McKeown, R. E. (2000). Physical health consequences of physical and psychological intimate partner violence. *Archives of Family Medicine*, 9(5), 451–457.

Cooper, J.R.M., Walker, J., Askew, R., Robinson, J.C., & McNair, M. (2011). Students' perceptions of bullying behaviors by nursing faculty. Issues in Educational Research, 21(1), 1-21.

Creasey, G., & Hesson-McInnis, M. (2001). Affective responses, cognitive appraisals, and conflict tactics in late adolescent romantic relationships: Associations with attachment orientations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *48*, 85–96.

Creasey, G., Kershaw, K. & Boston, C. (1999). Conflict Management with Friends and Romantic Partners: The Role of Attachment and Negative Mood Regulation Expectancies. *A Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 28, 523.

Dardis, C. M., Dixon, K. J., Edwards, K. M., & Turchik, J. A. (2015). An examination of the factors related to dating violence perpetration among young men and women and associated theoretical explanations a review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, *16*, 136-152.

De Olivera Fonseca-Machando. M., Dos Santos Monteiro. J.C., Haas.V. J., de Vilhena Abrao. C.F., & Gomes- Sponholz. F. (2015). Intimate partner violence and anxiety disorders in pregnancy: the importance of vocational training of the nursing staff in facing them. *Rev. Latino-Am. Enfermagem*, *23*(5), 864-865.

Denscombe, M. (2010). *Grounded rules for social research: Guides for good practice.* New York: Macmillan.

Desmarais, S. L., Reeves, K. A., Nicholls, T. L., Telford, R. P., & Fiebert, M. S. (2012). Prevalence of physical violence in intimate relationships, part 1: Rates of male and female victimization. *Partner Abuse*, *3*, 140-169.

Dillion, G., Hussain, R., Loxton. D., & Rahman, S. (2013). Mental and physical health and intimate partner violence against women: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Family Medicine*, 1.15.

Djamba, Y. K., & Kimuna, S. R. (2008). Intimate partner violence among married women in Kenya. *Journal of Asian & African Studies*, *43(*4), 457-469.

Dobash, R.P., & Dobash, R.E. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Doumas, M.D., Pearson, C.L., Elgin, J.E., & McKinley, L.L. (2008). Adult attachment as a risk factor for intimate partner violence: The "mispairing" of partners' attachment styles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *23*, 616-634.

Dozier, M., Stovall, K. C., & Albus, K. (1999). Attachment and psychopathology in adulthood. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), Handbook of attachment theory and research (pp. 497-519). New York: Guilford.

Durose, M., Harlow, C., Langan, P., Motivans, M., Rantala, R., & Smith, E. (2005). Family violence statistics including statistics on strangers and acquaintances (NCJ 207846). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Dutton, D. G. (1994). Patriarchy and Wife Assault: The Ecological Fallacy Violence and Victims, 9(2), 67-82.

Dutton, D. G. (2007). Thinking outside the box: Gender and court mandated therapy. In J. Hamel, & T. L. Nicholls (Eds.), Family interventions in domestic violence.

Dutton, D. G. (2012). The case against the role of gender in intimate partner violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *17*(1), 99–104.

Dutton, D.G., & Browning, J.J. (1988). Concern for power, fear of intimacy and wife abuse. In: G.T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J.T. Kirkpatrick, & M. Straus (Eds.), *New Directions in Family Violence Research* (pp. 163-175). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Edwards-Jauch, L. (2016). Profile: Action research on gender-based violence at the University of Namibia: Results and methodological reflections. *Feminist Africa, 17*, 102-113.

Fairchild, A. J., & Finney, S. J. (2006). Investigating validity evidence for the experiences in close relationships-revised questionnaire. *Educational & Psychological Measures, 66(1),* 116-135.

Fass, D. F., Benson, R. I., & Leggett, D. G. (2008). Assessing prevalence and awareness of violent behaviors in the intimate partner relationships of college students using internet sampling. Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 22(4), 66–75.

Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 281-291.

Feeney, J. A., Noller, P., & Callan, V. J. (1994). Attachment style, communication and satisfaction in the Psychology, 51, 1173-1182. Early years of marriage. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds), *Advances in personal relationships: Vol. 5. Attachment processes in adulthood* (pp. 269-308). London: Jessica Kingsley.

Feeney, J.A. (2008). Adult romantic attachments: Developments in the study of couple relationships. In J. Cassidy and P. R. Shaver (Eds.) *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 456-481). New York: Guilford Press.

Finneran, C., & Stephenson, R. (2013). Intimate partner violence among men who have sex with men. A systematic review. *Trauma Violence Abuse*, *14*, 168-185.

Flanzer, J. (2005). The status of health services research on adjudicated drug-abusing juveniles: Selected findings and remaining questions. *Substance Use and Misuse*, *40*(7), 887–911.

Fossati, A., Feeney, J.A., & Carretta, I. (2005). Modeling the relationship between adult attachment patterns and borderline personality disorder: the role of impulsivity and aggressiveness. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *24*(4), 520-537.

Fournier B., Brassard A., Shaver P. (2011). Adult attachment and male aggression in couple relationships: The demand-withdrawal pattern and relationship satisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *26*, 1982-2003.

Fournier, B., Brassard, A., & Shaver, P. (2011). Adult attachment and male aggression in couple relationships: The demand-withdrawal pattern and relationship satisfaction as mediators. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26, 1982-2003.

Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item-response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *78*, 350-365.

Gaines, S. O., Work, C., Johnson, H., Youn, M. S. P., & Lai, K. (2000). Impact of attachment style and self-monitoring on individuals' responses to accommodative dilemmas across relationship types. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 17, 767–789.

Gallo, L. C., & Smith, T.W (2001) Attachment Style in Marriage: Adjustment and Responses to Interaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *18* (2), 263-289.

Gelles, R. J. (2000). Estimating the Incidence and Prevalence of Violence against Women. *Violence against Women, 6*(7), 784-804.

Godbout, N., Daspe, M.-È., Lussier, Y., Sabourin, S., Dutton, D., & Hébert, M. (2017). Early exposure to violence, relationship violence, and relationship satisfaction in adolescents and emerging adults: The role of romantic attachment. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 9*(2), 127-137.

Goode, W. J. (1971). Force and violence in the family. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *33*(4), 624–636.

Goodman, L. A., Smyth, K.F., Borges, A.M., & Singer, R. (2009). When crises collide: How intimate partner violence and poverty intersect to shape women's mental health and coping. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse, 10*, 306-329.

Gracia-Moreno, C., Jansen. H., Watts, C., Ellsberg, M., & Heise, L. (2005). *WHO Multi country study on women's health and domestic violence against women*. Geneva. World Health Organization.

Greenberg. J. (1999). If.... Journal of Supreme Court History, 24(2). 181-200.

Hamby, S. (2009). The gender debate on intimate partner violence: Solutions and dead ends. Psychological Trauma, 1, 24–34.

Hamel, J. (2007). Toward a gender-inclusive conception of intimate partner violence research and theory: Part I - Traditional perspectives. International Journal of Men's Health, 6(1). 36- 53.

Hartman, A. (2016, March 03). 50 000 gender crimes reported in three years. The Namibian. Retrieved from http://www.namibian.com.na.

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

Henderson, A. J. Z., Bartholomew, K., & Dutton, D. G. (2015). He Loves Me; He Loves Me Not: Attachment and Separation Resolution of Abused Women. *Journal of Family Violence, 72*(2), 169-191.

Henning, K., & Feder, L. (2004). A Comparison of Men and Women Arrested for Domestic Violence: Who Presents the Greater Threat? *Journal of Family Violence*.19 (2), 69-80.

Herrzog, S. (2007). An empirical test of feminist Theory and Research. The Effect of heterogeneous gender role attitudes on perceptions of intimate partner violence. *Feminist criminology*, *2*(3), 223-244.

Hines, D. A., & Malley-Morrison, K. (2001). Psychological effects of partner abuse against men: A neglected research area. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2, 75– 85.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Bates, L., Smutzler, N., and Sandin, E. (1997). "A Brief Review of the Research on Husband Violence: Part I: Maritally Violent Versus Nonviolent Men." *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 2(1), 65–99.

Karamagi, C., Tumwine, K., Tylleskar, T., & Heggenhougen, K. (2006). Intimate partner violence against women in eastern Uganda: Implications for HIV prevention. *BMC Public Health*, *6*, 284.

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

Kimmel, M. (2002, January 26). *Beyond the mythson domestic violence*. The Irish Times, p. 16-16.

Kuehnle, K., & Sullivan, A. (2003). Gay and lesbian victimization: Reporting factors in domestic violence and bias incidents. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *30*(1), 85-96.

Lamis, D.A., Leenaars, L., Jahn. D., & Lester, D. (2013). Intimate Partner Violence Are Perpetrators Also Victims and Are They More Likely to Experience Suicide Ideation? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28 (16), 3109-3128.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Turner, L. A. (2012). The efficacy of an intimate partner violence prevention program with high-risk adolescent girls: A preliminary test. *Prevention Science, 13*, 384–394.

LaViolette, A. D., & Barnett, O. W. (2000). *It could happen to anyone: Why battered women stay*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J.E. (2010). *Practical Research: Planning and Design 9th edition*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Levine, A., & Heller, R. (2010). *Attached: Identify your attachment style and find your perfect match*. London: Pan Macmillan.

Levinson, D. (1989). Frontiers of anthropology, Vol. 1. *Family violence in cross-cultural perspective*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Locke, L.M., & Richman, C.L. (1999). Attitudes Toward Domestic Violence: Race and Gender Issues. *Sex Roles*, 40(3/4), 227–247.

Lussier, Y., Brassard, A., Godbout, N., Sabourin, S., Wright, J., & Dutton, D. (2013). La violence conjugale: paramètres utiles pour l'évaluation et l'intervention. Cahier recherche et pratique : *Les nouvelles réalités du couple*, 3(2). 8–13.

Main, M., & Cassidy, J. (1988). Categories of response to reunion with the parent at age 6: predictable from infant attachment classifications and stable over a 1-month period. *Developmental Psychology, 24*(3), 415-426.

Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: a move to the level of representation. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50,* 66-106.

Malley-Morrison, K. & Hines, D.A. (2004). *Family Violence in a cultural perspective: Defining understanding and combating abuse*: Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

Mauricio, A. M., Tein, J. Y., & Lopez, F. G. (2007). Borderline and antisocial personality scores as mediators between attachment and intimate partner violence. *Violence and Victims, 22*,139-157.

Mayseless, O. (1991). Adult attachment patterns and courtship violence. Family Relations, 40, 21-28.

McClennen. J. (2005). Domestic Violence between Same-Gender Partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *20* (2), 149-154.

Mihalic, S. W., & Elliot, D. (1997). A social learning theory model of marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, *12*, 21-47.

Mikulincer, M., Gillath, O., & Shaver, P. R. (2002). Activation of the attachment system in adulthood: Threat-related primes increase the accessibility of mental representations of attachment figures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 881-895.

Mikulincer. M., & Shaver. P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: structure, dynamics, and change*. New York: Guilford.

Morrison, K.E., Luchok, K. J., Richter, D. L., & Parra-Medina D. (2006). Factors influencing help-seeking from informal networks among African American victims of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *21*(11):1493–1511.

Nicolaidis, C., & Paranjape, A. (2009). Defining intimate partner violence: Controversies and implications. In C. Mitchell & D. Anglin (Eds.), *Intimate partner violence: A health-based perspective* (pp. 19-30). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Nicolson, P. (2010). Domestic Violence and Psychology: A Critical Perspective. Routledge, London.

Nichols, B. (2006). Violence against Women: The Extent of the Problem. In "Intimate" violence against women: when spouse, partners, or lovers attack (pp 1-8). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger

O'Leary, K. D., Tintle, N., & Bromet, E. (2014). Risk factors for physical violence against partners in the U.S. *Psychology of Violence*, *1*, 65-77.

O'Connell Corcoran. K.. & Mallinckrodt. B.. (2000). Adult Attachment, Self-Efficacy, Perspective Taking, and Conflict Resolution. *Journal of Counselling & Development, 78(4)*, 473-483.

Ofei-Aboagye, E. (2004). Promoting Gender Sensitivity in Local Governance in Ghana. *Development in Practice*, 14 (6), 753-760.

Oka. M., Sandberg, J.G., Bradford, A.B., & Brown. A. (2014). Insecure Attachment Behavior and Partner Violence: Incorporating Couple Perceptions of Insecure Attachment and Relational Aggression. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 40(4), 412-429.

Orcultt, H. K., Garcia, M., & Pickett, S.M. (2005). Female-perpetrated intimate partner violence and romantic attachment style in a college student sample. *Violence and Victims, 20*(3), 287-302.

Pearson, C.L. (2006). Adult attachment as a risk factor for intimate partner violence. *McNair Scholars Research Journal, 2(1),* 8-10.

Peloquin, K., Lafontaine, M., & Brassard, A. (2011) A dyadic approach to the study of romantic attachment, dyadic empathy, and psychological partner aggression. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 28(7),* 915-942.

Peterman, L.M., & Dixon, C.G. (2003). Domestic violence between same-sex partners: Implications for counseling (practice and theory). *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 8, 40-48.

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

Plichta, S. B. (2004). Intimate partner violence and physical health consequences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19,* 1296-1323.

Psycho-Analysis, 39, 350-373.

Quigley, B. M., & Leonard, K. E. (2002). Alcohol and the continuation of early marital ggression. *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, 24(7), 1003–1010.

Renner, L.M., &Whitney, S.D. (2012) Risk factors for unidirectional and bidirectional intimate partner violence among young adults. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 36(1), 40--52.

Ristock, J. L. (2003). Exploring dynamics of abusive lesbian relationships: preliminary analysis of a multisite, qualitative study. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31, 329–341.

Rohner, R. P., & Britner, P. A. (2002). Worldwide mental health correlates of parental acceptance rejection: Review of cross-cultural and intracultural evidence. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 36, 16-47.

Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Miyake, K., & Morelli, G. (2000). Attachment and culture:

Security in the United States and Japan. *American Psychologist*, 55(10), 1093-1104

Sharpsteen, D. J., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1997). Romantic jealousy and adult romantic attachment. *Personality Processes and Individual Differences*, 72, 627–640.

Silverman, J. G., Raj, A., Mucci, L. A., & Hathaway, J. E. (2001). Dating violence against adolescent girls and associated substance use, unhealthy weight control, sexual risk behavior, pregnancy, and suicidality. *Journal of American Medical Association*, *286*, 572-579.

Social Impact and Policy Analysis Corporation (SIAPAC). (2008). *Knowledge, attitudes and practices study on factors that may perpetuate or protect Namibians from violence and discrimination*: Caprivi, Erongo, Karas, Kavango, Ohangwena, Omaheke and Otjozondjupa regions. Windhoek: Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare.

Sonmer, J., Babcock, J., & Sharp, C. (2017). A dyadic analysis of partner violence and adult attachment. *Journal of Family Violence*, 32(3), 279-290.

Spencer, K., Haffejee, M., Candy, G., & Kaseke, E. (2016). Intimate partner violence at a tertiary institution. *SAMJ: South African Medical Journal*, *106* (11), 1129-1133.

SPSS: IBM Corp. Released 2016. *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0.* Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Sroufe, L. A., & Waters, E. (1997). Attachment as an organizational construct. *Child Development*, *48*, 1184-1199.

Stephenson, R., Hast. M., Finneran, C., & Sineath, C.R. (2014). "Intimate partner, familial and community violence among men who have sex with men in Namibia." *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 16(5), 473-487.

Stover, C.S. (2013). Fathers for change: a new approach to working with father with histories of intimate partner violence and substance abuse. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, *41*(1), 1–9.

Stover, C.S. (2015). *Fathers for change for intimate partner violence and substance abuse: initial community pilot*. Family Process.

Straus, M. A. (2011). Gender symmetry and mutuality in perpetration of clinical-level partner violence: Empirical evidence and implications for prevention and treatment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16(4), 279-288.

Sugarman, D. B., & Hotaling, C. T. (1989). *Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers.* In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.), Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues. New York: Praeger.

Szumilas, M. (2010). Explaining odds ratio. *Journal Canadian Academy Child Adolescent Psychiatry*, 19, 227-229.

The Namibia Ministry of Health and Social Services (MoHSS) and ICF International. (2014). *The Namibia Demographic and Health Survey 2013*. Windhoek, Namibia, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: MoHSS and ICF International.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N., (2000). Prevalence and Consequences of Male-to-female and Female-to-male Intimate Partner Violence as Measured by the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Violence against Women*, *6*(2), 142-161.

Tully, C. T. (2001). Domestic violence: The ultimate betrayal of human rights. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, 13, 83–98.

University of Namibia Strategic & Physical Planning. (2016). *University of Namibia main campus undergraduate student population*. Unpublished raw data.

Van Rooy, G., & Mufune, P. (2013). Psycho-social characteristics of male perpetrators of intimate partner violence in Namibia. *Acta Criminological: Southern African Journal of Criminology, 26 (2),* 1-14.

Waltz, J., Babcock, J. C., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (2000). Testing a typology of batterers. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68, 658-669.

Yamane, Taro. (1967). Statistics: An Introductory Analysis, 2nd Edition, New York: Harper and Row.

Yarkovsky, N., & Fritz, P. A. (2014). Attachment style, early sexual intercourse, and dating aggression victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29, 279–2.

APPENDIX A

Ethical Clearance

UNAM
UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA

ETHICAL CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE

Ethical Clearance Reference Number: FHSS /209/2017 **Date: 26 May, 2017**

This Ethical Clearance Certificate is issued by the University of Namibia Research Ethics Committee (UREC) in accordance with the University of Namibia's Research Ethics Policy and Guidelines. Ethical approval is given in respect of undertakings contained in the Research Project outlined below. This Certificate is issued on the recommendations of the ethical evaluation done by the Faculty/Centre/Campus Research & Publications Committee sitting with the Postgraduate Studies Committee.

Title of Project: Exploration Of Attachment Styles As Predictors Of Intimate Partner Violence Among Students At The University Of Namibia Main Campus

Nature/Level of Project: Masters

Researcher: Natasja K. Magorokosho

Student Number: 200969056

Faculty: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Supervisor: Dr M. Mberira (Main) Dr K. Veii (Co)

Take note of the following:

(a) Any significant changes in the conditions or undertakings outlined in the approved Proposal must be communicated to the UREC. An application to make amendments may be necessary.

(b) Any breaches of ethical undertakings or practices that have an impact on ethical conduct of the research must be reported to the UREC.

(c) The Principal Researcher must report issues of ethical compliance to the UREC (through the Chairperson of the Faculty/Centre/Campus Research & Publications Committee) at the end of the Project or as may be requested by UREC.

(d) The UREC retains the right to:

(i) Withdraw or amend this Ethical Clearance if any unethical practices (as outlined in the Research Ethics Policy) have been detected or suspected,

(ii) Request for an ethical compliance report at any point during the course of the research.

UREC wishes you the best in your research.

Prof. P. Odonkor: UREC Chairperson

Ms. P. Claassen: UREC Secretary

APPENDIX B

Consent form & Questionnaires

INFORMED CONSENT COVER LETTER FOR

ANONYMOUS/CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRES

Date:

Dear Participant,

I am a graduate student under the direction of Dr. Mara Mberira in the Department of Psychology at the University of Namibia – Main Campus. I invite you to participate in a research study, entitled Examination of the relationship between attachment styles and intimate partner violence among students at the University of Namibia – Main Campus. The term "intimate partner violence" describes physical violence, sexual violence, stalking and psychological aggression (including coercive acts) by a current or former intimate partner (Breiding et al., 2015).

An intimate partner is a person with whom one has a close personal relationship that can be characterized by the following:

- Emotional connectedness
- Regular contact
- Ongoing physical contact and/or sexual behavior
- Identity as a couple
- Familiarity and knowledge about each other`s lives

The relationship need not involve all of these dimensions. Examples of intimate partners include current or former spouses, boyfriends or girlfriends, dating partners, or sexual partners. IPV can occur between heterosexual or same-sex couples and does not require sexual intimacy (Breiding et al., 2015).

This study has been approved by the University of Namibia PVC Research and Innovation department.

The purpose of this research is to explore the possible relationship between attachment styles and intimate partner violence and to determine the best predictor of intimate partner violence from the different styles of attachment. You must be above the age of 18 and you are or have been in a relationship regardless of intimate partner violence history (inclusive) to participate in this study.

BENEFITS: If you choose to participate in this study, results of this study will provide important information to professionals working in the area of intimate partner violence.

CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION: Your participation will involve completing two questionnaires and will take about 10 minutes. Your involvement in the study is voluntary. Furthermore, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

CONFIDENTIALITY: This questionnaire is anonymous. The results of this study might be published, but your name will not be linked to responses in publications that are released from this project. Therefore, there is no need for you to provide your student

number. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only. All information you provide will remain strictly confidential.

If you have understood the information discussed with you and you are agreeing to participate in the study may you provide your signature in spaces provided below.

I ..... agree to participate in this study.

Thanks for your consideration!

Sincerely,

Natasja Magorokosho, Bpsy.

Masters Candidate

Department of Psychology

University of Namibia

Socio-Demographic Questionnaire

In order to learn more about ways that different people resolve conflict, we need to know something about the individuals who complete our surveys. The information you provide will be used to gain more information about people in general and will not be used to identify you in any way. If you feel that any question might identify you specifically, please feel free to leave that question blank.

Please identify your gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

Which age category do you belong too? 18-25 ☐ 26-35 ☐

36-40 41-50+ ☐ ☐

Which year of Study are you in? 1st year ☐ 2nd year ☐

3rd year 4th year ☐ ☐

Which faculty do you belong where your major or field of study belongs to?

Economics and Management Sciences ☐

Education ☐

Health Sciences ☐

Military Science ☐

Science ☐

Law ☐

Humanities and Social Sciences ☐

PART B Abuse within Intimate Relationship Scale (AIRS)

Please check the appropriate box for how often you have engaged in these behaviors

	Never	Once	Twice or more
1. I have given my partner the silent treatment			
2. I have used an object to hit my partner			
3. I have pushed my partner			
4. I have shoved my partner			
5. I have had pushing matches with my partner			
6. I have forcefully pushed my partner			
7. I have squeezed my partner is a forceful way			
8. I have blamed my partner for things that were uncontrollable			
9. I have mocked my partner			
10. I have purposely insulted my partner			
11. I have criticized my partner			
12. I have ridiculed my partner			
13. I have kept secrets from my partner			
14. I have physically attacked my partner			
15. I have grabbed my partner's arm tightly			
16. I have betrayed my partner			
17. I have lied to my partner			

18. I have belittled my partner			
19. I have deceived my partner			
20. I have used profanity towards my partner			
21. I have screamed at my partner			
22. I have degraded my partner			
23. I have sneered at my partner			
24. I have ignored my partner			
25. I have grabbed my partner in a rough manner			
26. I have thrown objects while arguing with my partner			

PART C Experience in Close Relationship Structure (ECR-R) Questionnaire

Directions: Please read each statement and indicate how true each is for you, during the last six months, using the scale below. The statements below concern how you feel in romantic relationships. We are interested in how you generally experience romantic relationships, not just in what is happening in a current romantic relationship.

DISAGREE STRONGLY			NEUTRAL/ MIXED			AGREE STRONGLY
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please **circle** the appropriate number (only one) for each statement:

1. I'm afraid that I will lose my partner's love.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
2. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

4. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
5. I often wish that my friend's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
6. I worry a lot about my relationships.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
7. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
8. When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
9. I rarely worry about my partner leaving me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
10. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

11. I do not often worry about being abandoned.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
12. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
13. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
14. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
15. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
16. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
17. I worry that I won't measure up to other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry.								

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
19. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
20. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
22. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
23. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
24. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
25. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

26. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
27. It's not difficult for me to get close to my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
28. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
29. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
30. I tell my partner just about everything.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
31. I talk things over with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
32. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
33. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.								

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
34. I find it easy to depend on romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
35. It's easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
36. My partner really understands me and my needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	