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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore explanatory values provided by tenets of attachment theory for understanding roles that intra-and interpersonal dimensions of preservice teachers’ professional dispositions play in shaping conflict styles employed by individuals in managing student behaviors in socioculturally-diverse classrooms. Preservice teachers (N=73) enrolled in undergraduate education courses completed online surveys. Hierarchical regression analyzed the degrees to which school locations (rural, urban, suburban) and prior levels of exposures to sociocultural diversity (student populations, teachers, close circle of friends); attachment dimensions (anxiety, avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissive, fearful); and universality-diversity orientations (diversity of contact, relativistic appreciation, comfort with differences) account for variances in predicting conflict styles (integrating, compromising, obliging, dominating, and avoiding) that preservice teachers are likely to employ when responding to classroom conflict. Model 1 predictors were demographic descriptors (school locations and levels of diversity characterizing participants’ own PreK-12 education experiences); Model 2 included attachment dimensions and styles and universality-diversity orientation subscales. The degrees to which independent variables were found to account for variances in predicting conflict styles are (a) 33% for integrating styles: positive scores in anxiety attachment dimension ($\beta = .182, \rho = .015$) and relativistic concern ($\beta = .057, \rho = .003$)-negative scores for a dismissive attachment style ($\beta = .094, \rho = .010$), (b) compromising styles: no significant predictors in full regression model; negative associations between attendance in rural schools ($\beta = -.77, \rho = .015$) in Model 1, (c) 20.1 % for obliging styles: negative scores ($\beta = -.208, \rho = .032$) for diversity of student populations and positive scores ($\beta = 2.68, \rho = .055$), (d) 46.6% for dominating styles: negative scores for diversity of contact ($\beta = -.044, \rho = .023$) and
emotional comfort with differences ($\beta = -.054, \rho = .014$), and (e) 79% for avoiding styles: scores in dismissive attachment style ($\beta = .082, \rho = .000$).
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The stakes for novice teachers and teaching institutions responsible for preparing educators to meet the challenges they will face in new millennium schools continue to escalate. Unprecedented patterns in rates of demographic growth and distributions of race and ethnicity among the U.S. populace have led analysts to project that, by the year 2020, over one-third of students enrolled in U.S. public schools will be represented by youth of color who reside in high-poverty communities (Kirsch, 2007). Families who have recently immigrated to the United States currently represent half of the nation's annual population growth rate (Golnick & Chinn, 2002) and the highest rates in immigration since the turn of the last century (Banks, 2006). Eighty-percent of these newcomers are non-White and their offspring are expected to join youth from over 40 million non-English speaking families (Golnick & Chinn, 2002) to contribute to the growing sociocultural diversity among student populations in the classrooms of the nation's public schools (Darling-Hammond, 2006).

Declining rates in overall literacy and numeracy across student- and adult populations are expected to lead to heightened exposures to chronic family poverty, mobility, and unemployment (Carnigan, Sanders, & Pourdavood, 2005) that will place almost one-fourth of these youth at heightened risk for critical developmental delays and eventual academic failure (Shonkoff & Philips, 2000). These students are projected to come together in urban schools serving increasingly diverse student populations who have historically been- and continue to be-positioned at the lower end of the national gap in academic achievement (Frykholm, 1997). Currently, nearly half of African American youth and 40% of Latino students attend high schools in which graduation is not the norm compared to only 11% of their White peers (Balfanz & Legters, 2004). Overall drop-out rates among students who hold immigration status in U.S.
public schools are higher than the national average (Balfanz & Legters, 2001) and, while foreign-born youth represent only 11 percent of the entire student population—these youth represent 29 percent of the entire population of students who do not complete a public school education (Laird, Kienzl, DeBell, & Chapman, 2007).

By the year 2050, students of color and offspring of recent immigrants will represent a new majority among the U.S. citizenry. Growing diversity among student populations nationwide has intensified pressures upon teacher education programs to prepare new teachers who will succeed (Quinn, 2005) in eliminating gaps that have historically separated academic achievement by students’ race, ethnicity, language, socioeconomic status, and school characteristics (Talbert-Johnson, 2006). Heightened concerns exist surrounding today’s education institutions’ capacities to supply districts with teachers who are prepared to redress challenges that have persisted throughout much of U.S. history. In contemporary landscapes of public education, these tasks are expected to be further compounded by the uptake of unprecedented staffing demands. Over the next few decades, analysts project that over 2.2 million new teachers will be required to fill vacancies linked to rising enrollment (Gerald & Hussar, 1998), teacher attrition and migration (Ingersoll, 2001b), and, at increasing rates over the next decade—the mass retirement of over 700,000 seasoned teachers (National Governors Association, 2000). Demands posed by retirement alone are estimated to create needs to hire 2.9 and 5.1 million full-time teachers between 2008 and 2020 (Aaronson & Meckel, 2008).

The convergence of these events is projected to strain fiscal resources across all sectors of education, however, will be felt most severely in urban districts serving highly-diverse, low-income student populations (Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2004; Scafidi, Sjoquist, & Stinebrickner, 2002). In these schools, novice and experienced teachers are 50% more likely to
leave than educators who teach in more affluent and less-diverse suburban communities (Ingersoll, 2001). Attrition rates reveal that 20% of new teachers typically leave positions in the classroom at some time during their first three years and over 30% are likely to exit after five years (Cooper & Alverado, 2006). In fact the odds of novice teachers leaving the field who enter under the age of 30 are 171% higher than those over the age of 50 (Ingersoll (2001).

High rates of teacher turnover continue to have a negative impact on the quality of education in U.S. public schools (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005). Students who are taught in high-poverty schools by more novice, and less experienced teachers (Haberman, 2005) demonstrate consistently lower gains in academic achievement (Hanushek, Kain, O’Brien, & Lavin, 2004). Research has demonstrated that teachers continue to make annual gains in proficiency during their first seven years in the classroom- while the effectiveness of many teachers continues to improve after an average of 11 years of teaching (Carroll, Reichardt, & Guarino, 2000). For schools that are already taxed by few resources, significant effort is spent pouring money and professional support into the recruitment of new teachers who are unlikely to remain long enough for schools to realize their investment. Most important, the constant staff churn consigns a large share of children in high-turnover schools to a parade of relatively ineffective teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2000) characterized by Ingersoll (2012) as a constant replenishment of beginners.

Urgent concerns surrounding projected teacher shortages are commonly attributed to the convergence of rising enrollment (Gerald & Hussar, 1998) and retiring teachers (Ingersoll, 2001b, Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). Researchers (Ingersoll 2001a, 2001b) have suggested, however, that the number of teachers currently enrolled in teacher preparation programs should be, theoretically, sufficient for meeting current staffing demands (2001) In a review of patterns in
teacher longevity, Ingersoll’s study revealed that prevalent norms in teacher tenures have been steadily decreasing over the last 20 years due to factors that pre-date current concerns. In the 1987-88 school year, Ingersoll estimates that most educators had been teaching for at least 15 years- and there were 65, 000 first-year teachers. In 2007-08, Ingersoll found the majority of educators were those with- one year of experience, a number that had grown to 200,000. The stability once provided by the long tenures of veteran educators is rapidly being replaced by an increasingly unstable new generation of teachers who are more likely to leave- rather than remain in urban classrooms.

**Introduction Summary**

The at-risk status of the nation’s “new majority” among youth will emerge to represent the dominant norm in U.S. public schools by the year 2050 (Education Trust, 2004). Consensus surrounding the vital importance of developing education institutions’ capacities to train teachers who are prepared to enter and remain in urban classrooms (Jofitus & Maddox-Dolan, 2002) is increasing as the consequences of educational failure grow more severe (Education Trust, 2004). If these youth do not meet educational benchmarks—learning to read fluently, advancing to the next grade, or graduating from high school, they are likely to "pay a greater price for their failure than ever before" (Donaldson, 2009, p. 348).

School districts have looked to the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2008) for ensuring the presence of qualified teachers in the nation’s classrooms. Founded upon beliefs that “high quality education is a fundamental right of all children,” NCATE was granted responsibilities by the federal government in 1954 for developing rigorous performance-based programs and unit standards for educator preparation- and for evaluating institutions according to those standards” (2008, p. 6). NCATE has pledged to
use all available tools to justify confidence that (a) teacher education institutions are supplying school districts with well-prepared candidates, (b) candidates are demonstrating the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions needed to help all students learn, and (c) school districts and state authorities are ensuring that all students will be taught by “caring, qualified, and effective teacher[s]” before youth are "entrusted to their care." To those ends, the 2008 standards respond to researchers’ longstanding calls for defining the nature of educators’ professional dispositions and the roles they play in promoting learning for all students in today's pluralistic classrooms.

NCATE defines teacher dispositions as the "professional, attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities" (p. 88-89). NCATE specifically requires education institutions to train and assess candidates’ capacities to (a) operationalize the belief that all students can learn and (b) demonstrate fairness in educational settings by meeting the educational needs of all students in a caring, non-discriminatory, and equitable manner. In addition, NCATE standards require that professional education programs prepare candidates who, at a minimum, demonstrate evidence of capacities to (c) understand the impact of discrimination based on race, class, gender, disability/exceptionality, sexual orientation, and language on students and their learning, and (d) apply their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in a manner that facilitates student learning.

The 2008 Standards direct professional education units to move beyond global characterizations of professional dispositions only “positive behaviors [that] support student learning and development” to conceptual frameworks that will enable institutions to more accurately “identify, define, and operationalize”- and assess their variances “based on observable behaviors in educational settings” (p. 89-90). NCATE acknowledges that the field of teaching
and the states are now grappling with the determination of benchmark levels for assessing proficiencies as identified in the 2008 standards.

**Statement of the Problem**

In the 2008 *Call to Justice* issued by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teachers, NCATE acknowledge the realities of the nation’s historical struggles to provide “equal educational opportunity to all children” and the ongoing “existence of an unacceptable achievement gap based on race, ethnicity, disability/exceptionality and socioeconomic status.” NCATE recognizes that this gap is “exacerbated by some children being assigned well prepared teachers and other children being assigned unprepared and under-prepared teachers” (2008, p. 6-7). While NCATE has emphasized the critical importance of teachers’ professional disposition in defining the kinds of education quality that will reverse longstanding inequities in educational opportunities, provided to all youth, the Council fails to incorporate needs to conceptualize teachers’ professional dispositions in terms of their salience to phenomena associated with teacher turnover. Limiting conceptualizations of the severity of teacher turnover rates to novice teachers being unprepared or under-prepared fails to take into consideration outcomes underlying evidence suggesting that - even in the case of critical shortages, only 12% of future teachers report interest in applying to urban schools and only 18% of undergraduates would be willing to even consider teaching in urban public schools (Feistritzer, 1990, 1993).

**Developing Teachers’ Professional Dispositions for Expanding Education Quality**

While understanding of the nature of educators’ professional dispositions remains essential to current- and future outcomes in public education in a general sense, needs for understanding how to support the development of specific attributes of professional dispositions that are likely to contribute to novice teachers’ decisions to enter- and remain in urban schools
remain a more fundamental concern. If not address, the answer to this critical question will remain— who will be teaching the up and coming new majority of youth that are expected to be enrolled in the nation’s public schools by the year 2050?

**Contemporary Issues in Public Education: Addressing Teacher Turnover**

The following section will highlight answers to the following questions for the purposes of establishing foundations underlying this study’s rationale. Who are our nation’s teachers? What kinds of concerns— and emotional responses to those concerns characterize teachers’ daily experiences in urban schools? What reasons do they cite for leaving urban classrooms?

**Who are our nation’s teachers?** As the proportion of urban school populations in the United States continues to expand, preservice teachers will be increasingly called upon to address the longstanding achievement gaps that have historically differentiated urban schools serving youth of Color from White middle-class youth living in suburban areas. Projections for enrollment rates in teacher preparations programs suggest little or no change in existing trends meaning that increasingly diverse non-English-speaking youth living at- or near poverty levels will continue to be taught in large urban schools by White female educators from middle-class backgrounds who were, themselves, educated in suburban and/or rural school settings (Swartz, 2003; Howard, 1999). Only 15% of White educators, who represent 90% of all teachers (Sleeter & Grant, 1994), describe themselves as fluent in another language (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1996). This next generation of novice teachers will increasingly be called to teach youth of limited English-proficiency many of whom will arrive at school without basic food, shelter, and health care from racially and ethnically diverse urban communities (Tellez, Hlebowitsh, Cohen, & Norwood, 1995).
What kinds of concerns characterize teachers’ daily experiences in urban schools?

Analyses of the reports from 52% of teachers and administrators who perceived dramatic increases of violence in their rural schools determined that individuals' appraisals of declining levels of safety in their schools were actually tied to concerns about behaviors indicative of incivility (e.g., spreading rumors, pushing, shoving, and engaging in verbal intimidation, threats, and sexual harassment)—rather than high-risk behaviors such as carrying weapons, drug use, or gang-involvement (Peterson, Beekley, Speaker, & Pietrzak, 1996). At the same time, research suggests that heavy reliance on- or misuse of- security measures and zero tolerance policies (Hyman, 1997) employed by districts in attempts to prevent future lethal events—may actually serve in triggering the emotional backlash, perceptions of unfairness, and school disorder among youth (Mayer & Leone, 1999) that are tied to escalating risks for future violence in schools (Heaviside et al., 1998).

Chronic exposure to experiences associated with conflict, disruptive behavior, and victimization are associated with preoccupations with perceptions of fearfulness, vulnerability (Scheckner et al., 2002), overwhelming emotional arousal, and alienation among students and teachers within classrooms and the broader school community (Dwyer & Osher, 2000; Osher, Sandler, & Nelson, 2001). Maladaptive cycles associated with reductions in positive emotional status and increased efforts required for affect and behavior regulation tend to decrease individuals’ overall access to- and participation in- positive social engagement (Greenberg, et al, 2003) across all levels of schools’ social environments, thereby, further increasing the risks of exposures to subsequent violent incidents (Dwyer & Osher, 2000) not only for involved individuals but for bystanders within the school community (Henry, 2000).
What reasons do teachers cite for leaving urban classrooms? Teachers who began careers in urban schools and left within five years frequently cite concerns surrounding threats of violence as factors that contribute to perceptions of heightened personal stress, decreased productivity in the classroom, and diminished enjoyment of- and satisfaction with- their daily professional roles as educators in the classroom (Smith & Smith, 2006). Levels of teacher-reported distress linked to concerns surrounding their own exposures to interpersonal conflict, actual and/or implied threats of physical aggression, and/or potential violence are rising in all school setting (Walker & Gresham, 1997), but are perceived to be most problematic for educators teaching in inner-city schools within high-rate crime areas (Crouch & Williams, 1995).

Problems with conflict and disorderly behavior. Regardless of tenure, educators consistently report the management of classroom conflict and problems with discipline (Ingersoll, 2001) in the classroom as major concerns (Goyette, Dion, & Dion, 2000). Teacher/student conflict characterized by verbal abuse, widespread classroom disorder, and acts of disrespect directed towards teachers remained higher in large urban schools (Diamond, 1997). Over 1 in 3 teachers report they have seriously considered quitting the profession, or know a colleague who has left, because student discipline and behavior became intolerable (Public Agenda, 2004). Teacher-student conflict is cited as a primary reason for new teacher attrition after only several years of service in the profession (Diamond, 1991) and the most common source of high levels of burnout and stress among seasoned educators (Schottle & Peltnier, 1991).

Chronic exposures to elevated levels of classroom and school-wide conflict have been linked not only to high turnover among new teachers (Diamond, 1991) but to increased attitudinal negativity and decreased performance of veteran teachers who choose to remain in the
classroom after the onset of stress and burnout symptoms appear (Burke & Greenglass, 1996). Teachers’ self-reports include (a) feelings of powerlessness (LeCompte & Dworking, 1991), (b) perceived internal conflict with own previously held representations surrounding optimal approaches to classroom management, (c) physical and mental exhaustion (Troman & Woods, 2001), and loss of idealism, enthusiasm, sense of meaning (Matheny & Gfroerer, & Harris, 2000) and purpose (Pines, 2002). Teachers describe their inabilities to maintain order (McKinney et al., 2007) and frequent problems with managing conflict, and disorderly behavior Haberman, 2005; Haberman & Richard, 1990) in high-poverty inner-city public schools (Walker, 1997)- as their reasons for seeking transfers to school characterized by fewer problems with discipline- and distinctly lower levels of teacher turnover (Ingersoll, 2001).

**Challenges in navigating differences in sociocultural identity.** Novice teachers describe themselves as inadequately prepared to teach ethnically diverse student populations in urban districts (Gordon, 2000) and their teacher education programs as “detached from the realities of urban schools” (p. 79). Teachers cite (a) problems with addressing issues (e.g. communication, misunderstanding, mistrust) related to differences between their own sociocultural identities and background experiences- and those of students and families (Haberman & Richard, 1990) and report (b) viewing themselves as personal failures (Haberman, 2005), (c) perceiving that they are neither respected nor (d) appreciated by students and families (Haberman, 2005; McKinney et al., 2007) while struggling to manage (e) high levels of emotional distress; and (f) daily frustration and (g) disappointment associated with their own failures to (f) foster gains in academic achievement among students from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds in their classrooms (Johnson & Birkeland, 2003). Novice educators attribute low academic performance to the absence of student motivation (Ingersoll, 2001) for- and engagement in-
learning (McKinney et al., 2007), the detrimental effects of poverty, and a lack of school
readiness and parental involvement (Hanushek, Kain, et al., 2005). These, in addition to concerns
surrounding violence, conflict and discipline are the reasons most cited for teachers’ requests to
transfer out of urban schools to seek positions in high-performing predominantly White, middle-
class settings “similar to the ones they attended” (Talbert-Johnson, 2006 p. 151).
What knowledge can we apply to expanding conceptualizations of teachers’ professional
dispositions in order to address these concerns?

**Current Models for Conceptualizing Teachers’ Professional Dispositions**

Beliefs as psychological constructs have long been recognized for the influences they
exert on teacher quality. Pajares characterizes beliefs as “messy” constructs whose defining
characteristics frequently “travel in disguise- and often under alias” (1992, p. 2) with attributes of
other components embedded in knowledge contained within teachers’ professional dispositions.
Closely aligned with the practical knowledge that shapes teachers’ behaviors, qualities of
individuals’ "knowledge, beliefs, conceptions, and intuitions [remain] inextricably intertwined”
(Verloop et al., 2001, p. 446).

The importance of beliefs in influencing decision-making underlying behaviors displayed
by educators in the classroom has long been a focus of study for understanding determinants of
teacher quality (e.g., Borko & Putnam, 1996; Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Chant, Heafner, &
Bennett, 2004; Kagan, 1992; Richardson & Placier, 2001). Pajares argues that the structures
underlying teachers’ beliefs are by no means uniform or simple and range in form and foci from
beliefs about (a) pedagogical and professional knowledge and (b) students’ and teachers’ own
self-efficacy, self-esteem, motivation, and performance appraisals of self and other. According to
Pajares (1992), variances in components of teachers’ explicit and implicit beliefs range from
attitudes, values, and judgments; personal opinions, axioms, and theories; conceptual and ideological systems, and perceptions and guiding images- all of which are influenced by personal and practical knowledge derived from individuals’ own experiences.

**Acknowledging origins of professional disposition.** Research on preservice teachers indicates that the professional knowledge that candidates gain and take away from their education courses transfers in only limited ways to shape individuals’ dispositions (Ball, 2000; Forlin, Tait, Carroll, & Jobling, 1999; Mueller & O’Connor, 2007) and behaviors displayed in the classroom (Zeichner, 1993). Richards and Lockhart (1994) argues that considering (a) the sources of beliefs as socialization processes that build up gradually over time, (b) their objective and subjective nature, and (c) variances in the degrees of individuals’ conscious awareness of-and, therefore, access to their beliefs- all represent critical foundations for understanding teachers’ decision making and classroom actions.

**Exposures to teacher modeling: qualities of own schooling experiences.** According to Johnson (2005), preservice teachers’ beliefs are also derived from the nature of their own early educational experiences. Studies confirm that strong beliefs about learning and teaching are established through an “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975) well before individuals complete their degrees in education (Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Powell, 2002). Memories grounded in their own schooling experiences as well as in observing the actions of cooperating teachers pose challenges to preservice teachers emerging beliefs (Mueller & O’Connor, 2007) when these models are not ideal a (Barker & Burnett, 1994; Connor & Killmer, 1995). In 1975, Lortie argued that aspects of candidates’ predispositions that remain grounded in beliefs derived from these more informal kinds of experiential learning would be likely to remain more powerful predictors of their future performance in classrooms than coursework or formal instruction
associated with their field experiences. According to Ball and Cohen (1999), “Even when they aim high, preservice teacher education offers a weak antidote to the powerful socialization into teaching that occurs in teachers’ own prior experience as students” (p. 5).

**Products of early familial socialization: qualities of emotion-based experiences.** Studies suggest that what preservice teachers learn in teacher preparation programs and who they ultimately become as teachers- are influenced by the attitudes, values, and beliefs that stem from long-established moral codes that were shaped throughout candidates' early experiences with their own families (Bennings et al., 2008). Studies suggesting that the depth of deeply ingrained beliefs and frequently inflexible attitudes about teaching held by preservice teachers rise from these “pre-existing frames of reference” that "ultimately prevent preservice teachers from gaining new perspectives" (Mueller & Hindin, 2011; p. 19).

According to Nespor, knowledge may be readily confirmed- or disconfirmed by objective facts whose authenticity is widely shared. Beliefs, on the other hand, are derived from individuals’ cumulative subjective experiences whose internalized meanings are appraised to represent personal views of reality that remain, therefore, incontestable (1987). While knowledge is held explicitly in teachers’ conscious awareness, beliefs are frequently held implicitly and remain outside of individuals’ conscious awareness. Accordingly, individuals are likely to remain willing to revise and update their explicitly held knowledge bases when exposed to new and reliable sources of factual information. The accuracy of tacitly held beliefs is assumed so upon encountering new- and reliable information, even when evidence exists in direct opposition to individuals’ personal stances, their beliefs are likely to remain resistant to change.

Beliefs that are derived directly from individuals’ personal experiences and histories of the underlying socialization processes that shape their meanings- are accepted as representing
truth and remain, therefore, “imbued with emotive commitment” (Borg 2001, p.186) to maintain and defend them. The accumulated strength of these personal emotion-based experiences, according to Pajares (1992), hold the potential for exerting far more influence upon “determining how individuals organize and define problems” than knowledge. Regardless of the presence- or lack of individuals’ conscious awareness of their existence, these strongly held, emotionally grounded beliefs serve as “much stronger predictors of behavior” (p. 311).

**Problems with enactment: transferring course content to actual classroom behaviors.** The importance of teachers’ knowledge bases including beliefs, and content, pedagogical, and other forms of professional knowledge (Shulman, 2004; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001) have remained critical components for defining and assessing teacher effectiveness throughout the history of U.S. education. Educators in teacher education programs acknowledge, however, that such knowledge remains inert and useless (Schussler, Stooksberry, & Bercaw, and (2005) unless teacher are able to overcome what Kennedy (2006) has termed the “problem of enactment” (p. 70) by learning how to demonstrate their knowledge by transferring it successfully to actual interactions with youth in the classroom. (Bransford et al., 2005).

**Creative improvisation for responding to students as individuals.** At a minimum, NCATE standards require that professional education programs prepare candidates who demonstrate evidence of their capacities to apply their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in a manner that facilitates learning for youth- regardless of differences in sociocultural identities and life experiences. In the early 1900s, John Dewey emphasized that the core of educator effectiveness lies in the effects that teachers’ dispositions have not only on student achievement in a general sense, but upon the positive growth and development of particular individual students (Richardson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Effective teachers have been
characterized as “thoughtfully adaptive” (Duffy, 2002) or as possessing an “adaptive expertise” (Bransford et al., 2005) that contributes to capacities for “disciplined improvisation” (Sawyer, 2004). The “adaptive metacognition” (Lin, Schwartz, & Hatano, 2005) that contributes to these teachers’ abilities to enact “wise improvisation (Little et al., 2007) have been described as “entrepreneurial” because they view knowledge “as tools to be adapted, not as panaceas to be adopted” (Duffy, 1997, p. 363).

Ball and Cohen (1999) characterize the complexities of effective teaching in terms of skills for addressing “the particulars” that require educators to constantly assess how to incorporate knowledge of “particular students interacting with particular ideas in particular circumstances” (p. 10) into classroom strategies in “a creative, improvisational fashion” (Sawyer, 2004 p. 13). In short, successful teachers must recognize that virtually every situation is different, must see multiple perspectives and imagine multiple possibilities, and must apply professional knowledge differentially. Studies suggest, however, that teacher education goals for developing these entrepreneurial and creative characteristics in candidates have been difficult to achieve. Despite introducing similar knowledge in coursework and exposing all candidates to best-practices in field opportunities, candidates are observed to be putting their knowledge into action in sharply different ways. While several candidates demonstrate capacities to adapt knowledge in response to students and situations in ways consistent with intents and principles of effective teaching (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Bransford et al., 2005; Kennedy, 2006)- many others continue to apply knowledge in narrow, technical, or rigid ways (Pressley et al., 2006).

Self-understanding and teacher identity. Bullough (1997) argues that understanding teacher identity, defined “what beginning teachers believe about teaching and learning and self-as-teacher”, is “of vital concern to teacher education” as it serves as foundations for the meaning-
and decision-making that is likely to influence individuals’ approaches to academic instruction as well as teacher/student relationships, and classroom management. The reality that “behavior is a function of self-concept… makes self-concept an essential aspect of teaching and learning to teach” (Tusin, 1999, p. 27), so that “the more that teachers know about themselves (the private curriculum within) the more their personal decisions are apt to be about how to pave the way for better teaching” (Hamachek, 1999, p. 209).

Researcher calls for teacher educators to focus upon the exploration and development of the teaching self have been tempered by observations that even when candidates are presented with facts that clearly contradict beliefs embedded within their self-concepts that both remain extremely resistance to change (Swann, 1992). Bullough and Baughman (1997) note that studies examining the effects of teacher preparation programs suggest that inducing shifts in identity represent processes that are (a) complex and frequently (b) difficult and (c) painful, and that more often than not (d) fail to influence meaningful or lasting changes in how teachers’ view themselves. Despite the inherent challenges, however, calls for teacher educators to dedicate efforts towards developing candidates’ self-understanding are based on assumptions that enhancing individuals’ conscious awareness of the personal factors that influence their own behavioral choices in the classroom may foster tendencies to monitor not only their strength but their biases in order to focus more directly upon determining what actions may be in students’ best interest (Kelchtermans & Vandenberghe, 1994).

**Calls to Incorporate Teacher Resilience Models**

The 2008 NCATE standards feature the definition of the professional teacher disposition-long-called for- and awaited by researchers and education institutions. Like NCATE, a broad consensus exists among education researchers, private and public leadership, and the general
public that demographics of student populations, characteristics of school climates, and broader socioeconomic conditions embedded in urban communities have proven challenging for many- if not most educators in urban settings for decades. Less attention has been paid, however, to the presence of novice educators who succeed with a sense of personal enthusiasm and moral commitment in reaching and teaching all youth despite challenging circumstances (Brown, 2002; Haberman, 2005, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1999). Attention has been paid to elevated rates of teacher turnover tied to chronic problems with conflict and discipline in high-poverty urban schools serving diverse student populations (Kopetz et al., 2006), yet less note is made of the presence of exceptionally effective educators who, given similar conditions, succeed in fostering prosocial behaviors and cooperative attitudes among the youth in their classrooms (Knapp & Associates, 1995). What variances in teachers’ professional dispositions explain the phenomena of students who, despite differences in academic abilities, sociocultural backgrounds, or overall unwillingness to comply with schools’ behavioral norms move through the school day to display disruptive and disrespectful behavior in one classroom- only to display a highly engaged and cooperative demeanors in another class with a different teacher (Wentzel, 2003)? According to resilience researchers, it is time to listen to teachers’ voices and develop foundations for models of teacher preparation that directly target not only the problem areas where educators have struggled for decades (Kantor & Brenzel, 1992), but build upon what is known about their success.

**Theoretical Framework**

The purpose of this study was apply the tenets of attachment theory towards understanding constellations among professional dispositions’ constituent attitudes, values, beliefs, and verbal and nonverbal behaviors- as they are manifested by teachers who demonstrate
success in maintaining secure and orderly classrooms where youth of all sociocultural identities and backgrounds realize consistent gains in their academic achievement and social development.

**Attachment Theory**

Attachment perspectives provide a framework from which to “develop logical causal sequences and gain useful perspectives on developmental contexts” (p.418) for enriching understanding of their “context, coherence, and meaning” (Trusty, Mellin, & Herbert, 2008, p. 410). The tenets of attachment theory provide a template for exploring how variances in individuals’ own educational experiences, attachment styles, and universality/diversity orientations converge to predict conflict styles assumed to shape the approaches that preservice teachers are likely to employ when managing their classrooms’ interpersonal climates. Exploring ethological assumptions underlying attachment theory’s principles may "make use of processes that occur naturally in optimal development" (Fosha, 2001, p. 227) for providing a fundamental understanding of the complex mechanisms that contribute to variances in educators’ professional dispositions and reciprocal effects derived from the qualities teacher/student relationships.

According to attachment theory, mental representations of self and other are shaped from the convergence of influences that are grounded in early patterns of affect regulation established with caregivers (Fox & Calkins, 2003). As they mature, individuals are assumed to bring these patterns of cognitive, emotional, and motivational function into new social partnerships (e.g. siblings, peers, teachers) and contexts (family and schools). Outcomes associated with variances in relative need-fulfillment and/or deprivation associated with qualities of reciprocal responses from others in these exchanges will accumulate and exert continuing influences upon critical developmental trajectories. These individual differences in capacities and strategies for emotion regulation carry over into adulthood, where they influence coping styles, problem solving, social
support processes, relationship quality, and mental and physical health (Cooper, Shaver, & Collins, 1998; Fabes & Eisenberg, 1997; Repetti, Taylor, & Seeman, 2002) and qualities of individuals’ own future styles of caregiving.

Attachment research has demonstrated the salience of attachment theory’s explanatory values for predicting patterns of human responses to stimuli ranging from personal threats to physical and psychological security and proximity to caregivers who may vary in the range and depth of sensitivity, responsiveness, competence, and willingness they bring to investing in efforts for optimizing developmental outcomes for youth in their care. From this perspective, interactions between teachers and their students would be expected to unfold within the contexts of reciprocal exchanges of emotion-based communications that vary in degrees of their calibration to a set of shared goals. Optimal functioning of teacher/student relationships builds upon students’ biologically-driven expectations to look to their teachers for acceptance and affirmation of their unique identities- and for teachers to respond with warmth, skill, creativity, and commitment in tailoring classroom contexts for engaging with youth in ways that will both support- and challenge them in expanding the visions they hold for their futures. Attachment theory in the contexts of this study will be applied to examining patterns not only in the willingness that teachers bring to working with youth in a general sense, but how they respond in specific ways to particular youth.

Attachment theory assumes that the qualities of early interactions- and the relationships that are formed- between immature humans and the early caregivers upon whom youth must rely to provide the protection, care, and developmental support required for survival- contribute to the formation of stable templates for governing psychological, emotional, cognitive, and social functioning across the human life span. Argued to have been selected as evolutionary products of
natural selection, universal purposes, functions, and goals underlying attachment mechanisms are assumed, in this study, as likely to govern variances in nature and qualities of attitudes, values, beliefs, and verbal and nonverbal behaviors that preservice teachers are likely to daily interactions with youth in their classrooms.

Applying an attachment perspective for expanding conceptualization of the qualities that define the professional dispositions of effective teachers – and to understand what, when, and how they function to generate the exceptional success of some urban teachers opens opportunities for tapping resources embedded in the formation of attachment bonds and their potential benefits for students and teachers. The unique nature of emotional bonds biologically-engendered in response to interactional properties of daily exchanges and qualities of relationships that form between youth- and their teachers- may offer a template for understanding the strength of reciprocal effects responsible for triggering the strong emotional responses, both positive and negative, that are linked to class-wide (e.g. less time for teaching and learning) and individual outcomes for students (e.g. discipline consequences, diminished academic performance, and elevated risks of school drop-out) and teachers (e.g. stress, burnout, and elevated risks turnover).

Universality-Diversity Orientation

NCATE requires teacher education to support the development of all teacher candidates’ programs to support the development of professional disposition requirements to (a) “develop professional dispositions that respect and value differences” (p. 37), (b) “demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to work successfully with children of all races, ethnicities, and (c) “disabilities/exceptionalities, and socioeconomic groups” (p.6), (b) that respect and value differences and reflect multicultural (defined as “understanding of the social,
political, economic, academic, and historical constructs of ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area” (p. 87) and “global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and representations of students and families from diverse populations” (p. 37).

According to Gomez (1994), the implications for ensuring educational quality when increasingly homogeneous population of teachers are instructing an increasingly heterogeneous population of students far surpass the obvious differences in their numbers (Banks, 2006). Researchers suggest that problems in reversing achievement gaps and promoting academic success for all students do not reside, fundamentally, in the changing demographic profiles of youth (Hollins & Guzman, 2005), but with the levels of cultural dissonance, cultural discontinuity (Irvine, 2003), or ethnic mismatch (Kesner, 2000) that youth experience with their majority group teachers in the classroom. Gay (2000) describes the demographic divide that separates the sociocultural socialization patterns and life experiences of teachers and youth as “existentially different” from one another (p. 6).

At a time when student populations are growing more diverse, while teacher candidates are becoming more homogeneous (Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000) understanding the nature of phenomena related to the relationships that exist between knowledge and beliefs as they relate to sociocultural differences becomes more critical. According to Kagan (1992), much of what is considered professional knowledge may also be categorized as belief. The difference between attitudes, values, perceptions, theories, and images and knowledge (Fairbanks et al., 2010) reside in highly permeable lines that are drawn between the nature of authority (Pajares, 1992) vested in beliefs (e.g. based on personal experiences) versus knowledge (e.g. based on objective appraisals of fact- as agreed upon by particular social communities) and their corresponding assumptions of
fact (Richardson, 1996, 2003). The distinctions between facts and beliefs (e.g. personal values and knowledge) lose their clarity when considering that individual and collectives views of reality vary with differences in sociocultural contexts across particular communities (Pajares 1992). When viewed from perspectives of the shifting distributions of individual racial, ethnic, linguistic identity and socioeconomic status in the nation's rapidly changing collective identity, the current study suggests, it becomes increasingly important for educators to be aware of the actual source (e.g. family, cultural, gender, geographic, age, sexual orientation, or historical) from which assumptions underlying particular knowledge domains are rooted.

Lindsey and Lindsey conceptualize cultural proficiency (Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989; Nuri Robins, Lindsey, Lindsey, & Terrell, 2006) as “a lens for inclusion of all learners” (2007, p. 43). Culturally responsive classroom management is a frame of mind as much as a set of strategies or practices. Misunderstandings and misinterpretations that occur between teachers and youth who share little- or no of the same sociocultural backgrounds and experiences may accumulate to eventually be experienced by students as discriminatory and/or lacking in fairness. As the cultural gap continues to widen in numbers of individual youth- and breadth throughout the class as a whole, researchers suggest that the gaps and the misunderstandings that have historically accompanied them will only widen. Discrimination may occur when classroom management approaches applied to the behaviors of youth from racial and ethnic minority backgrounds fail to recognize (a) cultural influences underlying youths’ responses to classroom events or (b) when disciplinary strategies are experienced by non-mainstream students as devaluing, censuring, or punishing what are viewed as normative behaviors by youth within the contexts of their own sociocultural backgrounds, or that (c) trigger processes leading to alienation and marginalization of youth within classrooms’ social contexts.
Differences in communication styles, according to Gay, may affect the quality of relationships that form between teachers and students. Preservice teachers’ exposures to socioculturally-based norms of communication that differ from those acquired throughout individuals’ own socialization experiences—may offer some preparation for learning how to accurately interpret—as well as to not misinterpret the unique—and varying ways in which youth will express themselves in the classroom. Understanding youths’ home communication environments provides a basis for preservice teachers’ interpretations of call-response (Gay, 2000) behaviors, for example, the non-conscious dimensions of an oral discourse style that is grounded in highly verbal traditions that acknowledge speaking out while others are talking—as acknowledging agreement rather than interrupting. Rather than view these behaviors as signs of disrespect and reacting negatively to them, teachers can develop instructional activities for building upon these interactions to engage youth (Monroe & Obidah, 2004) rather than setting the stage (e.g. through teachers’ own nonverbal communication of annoyance and/or resentment) for conditions that are likely to place the teacher/student relationship under increasing strain. On the other hand, the lack of response from youth who are recent immigrants and second language learners may be trouble teachers who may not understand their students’ preferences to maintain a relatively passive stance during classroom conversations.

Culturally-responsive classroom management builds upon assumptions embedded in wider models of culturally responsive pedagogy and culturally relevant teaching practices that center around teachers’ capacities for perceiving, interpreting, understanding, accepting, and, then, acting appropriately upon views appraising the motives, intentions, and underlying emotional messages embedded in appraisals of (a) “the self” and (b) “the other” and factors salient to their relationships in the classroom context (Weinstein, Curran, Tomlinson-Clarke,
Challenges for teacher preparation programs remain in determining how to support teachers to: (a) "see" more clearly the imprints of culture in their own and their students' behaviors- or to understand that 'behavior is largely a matter of communication in culturally prescribed ways' (Bowers & Flinders, 1990, p. xi), (b) understand how their behaviors represent patterns embedded in their own socialization histories, (c) remain receptive to the "notion that they may misread some of the behaviors of their culturally different students and, as a result, mistreat or disempower them personally or pedagogically (Spindler & Spindler, 1994), (d) increase their capacities for discovering cracks in the "sense of certainty [they hold] about their own cultural claims and mechanisms" (Bowers & Flinders, 1990, p. 72), (e) acknowledge inconsistencies in cognitive openness to the idea of cultural diversity while simultaneously expressing a lack of confidence in their abilities- and preferences not to be placed in situations where they felt uncomfortable and inadequate (Hollins & Guzman, 2005, p. 483).

Miville-Guzman Universal-Diverse Orientation (M-GUDS-S; Miville et al., 1999) The short form, Miville-Guzman Universal-Diverse Orientation (MGUD-S; Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, & Gretchen, 2000) of the original Miville-Guzman Universal-Diverse Orientation (M-GUDS; Miville, Gelso, Pannu, Liu, Touradji, Holloway, & Fuertes et al., 1999) will be used to examine associations between preservice teachers’ attachment styles and three subscales assessing dimensions of individuals’ Universality-Diversity Orientations (Fuertes et al., 2000) including (a) cognitive: relativistic appreciation of oneself and others involves recognition and acceptance of the similarities and differences among people, (b) behavioral: diversity of contact involves both previous and future intended behaviors relevant to interpersonal contact with people of different demographic backgrounds; and (c) affective: comfort with differences involves the emotional bond one feels toward others.
Conflict Styles

Preservice teachers’ conflict styles were selected as a dependent study for the purpose of investigating classroom conflict as a contextual determinant for critical outcomes for teachers and students alike. Boyce et al. define a social context as “a set of interpersonal conditions, relevant to particular behavior[s] and/or concerns that are “external to, but shaped and interpreted by, the [involved] individual[s]. Consistent with Boyce et al.’s arguments about criterion for investigating the influences of a particular context upon specific outcomes, it is necessary for the contexts to be (a) mutually determining in nature, so that (d) meanings that a given context holds for any individual will determine its effects upon that individual, and that (e) variances in assigned meanings and their subsequent effects are (f) derived from the degrees to which individuals appraise contexts as likely to provide- or deny the fulfillment of fundamental needs, and, thereby, hold potentials to contribute to “psychological well-being and disorder”. So defined, social contextual factors help us to understand for whom, or under what conditions, a given outcome will hold” (p.143).

According to Boyce et al. (1998), the selection of a particular context for assessment in terms of its effects upon particular foci of interest should be determined in light of specific questions or outcomes (p. 143). Critical questions, for the purpose of this study, include: (a) how do variances in the manifestations of preservice teachers’ professional dispositions (e.g. attitudes, values, beliefs and verbal/nonverbal behaviors), as conceptualized by individuals’ attachment styles and universality/diversity orientations predict preferences for the conflict styles individuals are likely to employ when responding to classrooms conflict? (b) do correlations among hypothesized attachment styles and universality-diversity orientations predict conflict styles that function in ways to reflect- or fail to reflect alignment with functions,
goals, and/or purposes of optimal forms of exchanges that occur between caregivers and youth, as prescribed by attachment theory?

(c) if systematic patterns and predicted directions of correlations, will they be of sufficient significance to warrant future study for expanding a model for conceptualizing variances in teachers’ professional dispositions in terms of qualities of teacher sensitivity and responsiveness embedded in emotional exchanges, the effects of relational outcomes (e.g. levels of engagement, trust, commitment) tied to the formation, maintenance, and, when necessary, repair of teacher/student relationships, and mutual benefits (e.g. respect, enjoyment, satisfaction) that are derived from bonds shared between youth and their teachers?

Attachment theory provides over six decades of research demonstrating how individuals respond to relational and/or environmental stressors including specific classifications of coping mechanisms, patterns of communication, regulation of emotions, and appraisals of self and others in conflict situations. Research is needed to explore the relational aspects of teacher dispositions that have been linked by resiliency researchers to conflict and classroom management practices in which all students, regardless of risk-status, demonstrate consistent gains in replacing aggressive and conflictual behaviors with cooperative and prosocial behaviors in the classroom.

The instrument selected for this study, the Rahim Conflict Inventory Scale II *(ROCI-II)*, conceptualizes individual preferences for handling interpersonal conflict into five conflict styles. Rahim’s work builds upon foundations established in prior models to differentiate individuals’ approaches to handling conflict on two dimensions: relative concern held for self and for others.

* Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II, Form A: Used with permission from the © Center for Advanced Studies in Management. Further use or reproduction of the instrument without written permission is prohibited.
These dimensions have been supported across multiple studies for their explanatory values in identifying underlying motivational orientations governing the ways in which individuals engage with others during interpersonal conflict (Ruble & Thomas, 1976; Van de Vliert & Kabanoff, 1990). Variances in the degrees to which individuals focus on satisfying their own concerns (high/low) and/or focus on desires for satisfying the concerns of others (high/low) are assessed to create five subscales for handling interpersonal conflict (Rahim & Bonoma, 1979) include integrating, compromising, obliging, avoiding, and dominating.

The integrating conflict style reflects individuals’ preferences for addressing conflict in ways that express a collaborative and inclusive stance across dimensions of intent, motivation, form, and implementation. The integrating style is manifested manifestations of simultaneous (a) concern for both self and others (b) emphasize preferences for process-oriented interactions that (c) place value on ascertaining and exchanging accurate information, (c) exploring all parties concerns and perspectives for (d) gaining a full and common understanding of salient issues involved in conflict issue, (e) encouraging a focus on collaborative efforts for (f) integrating input from all parties in order to (g) arrive at a joint solution that is (h) appraised by all parties as being mutually acceptable. An integrating conflict style actively embraces the notion that the best possible solutions are generated from seeking, processing, and consolidating input from all parties versus relying upon the use of personal power, influence, and/or expertise to determine conflict outcomes with limited benefits to self and/or some of involved participants. Individuals who prefer integrating conflict styles are (a) open to engaging in encounters with others, (b) willing to openly discuss differences with others, and (c) do not seek to keep disagreements to themselves.
The compromising conflict style reflects individuals’ preferences to adopt a practical approach to resolving conflict in ways that maintain moderate concerns for self and other. Characterized as a ‘mixed motive’ approach, the strategies employed by a compromising conflict style remain oriented towards expedient resolutions that require individuals to adopt a give-and-take stance in which all parties must prepare themselves to “split the difference” in terms of their needs and concerns in order to arrive at a solution (Rahim & Shapiro, 2000, p. 12). Compromising approaches are more directive in nature than integrating styles and are less invested in exploring and gaining in-depth understanding of individuals’ perspectives of the issues involved in a conflict situation.

The obliging conflict style is characterized by individuals’ low concern for self and high concern for other parties involved in conflict. Strategies adopted in obliging styles’ approaches to conflict tend to invest efforts in emphasizing commonalities, playing down differences, and demonstrating willingness to “accommodate and allow concessions [to] satisfy [others’] expectations” (Rahim & Shapiro, 2000, p. 10). Individuals’ openness to neglecting their own concerns is often accompanied by an “element of self-sacrifice in this style… that take[s] the form of selfless generosity, charity, or obedience” to others’ wishes (Rahim & Shapiro, 2000, p. 10).

The avoiding conflict style is characterized by low concern for self- as well as other parties involved in a conflict situation. Often accompanied by others’ appraisals of individuals’ lack of concern for other parties, individuals who adopt an avoiding stance will display behaviors interpreted as withdrawing, passing-the-buck, sidestepping, or see[ing] no evil, hear[ing] no evil, or speak[ing] no evil when encountering conflict situations. Individuals’ choices to postpone
engagement in or withdraw from a threatening issue are preferable even when doing so exposes individuals to potential losses or even considerable risks.

The dominating conflict style is characterized by individuals’ high concerns for self- and low concerns for others’ concerns, beliefs, desires, needs, or personal position in circumstances surrounding a conflict situation. Conceptualized as representing a win–lose orientation, individuals endorsing a dominating conflict style are committed to applying their power, authority, or influence for forcing their position in order to acquire outcomes consistent with their own desires without acknowledging others’ expectations or needs. When doing so may further their own agenda, individuals endorsing dominating conflict styles may defer to others’ requests (Rahim & Shapiro, 2000).

**Study Rationale**

A theoretical framework for meeting NCATE requirements for conceptualizing attributes of professional teacher dispositions held by effective urban educators, the current study proposes, would directly address issues underlying the longstanding patterns of chronic turnover in urban classrooms acknowledge roles played by associations among variances in (a) dimensions of the intra- and interpersonal functioning that teachers bring to interactions- and relationships formed-with individual youth, (b) orientations towards navigating the relative sociocultural differences and/or similarities of their own sociocultural identities and those held by students, and (c) approaches to conflict management strategies that extend beyond foci on behavioral and discipline issues to fostering classroom communities for fostering youths’ broader emotional and social development and capacities to participate as members of a responsible citizenry in an increasingly globalized world.
Chapter one highlighted several of the core constructs that have been identified by researchers in conceptualizing not only the nature of teachers/professional dispositions, but the difficulties that teacher training programs have encountered in preparing candidates to address many of public educations’ longstanding problems in the midst of unprecedented expansions in diversity among the sociocultural identities that are held by the nation’s youth. A brief summary suggests that teachers’ behaviors in the classroom are more likely to be predicted by deeply held emotion-based beliefs grounded in individuals’ personal experiences that have been shaped by historical patterns of socialization processes emerging from individuals’ familial and schooling backgrounds throughout their childhood. These filtering effects of these pre-existing frames of references shape perceptions and behaviors while simultaneously governing how individuals “screen, redefine, distort, or reshape subsequent thinking and information processing” Pajares (1992, p. 324). Contemporary researchers argue that while professional dispositions may represent points of inception for educators’ behaviors and thought (Schussler, 2006) that they do not represent behaviors themselves. As such, the nature of educators’ professional dispositions are more likely to be shaped by the accumulation of emotion-based experiences that are acquired throughout individuals’ lives – and are consolidated to function as a highly-personalized pedagogy to govern preservice teachers’ perceptions, appraisals, and behaviors in the classroom (Kagan (1992).

Attachment perspectives, the current study suggests, will shift paradigms for conceptualizing, defining, training, and assessing teachers’ professional dispositions, as defined by NCATE, as the (a) attitudes, (b) values, and (c) beliefs; (d) verbal and (e) nonverbal behaviors manifested within the (f) daily interactions that occur between teachers and their students- towards understanding the specific nature of the qualities of teacher/student relationships and
emotional bonds that contribute to teachers’ capacities for working effectively with all youth in secure and orderly classroom communities- where novice teachers choose to enter- and remain.

Over-arching constructs in attachment theory, the safe haven and secure base, support a global conceptualization of the organization and functioning of attachment theory’s systems and their underlying mechanisms. Attachment theory’s ethological perspectives emphasize universal human drives to seek others in relationships for enhancing evolutionary-rooted drives for ‘survival’ (i.e. to respond to stressors emerging from physical and social contexts), maintain optimal levels of physical, psychological, and social security, and to fulfill basic needs (i.e. sense of belonging, competency, and autonomy) associated with positive adaptation to demands posed by proximal settings, such as contemporary school environments. The hierarchical configuration of attachment theory’s primary (i.e. proximity-maintenance) and secondary-tier (i.e. exploratory, affiliative, and caregiving) systems provide a means for integrating the findings of extant research into a comprehensive framework for understanding core mechanisms that organize interpersonal functioning within teacher/student relationships, academic and social learning and variance in individual responses to sociocultural differences and/or similarities and the management of conflict in the classroom.

The central foci for developing qualities of interpersonal functioning among preservice teachers, based upon principles in attachment theory, would be directed towards the degrees to which teacher’ professional dispositions served in fostering the activation of protective factors surrounding youths’: (a) perceptions of physical, psychological, and social security, (b) fulfillment of universal needs for perceived acceptance, belonging, competence, and autonomy, (c) competencies (e.g. positive exploration, risk-taking, and engagement in learning processes) linked to autonomous functioning in the physical environment, and (d) competencies for
responding adaptively (e.g. regulation of affect and behavior and capacities for communication, problem-solving and conflict resolution) to relational- and/or environmental-based stressors posing behaviors to levels of perceived security and/or positive need-fulfillment. An attachment paradigm for conceptualizing dimensions of teachers’ professional dispositions that have been linked to positive developmental outcomes and fulfillment of attachment drives (above) would consider variance in caregiver qualities including:

(a) degrees of teacher availability, sensitivity and responsiveness in perceiving, interpreting, and responding to youths’ signals of need and/or distress,

(b) mental representations (i.e. attitudes, beliefs, and expectations) of self, youth, and the nature of teacher/student relationships,

(c) orientations (i.e. awareness, acknowledgment, appraisal, and expression) towards relational affect (i.e. nature, quality, intensity, and regulation styles) embedded in learning and social interactions in the classroom,

(d) qualities of affective bonds (i.e. levels of trust, commitment, and orientations towards relational repair) characterizing teacher/student relationships,

(e) levels of distortion and/or accuracy of perceptions in appraisals of self and youth self-monitoring and –management of teachers’ own interpersonal patterns (i.e. affect, cognition, behavioral, and relational) characterizing responsiveness to youth,

(f) patterns of communication (i.e. openness, flexibility, and reciprocity), and

(g) quality of coping mechanisms and approaches to conflict resolution in the classroom.

The primary attachment system (i.e. proximity-maintenance) is designed to meet evolutionary goals to (a) promote survival (i.e. threats to physical, psychological, and social security) and emerging capacities that allow individuals to (b) attain positive adaptation (e.g.
respond adaptively to stressors) and (c) fulfillment of basic needs (e.g. overcome barriers) encountered in their physical and social worlds- as well as psychological goals to (d) reduce fear, anxiety, and related forms of distress that, while activated, compromise individuals’ capacities to fully attend to critical goals encompassed in domains of secondary exploratory, affiliative, and caregiving systems, as described in b and c above (Bowlby 1969). According to Bowlby (1969), initial feelings of attachment security generated when those who are positioned as potential attachment figures in individuals’ lives respond to their distress in ways that serve as a safe haven for the reliable provision of protection, care, and regulatory support of strong emotions- contribute to the formation of attachment bonds. Experiences with caregivers who respond sensitively to individuals’ needs are associated not only with reductions in fear, anxiety, or distress, but the attainment of felt security (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). When drives to attend to security threats are no longer active, individuals experience a sense of confidence that allows them to fully engage in exploring their physical (exploratory system) and social (i.e. affiliative system) worlds- and/or, for adults, to focus upon their roles as caregivers (i.e. caregiving system) by serving as a safe haven (e.g. provide protection and regulation of distress) and/or secure base (e.g. provide developmental support for building youths’ progressive capacities to ensure basic need-fulfillment).

When the attainment of felt security is continually denied, however, by the absence or insufficiency of attachment figures’ sensitivity and/or responsiveness to reacting to signals of need and/or distress, individuals’ attachment systems will remain partially, fully, or chronically activated (Simpson & Rholes, 2012), thereby, diverting the qualities of psychological (e.g. emotional, cognitive, motivational, and attentional) and physical (e.g. energy) resources that are available for individuals to devote to activities within the attachment systems’ other domains
(e.g. exploratory, affiliative, and caregiving systems. Over time, the relative success- or failure of individuals’ bids seeking proximity to caregivers to achieve (Simpson & Rholes, 2012), sustain, and/or restore perceptions of felt security accumulate to form stable mental representations or working models that serve as core mechanisms in governing emotional cognitive, social, and behavioral components of and outcomes associated with activation of attachment behavioral systems Bowlby (1969, 1973).

According to Bowlby (1973), working models are comprised of models of (a) significant others (i.e., attachment figures) including cumulative histories of the qualities of early caregivers’ sensitivity and responsiveness to individuals’ bids for proximity experiences and (b) self including information about one’s own abilities to achieve sufficient proximity/comfort with others and one’s own value as a relationship partner (Simpson & Rholes, 2012). Both of these components in combination with the ways in which individuals experience relationships with significant others (e.g., parents, close friends, romantic partners) shape the expectations, attitudes, and beliefs that individuals hold for future partners and relationships and their own roles as caregivers, themselves (Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980). Working models include cognitive structures that reflect an individual’s cumulative perceptions of experiences with past attachment figures (Collins, Guichard, Ford, & Feeney, 2004) containing episodic, semantic, and affective information (Simpson & Rholes, 2012) governed by psychobiological substrates (e.g. density of neural connections) associated with other relationship schema (Baldwin, 1992; Collins & Read, 1994) that determine accessibility (Collins et al., 2004) to relationship-relevant information and how those events are selectively attended to, filtered, stored, interpreted, and acted upon in stressful as well as non-stressful interpersonal contexts (Feeney, 2008; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).
Research has repeatedly confirmed that two relatively uncorrelated dimensions underlie individual differences in adult romantic attachment (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Simpson, Rholes, & Phillips, 1996). The first dimension, called anxiety, assesses the degree to which individuals worry about being underappreciated and possibly abandoned significant relationship partners. Individuals who score higher on anxiety claim to be highly invested in their relationships (e.g., sometimes to the point of enmeshment) and describe continual learning to become closer to their partners and feel more secure in their relationships. Anxiously-attached individuals are more likely to endorse items such as ‘Others often are reluctant to get as close as I would like,’ ‘I often worry that my partner(s) don’t really love me,’ and ‘I often want to merge completely with others, and this desire sometimes scares them away.’

The second dimension, called avoidance, reflects the degree to which individuals feel comfortable with closeness and emotional intimacy in relationships. Individuals who score higher on avoidance claim to be less invested in their relationships and they strive to remain psychologically and emotionally independent of their partners. Avoidant individuals are more likely to agree with self-report items such as ‘I’m not very comfortable having to depend on other people,’ ‘I don’t like people getting too close to me,’ and ‘I find it difficult to trust others completely.’ Although avoidance and anxiety are continuously distributed measures, attachment researchers often use the terms avoidant and anxious to refer to people who score higher on these measures compared to those who score lower.

Prototypically secure people score lower on the anxiety and avoidance dimensions. Secure individuals are comfortable depending on their partners and having their partners depend on them in return. They enjoy closeness and emotional intimacy in relationships, and they do not
worry about their partners withdrawing from or leaving them. Secure people are more likely to agree with items such as ‘I find it relatively easy to get close to others,’ ‘I’m comfortable having others depend on me,’ and ‘I’m confident others would never hurt me by suddenly ending our relationship.’ Security, as defined by lower scores on avoidance and/or anxiety, serve as the attachment researchers’ foci for making inferences about attachment security and how it impacts interpersonal functioning in different contexts.

Nearly 25 years of research has identified several foundational correlates of these adult attachment orientations. Securely attached adults, for example, tend to hold more positive views of themselves and close others (Bartholomew, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and maintain corresponding optimistic and benevolent views of their relationships and interactions with others with others (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Securely-attached individuals’ confidence in attachment figures’ attentiveness, sensitivity, and responsiveness to and consistent availability for responding to their requests for support or bids for engagement lead to orientations that enable them to respond directly to others to seek help and support when needed. The endorsement of efficient problem-focused” coping strategies (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) lead to prompt and complete deactivation of secure individuals’ attachment systems allowing them to restore equilibrium and resume other important life tasks requiring the dedication of comparatively less time, energy, and effort to addressing attachment-related issues than less securely-attached individuals (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003). All of these characteristics combined with securely-attached individuals’ overarching goals to build- and enjoy the greater closeness and intimacy acquired with attachment figures (Mikulincer, 1998) contribute to relatively happier, better functioning, and more stable relationships with others (Feeney, 2008).
Anxiously attached adults harbor negative self-views and guarded but somewhat hopeful views of their relationship partners (Bartholomew, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). These ambivalent perceptions lead anxious individuals to question their own worth as interactional partners, focus on how they have been treated in past relationships, worry about losing their current partner, and remain vigilant to signs of interactional partners’ waning interest, pulling away, or commitment (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994). Unmet needs underlying anxiously-attached individuals’ central goal to enhance deficiencies in felt security (Mikulincer, 1998) are often accompanied by behaviors that lead to partners’ perceptions of being smothered or scared away. Anxious individuals’ chronic uncertainty about whether they can truly rely upon others to be available and supportive when needed are supported by working models that often amplify distress and thereby contribute to furthering diminishment of security. At the same time, however, individuals’ continue to desire closeness (Bowlby, 1980; Cassidy & Kobak, 1988; Crittenden & Ainsworth, 1989) and actively strive to maintain autonomy, control, and emotional distance in their relationships (Fraley & Shaver, 1999; Mikulincer, 1998; Shaver & Hazan, 1993). Nevertheless, they experience distress when their partners are not available or are unsupportive, particularly in stressful situations (Feeney & Kirkpatrick, 1996; Mikulincer, Florian, & Tolmacz, 1990; Wei, Vogel, Ku, & Zakalik, 2005). Avoidant individuals also experience elevated negative emotions during partner separations (Feeney & Kirkpatrick, 1996; Mikulincer, Florian, & Weller, 1993), make more negative attributions for partners’ ambiguous-as well as positive behaviors (Collins et al., 2006) engage in more defensive behaviors (Pistole, 1989), and are less likely to use constructive conflict resolution tactics (Carnelley, Pietromonaco, & Jaffe, 1996; Simpson et al., 1996).
Attachment researchers also recognize four prototypes derived from the underlying dimensions of attachment avoidance and anxiety. Much like children's working models direct their attachment behavior in parent-child interactions, working models in adulthood should shape the way that adults express and regulate their attachment needs. Although the need for felt security is believed to be universal, people differ systematically in the way they cope with distress and regulate feelings of security (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). These differences in attachment style are thought to reflect underlying differences in internal working models of oneself (as worthy or unworthy of love and support) and others (as responsive or unresponsive), which are thought to develop, at least in part, from interactions with important attachment figures (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1973; Bretherton, 1987; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985).

These expectations are parts of relatively stable working models: mental representations of self and others in the context of close relationships. Consistent with the major tenets of attachment theory, adult attachment researchers have argued that these different styles of attachment can be understood in terms of rules that guide individuals' responses to emotionally distressing situations (Fraley & Shaver 2000), which have evolved, at least in part, in the context of parental responsiveness to signals of distress. In fact, Kobak and Sceery (1988) suggested that the different attachment styles can be understood in terms of rules that guide responses to emotionally distressing situations (Bartholomew, Cobb, & Poole, 1997) and conceptualized within four distinct attachment styles: secure, preoccupied, dismissing avoidant, and fearful avoidant.

Individuals who are securely attached score low in both attachment related anxiety and avoidance and are governed by rules that allow acknowledgment of distress and turning to others
for support. (Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Mikulincer, Florian, & Weller, 1993). Secure individuals are (a) confident that they are loved and valued by others, (b) comfortable with intimacy, and (c) willing to rely on others for support. Preoccupied (anxious-ambivalent) adults are high in anxiety and low in avoidance and their behaviors are organized around assumptions that others are unreliable and unlikely to remain consistently available for responding to their needs. Individuals who score high on anxiety maintain ongoing and exaggerated desires for closeness and dependence coupled with heightened concern about imminent rejection by others. Individuals classified as preoccupied maintain consistent hypervigilance by continually monitoring their social relationships for signs of potential rejection, thereby, inhibiting the energy and attention that have to devote towards self-confidence, autonomy, and meeting others’ needs (Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Mikulincer, Florian, & Weller, 1993; Ognibene & Collins, 1998).

Dismissing avoidant adults are low in attachment-related anxiety but high in avoidance. Derived from experiences with caregivers who remained nonresponsive to their needs, individuals classified as dismissing avoidant (a) value independence and self-reliance, (b) view attachment relationships as unimportant in their lives, and (c) prefer to distance themselves from close experiences with others. Avoidantly-attached individuals’ lives are governed by rules that restrict acknowledgment of (a) emotions and emotional experiences, (b) relationships as viable sources of protection, comfort, and enjoyment, and (c) benefits derived from seeking- and/or providing- comfort and support from and/or to others (Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Mikulincer, Florian, & Weller, 1993; Ognibene & Collins, 1998).

Finally, fearful avoidant individuals score high on both attachment anxiety and avoidance. Individuals who are classified as fearfully avoidant both desire the approval of- and
close relationships with others at the same time that they avoid intimacy due to their fears of being rejected. Close relationships of individuals who are fearfully avoidant are governed by intense desires for closeness and ambivalence surrounding their fears of becoming involved and therefore vulnerable to risks of being abandoned or rejected by others.

Research Questions

The research questions posed for this study are as follows:

Research Question 1 (Integrating Conflict Styles)

I. To what extent do variances in

A. demographic variables

   1. racial/ethnic identification and the
   2. relative diversity (very diverse, moderately diverse, little or no diversity) of (a) student populations, (b) teachers, and (c) close circle of friends; and
   3. geographic settings (urban, suburban, rural) of individuals’ own schooling experiences, and

B. attachment dimension (anxiety and avoidance),

C. attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissive), and

D. universal-diverse orientations (diversity of contact, comfort with differences, and relativistic appreciation)-

E. predict preservice teachers’ integrating conflict styles (concern: self/high, others/high)?

Research Question 2 (Compromising Conflict Styles)

II. To what extent do variances in

A. demographic variables
1. racial/ethnic identification and the
2. relative diversity (very diverse, moderately diverse, little or no diversity) of (a) student populations, (b) teachers, and (c) close circle of friends; and
3. geographic settings (urban, suburban, rural) of individuals’ own schooling experiences, and

B. attachment dimension (anxiety and avoidance),

C. attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissive), and

D. universal-diverse orientations (diversity of contact, comfort with differences, and relativistic appreciation)-

E. predict preservice teachers’ compromising conflict styles (concern: self/moderate, others/moderate)?

Research Question 3 (Obliging Conflict Styles)

III. To what extent do variances in

A. demographic variables
   1. racial/ethnic identification and the
   2. relative diversity (very diverse, moderately diverse, little or no diversity) of (a) student populations, (b) teachers, and (c) close circle of friends; and
   3. geographic settings (urban, suburban, rural) of individuals’ own schooling experiences, and

B. attachment dimension (anxiety and avoidance),

C. attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissive), and

D. universal-diverse orientations (diversity of contact, comfort with differences, and relativistic appreciation)-
E. predict preservice teachers’ obliging conflict styles (concern: self/low, others/high)?

Research Question 4 (Avoiding Conflict Styles)

I. To what extent do variances in

A. demographic variables
   1. racial/ethnic identification and the
   2. relative diversity (very diverse, moderately diverse, little or no diversity) of (a) student populations, (b) teachers, and (c) close circle of friends; and
   3. geographic settings (urban, suburban, rural) of individuals’ own schooling experiences, and

B. attachment dimension (anxiety and avoidance),

C. attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissive), and

D. universal-diverse orientations (diversity of contact, comfort with differences, and relativistic appreciation)-

E. predict preservice teachers’ avoiding styles (concern: self/low, others/low)?

Research Question 5 (Dominating Conflict Styles)

I. To what extent do variances in

A. demographic variables
   1. racial/ethnic identification and the
   2. relative diversity (very diverse, moderately diverse, little or no diversity) of (a) student populations, (b) teachers, and (c) close circle of friends; and
   3. geographic settings (urban, suburban, rural) of individuals’ own schooling experiences, and

B. attachment dimension (anxiety and avoidance),
C. attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissive), and

D. universal-diverse orientations (diversity of contact, comfort with differences, and relativistic appreciation)-

E. predict preservice teachers’ dominating conflict styles (concern: self/high, others/low)?

**Significance of the Study**

Studies have confirmed youths’ perceptions of belonging, behavioral and social functioning, and affective states attached to learning are associated with teacher/student relationships in which students describe the presence of positive affective qualities (Roeser et al., 1996). Characterized as warmth and security, positive emotional states within teacher/student relationships and overall classroom climate have been linked to students’ perceptions of well-being, academic self-efficacy beliefs, and actual achievement as measured by grades (Ames, 1992). “Feeling positively about how teachers and students interact in school may provide a secure emotional basis from which students can both enjoy school and develop their academic competence without feeling self-conscious or worried about failure” (Roeser et al., 1996, p. 419).

Attachment theory links the significance of positive affect and mutually shared experiences among youth and adults engaged within caregiving relationships to critical aspects of security that both motivate (caregiver) and reassure (youth) that the provision of ongoing care required for optimal growth and development is likely to continue. The application of attachment perspectives for understanding the affective dimensions of teacher/student relationships and their influences upon student outcomes offers a paradigm for shifting from a view of affect as an attribute held by individual teachers to a process variable that may be acknowledged, assessed, strengthened, and/or remediated, if needed, to enhance relational quality between teachers and
Attachment theory offers explanatory values for emphasizing roles that teachers may play in increasing youths’ emotional and social competencies, decreasing conflict and peer aggression, and reducing risks of school violence through proactive classroom management strategies constructed to maintain awareness, continual monitoring, opportunities for affect regulation, and accessible forms of social support. Attachment perspectives’ conceptualizations of the affiliative system provides teachers with explanatory values for understanding and responding to levels of acute distress associated with stress mechanisms governing youths’ primal drives to enhance social survival through actions that place individuals, peers, teachers, and school communities, as a whole at risk.

Limitations

The current study is designed to explore correlates among complex relational mechanisms (i.e. attachment styles) that are expected to exert influence upon the organization of variances within interpersonal attributes of preservice teachers’ prospective capacities for fulfilling NCATE requirements to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to work successfully with children of all races, ethnicities, disabilities/exceptionalities, and socioeconomic groups. NCATE requires that teacher preparation institutions explicitly assess candidates’ ‘belief that all students can learn” and the capacity to manifest “fairness” defined as “commitment demonstrated in striving to meet the educational needs of all students in a caring, non-discriminatory, and equitable manner (pp. 34, 73, 86) in the classroom. The current study recognizes the intent of NCATE standards and their inherent value in reversing longstanding trends that have hampered educational quality for all youth and failed to address the sources of high rates of teacher turnover and attrition in U.S.
public schools.

The current study also recognizes the methodological challenges posed to teacher preparation institutions faced with operationalizing constructs characterized by their complexity, multiple levels of influence, and subjective nature. The current study is limited to exploring the utilization of attachment perspectives to investigate the presence of relationships between preservice teachers’ attachment styles and selected aspects of professional teacher dispositions that have been identified a priori in the current study as representing risk and protective factors salient to issues identified as target concerns within NCATE as well as extant literature.

The current study does not imply explicit empirical support for identifying associations between stressors (e.g. academic achievement gaps, sociocultural dissonance, and classroom climate) currently experienced by teachers and youth in contemporary school environments- and the roles played by variances in levels of perceived security in influencing the nature and quality of interactions between youth and caregivers in attachment relationships. The current study highlights findings emerging from recent attachment research in schools to suggest trends in which researchers are exploring core assumptions underlying attachment theory and reciprocal relationships among variables that are central to the consideration of teacher/student relationship quality and contemporary factors of risk and/or protection in today’s schools.

The current study does imply direct empirical support for applying assumptions linking characteristics of preservice teachers’ attachment styles and prospective characteristics of professional teacher dispositions as attachment figures. The current study does suggest that preservice teachers’ styles may represent parallels examined within Bowlby’s early observations (1982) surrounding the caregiving system as an integral member of the several subsystems (e.g. exploratory and affiliative systems) within the primary attachment system (e.g. proximity-
maintenance) that may represent ongoing developmental processes (e.g. the evolution from cared for- to caregiver) in the evolution of preservice teachers’ professional dispositions.

The current study does not propose to operationalize or assess broad NCATE standards (e.g. fairness and the belief that all students can learn) or to imply, without empirical justification, that attachment styles are related to preservice teachers’ capacities to ‘demonstrate classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideas of fairness and develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity’ (p. 34). The current does extend, however, considerations of variances among attachment styles (e.g. levels of accuracy/distortion in appraising others, dogmatism, and viewing others’ intents) in the exploration of theoretical linkages established within empirical studies investigating affective dimensions and levels of perceived equity as embedded within conflict styles (e.g. organizational and classroom justice research) and their implications for inclusiveness and a ‘valuing of diversity’.

The current study was limited by the sample who, as preservice teachers, do not represent educators who are actively teaching in contemporary schools. While participant responses may have been influenced by their relative lack of experience in managing classrooms on their own, their current developmental status may be closer to the stage at which individuals are deciding whether to exit- or remain in urban schools and, therefore, represent a critical focus for targeted interventions by teacher preparation programs.

The current study assumes that the evolution of professional teacher dispositions is likely to represent a developmental process that will change not only over the course of teacher preparation course but with longevity in the field. The overall stability of attachment styles, however, represent a strength of the current study as does the nature of the items in the ECRS (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998) as they are less likely to elicit responses characterized by
social desirability. Assessment of preservice teachers’ universal-diverse orientations (M-GUDS-S, Fuertes et al., 2000) may be influenced by content encountered in multicultural courses that may not actually translate into behaviors aligned with best practices as prescribed. The study as also limited in scope by a lack of racial and ethnic diversity among the participants enrolled in the university serving as the research site. The lack of diversity means that the study’s findings do not capture the experiences of teacher trainees of color, however, again- this sample does reflect the core of the specific phenomenon that are at the center of the study’s concerns regarding critical issues tied to teacher turnover.

**Definition of Terms**

**Accessibility**

The construct of accessibility represents a necessary but not sufficient condition that is required before a teacher may demonstrate or fail to demonstrate sensitivity to youths' signals. The degrees to which teachers maintain- or fail to maintain reasonable accessibility to students' verbal and/or nonverbal cues depends on the relative presence- and/or absence of factors that determine whether or not youths’ signals, negative (i.e. need and/or distress) and/or positive (i.e. invitational bids for engagement)- will gain entry into- or be blocked from- registering in their teacher’s perceptual field. Teachers who maintain little or no accessibility to youths’ signals are unlikely to monitor and, therefore, notice when students are in need of protection, care, supervision, regulatory (e.g. emotional, behavioral, and/or academic) support, and/or assistance in restoring perceptions of security and/or access to the fulfillment of basic needs (e.g. belonging, competence, and/or autonomy).

**Accuracy versus Freedom from Distortion**

The accuracy of teachers’ interpretations of youths' signals will vary in the levels of
differentiation and the relative degrees of accuracy that characterize youths’ perceptions of teachers understanding to encompass and/or fail to encompass reflections of (a) underlying intentions embedded in youths’ original signals, (b) the full breadth of their physical, psychological, cognitive, emotional, and social relevance to youths’ current affective states, and (c) subtle, finely-nuanced dimensions of their social meanings- and the unique implications they hold for individual students’ emerging identities. Teachers may inaccurately attribute student performance behaviors (e.g. work pace or off-task activity) to ability (e.g. intelligence), motivation (e.g. effort), or parental attitudes (e.g. value placed on education)- rather than taking into consideration the entire spectrum of potential alternative explanations emerging from physical (e.g. hunger, fatigue, illness), emotional (e.g. preoccupation with peer and/or home issues), or interpersonal (e.g. reluctance to acknowledge misunderstanding of assignment) contexts, including qualities of the teacher/student relationship.

**Appropriateness**

Appropriate caregiver responses entail weighing complex and sometimes contradictory considerations to arrive at responses that are (a) finely tuned, (b) matched in nature, timing and intensity to children’s signals; (c) calibrated to weigh the relative merits of the immediacy of youths’ expressed desires versus potential long-term benefits; and (d) are smoothly, well-rounded and completely executed in ways that are (e) promotive of the fulfillment of attachment (e.g. physical, psychological, and social security) and basic universal (e.g. belonging, competence, and autonomy) needs.

**Attachment Behavior**

Attachment behavior is defined as any form of behavior that is (a) triggered by stimuli experienced as representing perceived threats (e.g. actual/imagined, explicit/symbolic) to an
individual’s survival (i.e. physical, psychological, social security) or future adaptive capacities (i.e. fulfillment of basic needs for belonging, competence, autonomy)- and (b) results in a person attaining proximity to some other clearly identified individual (i.e. attachment figure) who is conceived as “better able to cope with the world”.

**Attachment Figure**

An individual who is looked toward by another as (a) “better able to cope with the world” through the provision of comfort, care, and protection in response to distress/threat, and (b) as a source of the more global provision of a “strong and pervasive sense of security” derived from the knowledge that an individual would be readily “available and responsive” if the need should arise (Bowlby, 1988, p. 27).

**Attachment Theory**

Attachment theory is defined as a behavior-systems approach to understanding human behavior that provides a template for conceptualizing fundamental linkages among (b) universal drives to seek proximity to familiar persons perceived as ready, willing, and capable of providing protection, comfort, and care in times of distress and/or need- and a supportive environment” for fostering development (Bowlby, 1982/1969, 1973)- and the (c) organization of the psychological, emotional, cognitive, motivational, and social underpinnings of behavior functioning as substrates underlying human behavior.

**Awareness**

Variances in awareness are conceptualized in terms of thresholds (characteristics of youths’ signals that are required to enter teachers’ field of recognition) ranging from (a) low (i.e. teacher perceives cues that are subtle, nuanced, and understated) to high (i.e. teacher perceives only perceives cues that are blatant, obvious, and /or repeated over and over). Awareness is
expected to vary in the range of its (c) scope (i.e. extends to signals emerging across all, some, or limited domains of students’ psychological, emotional, social, behavioral, sociocultural, and/or academic functioning and development) and (d) target (e.g. extends to all, some, or limited individuals and/or groups of students). As Ainsworth described in contexts with caregivers, lowest levels of awareness (e.g. “obliviousness”) would be expected to correspond with diminished capacities for accurately interpreting youths’ signals- “when those signals do break into [adult] awareness, for these individuals have remained unaware of the prodromal signs [e.g. signals typically displayed prior to onset of specific behaviors] and contexts [e.g. whether stressors are derived from social, behavioral, and/or academic stressors] (Ainsworth, 1969, p. 11).

**Behavior Systems Approach to Human Behavior**

Theoretical underpinnings of behavioral systems are based upon ethological perspectives that assume broad spectrums of human (e.g. physical, psychological, social, cognitive, affective, and behavioral) functioning to be arranged within hierarchical configurations that prioritize primal drives for survival to override all other aspects of human behavior (Timberlake, 1994).

**Coordinated States (of communication)**

The status of exchanges between caregivers and youth are characterized as coordinated when the dyad’s pace, tone, and levels of interest and engagement are moving smoothly towards a mutual goal. Coordinated states are associated with positive affective states for both parties as they engage in ways that communicate their shared interest in an activity and/or pleasure taken in the nature of their shared experience itself.

**Cooperation**

Cooperation is defined from an attachment perspective as caregivers’ orientations
towards: (a) acknowledging youth as separate, active, autonomous person[s], whose wishes and activities have validity of their own, (b) adopting co-determining and invitational versus directive approaches, (c) demonstrating foresight for arranging physical and social contexts in ways that avoid situations that are likely to trigger the need for teachers' to exert control by imposing their will over youth, (d) using mood-setting, humor, distractions to transition youth from one activity to another, and (e) when possible, respecting youths’ ongoing interest, mood, rhythm, and pace.

Cycles of Coordinated/Miscoordinated states (of communication)

Assumptions that optimal caregiver/youth exchanges maintain a continual state of coordination are inaccurate as most well-functioning relationships are likely to maintain coordinated states only about 30% of the time (Tronick & Weinberg, 1998). The balance of interactions in these dyads appear to be either miscoordinated in nature- or spent in efforts by one or both partners to attempt to repair their ruptured communications (Gianino & Tronick, 1988). Typical caregiver/youth interactions are characterized by cycles that transition continually between relatively synchronous interactions to miscoordinated states and back again to encompass a wide range of emotional experiences. Such knowledge offers critical information for teachers’ expectations for- and appraisals of the frequency and quality (e.g. relative state of coordination and/or miscoordination) of their exchanges with youth- and their associated affective outcomes (e.g. positive/negative). While chronically negative emotional states are naturally aversive to teachers and their students, expectations to maintain only positive emotional states with students are equally unrealistic. Tronick and Weinberg emphasize that what is most important for the maintenance of positive adult/child relationships are both parties motivation to remain engaged with one another. Especially during conflictual periods, the commitment
displayed by teachers and their students to remain in dialogue in order to process the meaning of their disagreement and/or to arrive at what is required to repair (re-instate the coordinated nature of their exchanges and restore the positive valence of their emotional states) their miscommunication represents a hallmark of a secure teacher/student relationship.

**Distortion**

Potential sources of distortions that serve in biasing caregivers' reading of youths' signals, according to Ainsworth, emerge from the operation of psychological mechanisms such as projection, denial, or other marked defensive operations. Similarly, the current study suggests, it is plausible that teachers who read their students' signals through lenses biased by adults' own wishes, moods, and fantasies are more likely to lead to negative cycles in which teacher responses derived from inaccurate interpretations of youths' signals, are also reflective of distortions in teachers' appraisals of the underlying motivations, attitudes, and precipitating events that govern youths' behaviors in the classroom. On the other hand, teachers whose perceptions tend not to be distorted are also more likely to (a) have insight into if, when, and how their own wishes and moods may be influencing their appraisals of youth, (b) how adults' own moods and behaviors are likely to affect students' behaviors, and (c) apply this awareness to recalibrate their appraisals and form more realistic judgments about their students' behaviors.

**Empathic Concern**

Ainsworth conceptualizes empathy as an emotion-based component of care that serves as prerequisite foundation from which caregiver sensitivity and responsiveness are constructed. Paraphrasing Ainsworth, it is possible for caregivers to communicate both awareness of youths’ behaviors as well as accurate appraisals of what circumstances were likely to have led up to a particular event, however, it is unlikely that youth will experience adult responses as sensitive
unless they also convey in emotion-based language that teachers’ are “seeing- and even feeling things” from students’ point of view. Insensitive responding ranges from failing to acknowledge youths’ emotional distress in any way to misreading its characteristic valence (e.g. positive, neutral, negative), intensity (e.g. low, moderate, high), or underlying intent (e.g. deliberate communications of and/or disrespect versus nuanced manifestations of individual or culture-based expressions).

**Ethological Approaches to Understanding Interpersonal Functioning**

Ethological approaches assume the organization of broad spectrums of human interpersonal functioning to have evolved from natural selection within evolutionary processes designed to enhance the likelihood of early humankind’s survival and optimal adaptation to environmental stressors (Waters, 1981).

**Inaccessibility**

The effects of highly inaccessible teachers’ preoccupation with their thoughts and activities are categorized by Ainsworth et al., 1978) as ignoring or neglecting. Students’ experiences of their teachers’ responsiveness to their signals are described as (a) “most of the time, [teachers] simply do not notice [them], (b) occurs “only when [teachers] deliberately turns [their] attention to do something to or for [them]-- making a project of it, (c) rarely responds in the sense of giving care and social attention contingent upon [students’] behavior, rather, [teachers are] often completely unaware of [youths’] signals that their interventions are experienced as “at [teachers’] own whim and convenience”.

**Interactive Repair (of communication)**

The interactive transition from a miscoordinated state to a coordinated state is an interactive repair. Given that both individuals are active regulators of the other’s behavior, the
process of reparation occurs within the contexts of their mutually regulated exchanges. Each partner signals their evaluations of the state of their interactions through shifts in their affective configurations towards a positive an/or negative valence. In turn, in a subsequent response to their partner’s signals each partner attempts to adjust their behavior to maintain a coordinated state or to repair a miscoordination.

**Interference**

Interference is defined from an attachment perspective as caregivers’ orientations towards (a) believing that students can and should be trained by eliciting desirable and punishing undesirable behaviors fitted to teachers’ own appraisals without consideration of youths’ specific needs, desires, interests, motivations, or identities, (b) assuming that their roles as teachers grant them the right to impose their will on students to initiate, disrupt, break into, or cut across youths’ ongoing activities.

**Miscoordinated States (of communication)**

A miscoordinated state of exchanges occur when teachers and/or youth fail to accurately appreciate (e.g. perceive, interpret, acknowledge, and/or understand) the meaning of the other’s emotional display- and reacts inappropriately (e.g. response does not reflect attunement to original signal. Just as positive affective states are experienced by both partners during coordinated exchanges, miscoordinated exchanges are accompanied with shifts to negative affect for both parties. Characterized as miscommunications, these events are considered to represent normative states in the daily exchanges of human signals.

**Perception (relative accuracy and/or distortion)**

Degrees of accuracy and distortion and levels of differentiation serve as foundations from which teachers’ perceptions (e.g. includes interpretation, appraisal, and understanding) of student
signals will vary in their degrees of relative congruence with need and/or distress.

**Safe Haven**

Recognizing the role of infant import of a sense of security a feeling of security When threatened or in emotional or physical need, a sense of safe haven reflects infant perceptions of attachment figures and expectations surrounding the sensitivity, availability, and reliability of caregiver responses to address infant needs for comfort, support, and soothing from distress. Attachment theory acknowledges the import of a feeling of security within healthy infant-parent relationships, associating variations in infant security as essential determinants in outcomes of adaptive mental functioning and patterns of social interaction (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978).

**Secure Base for Exploration**

Infants use caregivers as a secure base from which to explore their environments. Viewed from attachment theory’s survival perspective; unfamiliar settings, new persons, or over-challenging tasks provoke complex motivations within children who balance their sense of interest and curiosity with awareness of potential risk (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986). The ‘secure base’ phenomenon provides a paradigm for conceptualizing the attachment system’s role in mediating children’s need to balance and shift among behaviors designed to seek active exploration- or return to the proximity or safety of attachment figure when needed (Waters, 1981).

**State of Being Attached**

Individuals are described as attached to attachment figures when they possess the strong disposition to “seek proximity to and contact” (Bowlby, 1988, p. 28) with an attachment figure, especially under certain specified conditions (i.e. experiences or perceptions of risk/distress).
“Stronger and Wiser”

Evolutionary processes countered risks to survival posed by human neonates’ profound helplessness and extended periods of complete dependence on others- by selecting an innate propensity (e.g. biologically-based drive) for immature humans to seek out- and maintain proximity to- caregiver figures perceived as capable of providing the kinds of care and developmental support that are required to survive and learn how to adapt positively to environmental stressors (Bowlby, 1969/1982).
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter 2 examines constructs, mechanisms, and ethological assumptions underlying the principles of attachment to explore the salience of their explanatory values for refining operationalization of variances in the emerging professional dispositions of preservice teachers and their potential contributions to individuals’ decisions to enter- and remain in today’s urban schools. Attachment theory’s ethological assumptions provide a lens for examining roles played by the effects of stimuli that activate biologically-based drives for all humans to attend to perceived threats, whether actual, imagined, or symbolic, to personal security. Viewing the qualities of exchanges- and relationships formed between teachers and students through an evolutionary lens that considers their relative degrees of match- or mismatch with the purposes, goals, and functions of optimal caregiving modes expands our understanding of (a) the nature of stimuli emerging from classrooms’ interpersonal contexts, (b) discrepancies between the social meanings attributed by students- and teachers, and (c) ties between their reciprocal effects and critical outcomes for youth and teachers alike.

Highlighted in section one of Chapter 2 are some of the evolutionary events that pressured the natural selection of optimal qualities of caregiver/youth interactions- and their roles in enhancing- and/or detracting from the likelihood mutual survival for adults and offspring in facing hostile conditions encountered in the ancient habitats of early hominids. The emphases placed on attachment theory’s evolutionary underpinnings in this section are intended to establish a theoretical foundation from which to view the (a) origins of human caregiving relationships, (b) roles played by emotion-based communications representing elemental substrates within interactions occurring between today’s teachers and students, (c) variances in teacher/student relationship qualities and (d) relational effects (mutual respect, trust, and
commitment), and their impact upon (e) student motivation to cooperate with- and/or aggress against classroom behavioral norms established by teachers. Teachers’ attachment styles were assumed to be linked to variances in qualities and consistencies of teachers’ (a) sensitivity to- and (b) relative accuracy and/or distortion in- perceiving and interpreting youths’ signals, (b) expression of understanding of youths’ emotional experiences, (c) maintenance of open, bi-directional forms of communication for ensuring youths’ voices will be heard, (d) calibration of behavioral expectations to reflect individual students’ developmental needs and sociocultural backgrounds, and (e) manifestations of persistence and commitment in supporting youth in attaining prosocial behavioral goals.

Chapter two reviews relationships between extant literature surrounding attachment theory, historical and contemporary approaches to attachment research and assessment, and salient issues surrounding school climate, academic outcomes; and relational aspects of teacher-student interactions in the classroom. Throughout this exploratory study, the salience of universal effects exerted by biologically-based drives for humans to attend- and respond to- stimuli perceived as threatening to personal security were considered for their theoretical effects upon dynamic processes contributing to the intensity and frequency of conflict events- and their influences upon elevated rates of teacher turnover in urban schools.

**Ethological Foundations of Attachment Theory: A Series of Evolutionary Events**

According to evolutionary biologists, human capacities for psychological, cognitive, and emotional functioning that distinguished early humans from other species in ancient environments may not, as held by traditional views, be attributed solely- or perhaps even primarily to graduated increases in brain size and structures. Evolutionists posit that it was the convergence of human infants' tendencies towards enhanced brain size (e.g. prefrontal cortex)
with the onset of early hominid's capacities to walk upright (i.e. bipedalism) in ancient environments that triggered a cascade of evolutionary events that led eventually to humankind's unique capacities for higher-order thinking. The enlarged skull size required to house the increasing dimensions of the fetal brain gradually came into direct conflict with the size and shape of the pelvic structures needed to support females' bipedal capacities. Heightened mortality rates during labor and childbirth posed risks not only to mother and infant, but, if left unaddressed- to the survival of the species as a whole.

Ensuring species-survival occupies preeminent status over any and all benefits that are less critical to protecting individuals from threats to their immediate mortality. Rather than not conserving adaptive advantages over other organisms gained from human's enhanced intellectual capacities and bipedal modes of locomotion, threats to ancient hominids’ survival were resolved by shortening infants’ gestational periods so that a less-developed (i.e. smaller) skull size would reduce labor and delivery risks for mother and infant. Reductions in infant/mother mortality were achieved, however, the consequences of this adaptation posed another set of problems.

Now at only one-fourth of adult brain size, the effects of the substantial reductions in neonates’ brain size and neurological maturity at-birth were comparable to those of a physiological preterm delivery (Prechtl, 1984). Species survival now hinged upon finding some means for compensating for the loss of time required for prenatal (i.e. en utero) processes to complete sufficient brain and neural development. Natural selection processes designed specific types of emotional exchanges within interactions and relationships formed-between youth and their caregivers to optimally match the kinds of stimulation that were required to ensure ongoing brain maturation and, thereby, restore the adaptive benefits provided in the form of a symbolic fourth trimester (Shanker, 2004).
**Responses to Heightened Species Vulnerability**

Reproductive ecologists classify all species by the degrees to which motor and neural system immaturity require newborns to rely completely upon caregivers for ensuring not only survival, but capacities for autonomous functioning. Evolutionary stressors served to place human neonates in a unique position between the young of species remained in nests and burrows and those more advanced motor and neural development granted them mobility to allow them to follow after their food-foraging mothers soon after birth (Gould, 1978, 1980).

Anthropologists (McKenna, 1994) posit that profound deficits in cognitive and motor development left human infants’ wholly incapable of responding on their own to threats posed by predation, starvation, and exposure to the elements. The convergence of human infants’ fairly sophisticated sensory (e.g. eyes open at birth) and perceptive (e.g. cognizance of maternal absence) capacities- and total dependence upon frequent on-demand nursing, however, left them excruciatingly aware of the pain of their own hunger (Gould 1978, 1980). Neonates were now less capable of directly initiating the satisfaction of needs required for survival and farther away, in terms of developmental readiness to function autonomously- leaving them simultaneously more dependent and vulnerable than any other mammal (Falk 2000).

In order to ensure individual and species-wide survival, evolutionary stressors pressured the emergence of intense forms of infant protests that were activated in response to stimuli experienced as posing threats with potentially lethal consequences (e.g. death from predation, thirst, starvation, and exposure to elements). Ethobiologists have posited that the level of stimuli overload infants faced at the time of their birth would have been sufficient to elicit symptoms of physical shock in adults experiencing similar neurological states (Greenspan & Shanker, 2004).

**Infants’ separation cry.** According to bioethologists, it is likely that the very first of
humankind's vocal productions were likely to have been embodied in the form of a human infant’s intense and profoundly distressed "separation cry" (MacLean, 1996, p. 545). Infants’ emotional states embedded in these expressions remain “inevitably and closely intertwined with fear" (Grossman, Grossman, Waters, 2006, p. 253) tied to their own survival. The properties of human infants’ sensory systems, limited motor reflexes, and primitive emotion circuits (Greenspan & Shanker 2004) converge in primal drives inherited from distant evolutionary ancestors (Panksepp 1998) to trigger waves of intense physiological, behavioral and experiential responses to threatening stimuli that infants are unable to regulate on their own (Gould 1978, Shanker & King 2002). If left alone, or in the presence of unsupportive caregivers, the rage and fear that is embedded in and automatically activated by youths’ responses to threatening environmental is likely to “keep escalating until sheer exhaustion forces the system to shut down (Shanker, 2004, p, 297). These forms of acute emotional distress are specifically activated in response to stimuli experienced as threatening due to the potential absence of caregivers or suboptimal access to the qualities of care upon which infants must rely for the levels of protection, comfort, care, and developmental support that are required to ensure survival.

**Co-designed (fitting) caregiving systems.** Evolutionary processes were required to generate a robust behavioral repertoire if human neonates were to survive the psychological distress tied to the profound lack of neurological maturity that would have otherwise buffered them psychobiological assaults encountered in the extrauterine environment. Natural selection processes responded with a solution to this evolutionary dilemma by shaping the in the form of a “special co-designed (‘fitting’) caregiving environment” (Keller 2000) characterized by (a) perceptions of threat that had to generate sufficiently aversive emotional states to prompt youth to elicit caregivers’ assistance, (b) drives for “almost every [youth to seek to] develop an
attachment relationship with a caregiver, and endeavor to use that caregiver as a source of comfort and protection in the face of threats from the environment" even when caregivers have proven themselves to be nonresponsive- or even abusive (Weinfield et al., 2008, p. 78), and (c) remain broadly based so that any potential threat of separation from- or access to caregivers’ prompt, sensitive, responsive, and/or willing care is experienced in the core of youths’ being as threats- whether directly to physical, psychological, or social security or to long-term adaptation via capacities to fulfill basic needs for belonging [relatedness], competence, and autonomy in their physical and social environments. Characteristics of caregiver/youth were designed to (a) reward intense engagement in reciprocally stimulating emotional exchanges (Schore 1994), (b) governed by mutually goal-directed behavioral repertoires (p. 78-79) that function in (c) activating experience-expectant and experience-dependent processes (Greenough & Black, 1992) to foster the ongoing maturation and optimal development of the human brain and neural systems.

**Effects of prolonged socialization: higher-order thinking.** Ethologists argue that it was precisely the convergence of the extreme plasticity associated with the profound immaturity of the neonate’s brain with the early and extended exposures to intense social stimulation and increased parental involvement that served as the foundations from which the human species’ capacities for critical inquiry, abstract and symbolic thinking, and complex linguistic and social systems would eventually emerge. According to Kissinger, “what it means to be human depends on an intensive and prolonged socialization process. Without that process, the intelligence, language, social behaviors we associate with being human simply do not materialize. In a very real sense, one's humanity materially depends not only upon genes, but upon a prolonged socialization process that triggers complex, developmental processes” (2007, p. 151).
**Emotion regulation** Attention devoted to processes underlying emotion-regulation are important not only for (a) supporting the development of youths’ capacities to control negative emotions, but for (c) understanding the roles that positive emotions generated within close caregiver/child interactions- play in energizing and regulating affect (e.g. calmness, contentment), (b) motivation (e.g. curiosity, interest, goal-selection), (c) cognition (e.g. flexibility, differentiation) and (d) behavior (e.g. effective decision-making). Developmental neuroscientists offer evidence to suggest that the consolidation of synaptic connections (Tucker et. al, 2000) and integration of various parts of the brain involved in the ongoing development of each of these processes proceed optimally when facilitated by mechanisms embedded in close caregiver-child interactions (Lewis 2005).

The better caregivers are able to read and anticipate youths’ nonverbal cues, the more efficient caregivers’ efforts in executing this regulatory function with youth will be- resulting not only in reducing the child’s real-time experience of emotional distress, but in minimizing the negative neurological consequences that may otherwise accumulate to comprise youths’ emerging progress towards internalizing their own emotion-regulation strategies (Sroufe, Egeland, Carlson, 2005). “Such ‘mindreading’ abilities on the part of the caregiver are not innate; rather, they can only be attained through the countless caregiver-child interactions” Shanker, 2004, p.298) that caregivers encounter during myriads of daily interactions (Greenspan & Shanker 2004).

**Universal Drives for the Fulfillment of Basic Needs**

Attachment theory and Self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Niemiec & Ryan, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2000b) share an emphasis upon the evolutionary origins of humans’ universal drives to fulfill needs for relatedness, competence, and autonomy and the roles they
played in shaping early hominids’ capacities for positive adaptation and survival in ancient environments. The historical focus of much of traditional attachment research has remained centered on variances in the reciprocal qualities of interactions, communications-, bonds, and relationships that are formed- between youth and their caregivers and their influences upon perceived security and emotion regulation. Bowlby’s (1982) emphasis upon the importance of basic need-fulfillment as an organizing force in shaping human development remained constant throughout his writings. Perhaps consistent with the hierarchical prioritization of attachment security over need-fulfillment within attachment theory’s behavior system, however, the empirical emphasis of subsequent attachment research has, until more recently focused more explicitly upon human drives to monitor, perceive, and respond to threats to perceived threats.

Attachment theory and Self-determination theory (SDT) share assumptions that humans are designed to: (a) seek and sustain a personal sense of security derived from connectedness to proximal others that extend past individual relationships to motivations to (b) experience belonging and membership in broader social groupings. Once secure in their sense of relatedness to others in close relationships, individuals will (c) function naturally as active and growth oriented organisms who (d) desire to follow their curiosity (Lowenstein, 1994) and (e) interests (Silvia, 2008) to (f) engage fully in the exploration (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000) of their physical and social worlds, (g) fulfill drives to experience a personal sense of their own competence (Flavell, 1999), (h) achieve a sense of personal autonomy (Edelman, 1987), and to-(i) strive to organize experiences derived from all of the above into an integrated sense of self, others, (Ryan, 1995) and relationships in their worlds in order to “initiate integrated, coherent, and self-regulated actions towards adaptive behavioral aims (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 138).

Self-determination theorists share attachment theory's positive view of growth and
development assuming that all humans will manifest tendencies—unless impeded—towards progressing towards optimal levels of "vitality, integration, and health… so long as the necessary and appropriate nutriments are attainable". Factors, conditions, relationships, or social environments that are perceived to place the fulfillment of any- or all of individuals’ universal needs "under conditions of threat or deprivation, on the other hand, will give way to the emergence of nonoptimal psychological outcomes… [experienced as] a general sense of "degradation and ill-being" across the entire developmental spectrum (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 228).

Maslow adds emphasis to attachment and self-determination theorists' positions that the relative fulfillment- or deprivation of each need impacts levels of functioning related to all other needs by arguing that it is important to remember that the existence of each individual as "an integrated, organized whole" represents "an experimental reality as well as a theoretical one". From this perspective, the perceived fulfillment of any need is experienced by the whole individual and not just a part… so that, a state of perceived need-deprivation will also change "not only the functions [most directly related to that specific need], but …many, perhaps even most other functions of which [the individual] is capable". The consequences of the relative fulfillment and/or deprivation of individuals' primal drives to seek, monitor, attend, and respond to perceived threats in ways that are most likely to ensure physical, psychological, and/or security and maintain perceptions of relatedness, competence, and autonomy— are posited, therefore, to extend to effects upon "almost every other faculty, capacity, or function, both physiological and psychic" (p. 20) of humans sharing a particular social environment, whether students or teachers. As outcomes related to these effects will be experienced by students and teachers, according to Maslow (1976) whether or not" they are identified, understood, and/or
"consciously value [d] by either youth, preservice teachers, or education institutions- the accrual of their "negative consequences" are likely to continue in U.S. public schools (p. 20).

The Principles of Attachment Theory

Over the last three decades, attachment theory has gained increased recognition as a conceptual framework for understanding variances among patterning among individuals’ affect, attitudes, behaviors and expectations for significant interpersonal relationships. John Bowlby’s (1988) attachment theory represents a behavioral systems approach for examining the quality of early child/caregiver interactions and their enduring influence upon the shape and trajectory of individuals’ socioemotional and personality development (Mikulincer, Shaver & Pereg, 2003).

Attachment theory applies evolutionary-based principles underlying universal drives for survival to species-specific behavioral systems posited to have organized human adaptation and response to environment threat throughout the history of humankind (Hinde, 2008). The origins of behavioral systems research (Sroufe & Waters, 1977) are rooted in ethological studies that explored mechanisms regulating animal behaviors that appeared to be both and purposive in nature Solomon and George (1996) describe the goals of systems-approaches to understanding behavior as the investigation of a series of behaviors that (a) act in conjunction to fulfill a specific adaptive function, (b) are driven by behavioral goals that extend over time, and (c) remain flexible in order to adapt to a wide range of environmental and/or developmental stimuli (Bowlby, 1982). Attachment systems coordinate learning and development to configure a broad spectrum of processes (e.g. motivational states; the integration and filtering of information; timing, memory, motor, and their corresponding neurophysiological functions) to respond individual perceptions of real and/or perceived risks to emotional, social, or physical survival, security, and/or evolutionary fitness (Timberlake, 1994).
Applying Ethological Perspectives to Contemporary School Settings

Attachment theory’s explanatory value for understanding behavior becomes salient when evolutionary-grounded perspectives are applied to investigate stimuli that potentiate perceptions of protection/risk and/or security/insecurity when individuals face distressing and/or threatening social or environmental factors. According to Bowlby (1988), attachment mechanisms governing the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral aspects of human interpersonal functioning were genetically wired into the human species by intense directional selection occurring throughout evolutionary processes. The universal motivation to seek security, according to Cassidy (1999), is embedded within primal drives for ensuring individual survival so “there is no need to view attachment as the by-product of any more fundamental processes or ‘drive’” (p. 5). “The reason why the attachment system evolved and remains so deeply ingrained in human nature is that it provided a good solution to one of the greatest adaptive problems our ancestors faced: how to increase the chances of survival through the most vulnerable years of development” (Simpson, 1999, p. 116).

Main (1999) notes the work of behavioral and evolutionary biologists who draw parallels between the structures of contemporary human brains and those possessed by ancestral hominids and early primates. Described as the conservation of old systems across mammalian evolution (Polan & Hofer, 1999; Suomi, 1999), Greenfield (1997) asserts that human brains of today are “believed to differ little from those seen in our species 30,000 years ago. For early human hunters and gatherers, the likelihood of predation and other dangers attendant upon separation were realities dealt with by the attachment behavioral system and were no doubt accompanied by emotions similar to those the infant experiences today” (p. 850). Children’s attachments, therefore, and the “emotions that accompany them in contemporary settings do not necessarily
serve an obvious immediate survival function” but reflect residuals of evolutionary processes and environmental stressors upon the functioning of the human brain. “Therefore infants in contemporary settings often behave as though their survival were at stake in situations where we believe them to be safe” (Main, 1999, p. 849). When young children, react with what is perceived by adults as ‘unreasonable distress’, Bowlby (1988) would attribute adults’ judgments and misunderstanding to a failure to consider the degree of environmental threat posed to infants’ chances for survival when faced with the primitive environmental conditions present in ancient humans’ habitats.

**Range and Scope of Attachment Systems**

Attachment theory focuses upon the origin, function, and qualities of reciprocal social exchanges occurring within significant relationships and their long-term influences upon adaptation and development. Attachment theory describes a species-specific behavior system that operates in the selection of behavioral responses to environmental stimuli in order to optimize human survival and reproductive fitness. Hazan and Shaver (1994) describe attachment mechanisms as belonging to one of several distinct and interlocking behavioral constellations described by Bowlby (1988) as proximity-maintenance, exploration, affiliation, and caregiving behavioral systems. Each of these systems is characterized by a unique set of evolutionary-driven functions and responds differentially to specific environmental cues that have signaled risk to human neonates throughout evolutionary history. The exploratory, affiliative, and caregiving systems each exert broad influences upon overall development, however, these systems remain hierarchically-ordered for preserving the status of attachments’ primary function, proximity-maintenance, for ensuring emotional, social, and physical safety necessary for survival. Once triggered by perceptions of physical, emotional or social threats; the attachment system will
remain active, precluding the activation of the other systems until individuals’ disequilibrium and anxiety have been reduced to tolerable levels (Main, 1999).

**Proximity-maintenance: the caregiver as ‘safe haven’.** Bowlby’s (1988) behavior-systems approach to understanding personality development recognizes the universal strength of humans’ biologically-based drive to seek proximity to familiar figures in times of perceived need and/or distress (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, &1982). Attachment theory emphasizes the primal significance of the extended period in which the young neonate has no other option for ensuring survival than to rely upon the nature and quality of care provided by others.

Attachment theorists assert that the quality of early child/caregiver relationships exerts a lasting impact upon the human psyche with the potential to remain a major influence in determining interpersonal attitudes and behaviors throughout an individual’s lifetime (Main, 1999). Born without the capacities for locomotion, feeding, and defense that require extended dependence on others (Mikulincer, Shaver & Pereg, 2003); human infants developed behavioral repertoires for promoting *proximity-maintenance* to attachment figures. Attachment behaviors have operated throughout human history to protect the “mobile infant and growing child from a number of dangers” including evolutionary threats from predation” (Bowlby, 1969, p. 375).

Bowlby (1988) defines *attachment behavior* as any form of behavior that results in a person attaining proximity to some other clearly identified individual who is conceived as better able to cope with the world” an *attachment figure*. “(T)he probable immediacy of mortality resulting from failure to maintain proximity to the attachment figure in unfamiliar or threatening circumstances leads proximity maintenance to stand first and foremost in the infant’s behavioral hierarchy in the natural environment” (Main, 1999, p. 854). The sensory systems, limited motor reflexes, and primitive emotion circuits (Greenspan & Shanker 2004) that humans inherited from
distant evolutionary ancestors are, therefore, triggered by a selective range of stimuli serving
some evolutionary function to set off a wave of physiological, behavioral and experiential
responses that infants are unable to regulate on their own (Gould 1978, Greenspan & Shanker
2004). If left alone without co-regulatory support provided by a caregiver, infants’ anger is likely
to “keep escalating until sheer exhaustion forces the system to shut down” (Shanker, 2004, p.
297).

A person described as attached to another individual possesses the strong disposition to
“seek proximity to and contact with that individual and to do so especially in certain specified
conditions” (Shanker, 2004, p. 28). The predictable goals of children’s attachment behaviors are
to seek proximity to caregivers who are perceived as (a) “stronger and wiser” (Shaver, Hazan, &
Bradshaw, 1988, p. 845), and capable of (b) providing comfort, care, and protection, and (c)
alleviating insecurities surrounding real or perceived threats from environment stimuli (Bowlby,
1969; 1982). The goal of a child’s attachment behaviors is not to achieve proximity to an object
in the person of an attachment figure or caregiver, “but rather a state a maintenance of the
desired distance” from a trusted, supportive figure, depending on the circumstances surrounding
the presence and degree of threatening stimuli (Cassidy, 1999, p. 6). Bowlby (1988) considers
the disposition to seek proximity “as a persistent attribute” of the attached person “which
changes only slowly over time and which is unaffected by the situation of the moment” (p. 20).
Evidence has suggested that during the first two or three years of life, the pattern of attachment is
a property of the relationship, rather than an attribute of the child’s temperament.

Affective bonding. Described by Sroufe and Waters (1977) as the “the psychological
tether which binds infant and caregiver together (p. 1186), affect plays a key role in the
formation and maintenance of enduring bonds (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1969, 1982) that
contribute to attachment relationships’ unique functions. Characterized as a specific type of affectional bonding process, Main (1999) differentiates the specific features and functions of attachment relationships from more generalized relationships that may also share qualities such as caring and sharing of affect (Main, 1999). The distinct significance of relationships upon which individuals rely throughout the human lifespan for providing support in times of distress (Laursen & Collins, 2004) remain directly linked to the power of selective pressures embedded within evolutionary drives for survival. The strength of the affective bonds that exist between infants and caregivers, therefore, reflect the primal nature of the infants’ urge to seek necessary care for survival- coupled with caregiver drives to maintain the reproductive fitness that ensures continuity of the human species (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1979, 1980).

The reciprocal emotional investment that grows throughout the bonding process is fostered by the repetition of ‘personally meaningful’ experiences that occur within the contexts of routine interpersonal exchanges between child and caregiver and contribute to infants’ perceptions of security and overall well-being (Kreppner & Ullrich, 1998). Depending upon the particular appraisal of quality of proximity; attachment figures may engender feelings of security and love or anger, anxiety or sadness (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Representing infants’ first and only means for signaling the nature and extent of biological and psychological need to others, attachment theory assumes that individuals’ early experiences surrounding the communication of affect are retained to form the foundation upon which the view of self and others in the social world are constructed and maintained.

According to Bowlby (1988), the urgency inherent in the human drive to seek proximity to other individuals perceived to offer a reliable source of comfort and support represents an indicator of healthy mental functioning and positive adaptation. “[T]here are, in fact, no more
important communications between one human being and another that those expressed emotionally, and no information more vital for constructing and reconstructing working models of self and other than information about how each feels towards the other” (p. 156). Intimate emotional bonds within attachment theory, therefore, are seen as “neither subordinate to nor derivative from other survival drives such as food or sex. The diminished perceptions of security that activate the attachment system and lead to the seeking Upon experiencing the diminished perceptions of security and strong affect that are associated with activation of the attachment system, the motivation to seek the proximity of a second individual who is “selected for his or her likelihood of being able to promote the attached individual’s safety and survival” represents the symbolization of an “infants ‘solution’ to potentially life-threatening circumstances of an immediate kind” (p. 846).

**Mental Representations of Security/Insecurity**

Attachment theory views child/caregiver interactions characterized by (a) the provision of care and fulfillment of needs, (b) positive affect and perceptions of trust, (c) reciprocity, as well as variations in degrees of children’s perceived security derived from these relationships as critical determinants of social outcomes and levels of functioning (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978) throughout the human lifespan. Individuals’ perceptions of relational security and/or insecurity are built up slowly over the course of countless interactions with caregivers, accumulating gradually to form a stable set of implicitly-held beliefs or *mental representations* (Waters, Merrick, Treboux, Crowell, & Albershein, 2000). The degree to which infants perceive caregivers to be consistently responsive in meeting critical needs for protection, care, and comfort will shape durable views of self and others in close relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and expectations for behavioral aspects of future interactions with siblings, peers, and non-
familial adults such as teachers (Hazan & Shaver, 1994).

While specifically evident when a person is “frightened, fatigued, or sick … [and is in need of] comfort and caregiving”, attachment processes remain active in a more global way by providing- or failing to provide a pervasive sense of security and/or insecurity that reflects individual expectations as to whether a caregiver is likely to remain “available and responsive” (Hazan & Shaver, 1994, p. 27) should the need for comfort and/or support arise. When threatened, distressed or requiring emotional or physical care; infants’ perceptions of caregiver consistency in sensitively fulfilling infant needs determines the degree to which caregivers serve as a reliable sources of comfort, soothing, and/or support i.e. a ‘safe haven’ (Hazan & Shaver, 1994).

Infants who consistently experience satisfaction of instrumental and emotional needs by maintaining proximity to reliable caregivers (Sheldon-Keller & Adams, 1998), develop a pervasive sense of well-being, described by Sroufe and Waters as ‘felt security’ (1977). Caregivers who are perceived as inconsistently available, rejecting, or insufficiently responsive to infants’ signaling of unmet needs or distress develop mental representations viewing caregivers as untrustworthy and unreliable, the self as unworthy, and the environment as a threatening and unpredictable place (Sheldon-Keller & Adams, 1998).

Mental representations are assumed to guide patterns of children’s thoughts, feelings, and behaviors; strategies for affect regulation, and willingness to engage in autonomous exploration of the environment (Klohen & John, 1998). Responding to stimuli associated with the regulation and fulfillment of attachment needs, the activation of mental representations are posited to occur automatically (Collins & Read, 1994), operating largely outside of conscious awareness (Feeney & Noller, 1996) upon individuals’ experiences of negative social interaction, relationships, or
events that trigger feelings of distress and/or vulnerability (Simpson et al., 1992).

The rates of onset and levels of stimulation required to activate individual attachment system varies depending upon the history and frequency of previously threatening stimuli (Collins & Read, 1994) and the degree to which individuals “perceive particular attachment responses to work” (Feeney & Noller; 1996, p. 93) in reducing distress and restoring security. The stability within attachment interactions and their resistance to change are enhanced by their self-fulfilling nature (Collins & Read, 1994) when “actions based on these models produce consequences that reinforce them. [W]hen individuals who believe that others do not care about them” approach social situations in defensive manners, the likelihood that others will respond in need-fulfilling ways is reduced and serves to perpetuate “negative models of self and other” (Feeney & Noller, 1996, p. 94).

**Exploratory system: caregiver provision of a ‘secure base’**. Infants’ exploration of their environments, from an attachment perspective, is a developmental prerequisite for eventual mastery of the physical and social world. Exploration leads to new information about the world and self that enriches self-regulating skills- “infusing children and adolescents with confidence in the effectiveness of their own resources for handling distress” (Mikulincer, Shaver & Pereg, 2003, p. 94). The exploration system plays a role in supporting developmental processes that assist children and adolescents in distancing themselves to an extent from parents in order to gain the freedom necessary for exploring the environment on their own. Unfamiliar settings and new persons, however, provoke complex motivations within infants who are faced with the need to temper their curiosity and desire to explore novel situations (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986) with individual perceptions as to whether a specific environmental context is safe enough to do so (Sroufe & Waters, 1977).
Grossmann et al. (1999) have described adaptive perceptions of individual security as an optimal balance between the attachment and exploration systems that are characterized by a young person’s generalized orientation towards open-mindedness and a cautious, but curious, approach to new persons and situations. The optimal outcome of exploratory attachment processes are individuals who function autonomously in exploring their environments while valuing and remaining attentive to attachment relationships (Ainsworth, et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1980) in their lives.

Attachment theory describes the ‘secure base’ phenomenon for conceptualizing children’s needs to mediate conflicting motivations surrounding the drive to maintain a sense of perceived security (maintenance of proximity to a trusted caregiver) and strong urges to explore and learn (Waters, 1981) about the surrounding environment (exploratory system). Variations in relational security with caregivers has been linked to differences in children’s acquisition of knowledge, skills and behavioral strategies for coping with challenges faced while learning about their emotional, social, and physical worlds. Early experiences associated with competent, reliable, and need-fulfilling care support the development of secure-base schema (Waters, Rodrigues, & Ridgeway, 1998) that influence a child’s expectations about others will be available to provide any necessary support and are capable of shaping learning conditions in a manner that promotes children’s beliefs that learning environments are places in which they are likely to experience success (Bowlby (1969, 1973, &1982).

The proximity of trusted caregivers who consistently provide care that is responsive and contiguous to both children’s expressed and developmental needs provides children with the sense of a ‘secure base’ (Al-Yagon & Milulincer, 2006) from which to explore their environments. When distressed by real or imagined threats from the environment; infants who
perceive caregivers as responsive and available will seek proximity to them, reestablish contact, and after experiencing a sense of having been comforted will settle, return to relaxed play, and continue their exploratory efforts with confidence.

Upon encountering unfamiliar or stress-provoking circumstances (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, & 1982), children’s “ability to use an attachment figure as a secure base provides the child with comfort and relief, infuses a sense of basic trust and security, enables the infant to handle distress, and facilitates engagement in non-attachment behaviors such as exploration of the environment and risk-taking activities” (Al-Yagon & Mikulincer, 2006, p.1; Waters & Cummings, 2000). Children perceiving caregivers as reliably available, responsive, and competent in creating and maintaining supportive and socially contingent learning environments exhibit higher levels of interest, active engagement, and willingness taking risks in attempting, persevering in, and eventually mastering challenging (Grossmann et al., 1999).

**Evolutionary functions: basic needs for competence and autonomy.** The proximal aim underlying the motivation that drives individuals’ desires to experience a sense of personal is, according to White (1959), the pleasure of being effective. As such, drives for competence function as non-specific versus content-specific motivations that fuel human curiosity to take interest- and engage- in active exploration of the physical and social dimensions of their worlds. Competence drives’ open and interactive nature contributes to both adaptive- and survival advantages. By remaining open and interested to environmental stimuli, early humans are likely to have gained advantages provided by the unexpected discovery of a game route, migration patterns, or alternative food sources- or the attention paid to understanding, implementing, and, when needed, improving upon skills, rituals, and social rules transmitted by other group members.
Without making either survival or reproductive skills a proximal aim, the human predisposition to seek competence gradually extends and differentiates toward activities and practices that are specifically relevant to effective social interaction and resources supporting physical adaptation. If humans had not experienced satisfaction from learning for its own sake and required prompting individuals may have been less likely to have (a) discovered and developed domain-specific skills and capacities they inherited, (b) learned how to apply them adaptively in new situations, or been prepared to (c) address novel experiences and unexpected demands posed by changing environmental conditions or (d) adapt to extreme variances in the cultural niches into which individuals might be born or desire to adopt. The broad tendency toward competence offers functional advantages in supporting individuals to become optimized in niche-relevant ways and in combination with drives to continually differentiate skills produces benefits for all group members (White, 1959).

Prototypically manifested within intrinsically motivated activity, needs to experience a sense of competence first appears in individuals within early forms of motor play, object manipulation, and exploratory interests that trigger, in turn, processes that spur further cognitive, motor, and social growth (Elkind, 1971; White, 1959) embedded in experience-dependent and experience-expectant forms of learning (Greenough, Black, & Wallace, 1987) that are required to promote changes in neural structures employed in subsequent maturation processes.

Autonomy may be conceptualized as a human volition to exercise self-regulated action that is associated with a sense of integrity and vitality when accompanied by inner states of self-concordance (e.g. perceived sense of harmony) among cognitions, affect, and behaviors that serve in directing individuals towards means for maintaining security and satisfying basic needs for relatedness, competence, and autonomy (Ryan, 1993) in proximal social contexts. The
biological basis underlying universal drives for autonomy direct individuals to maintain reactive
sensitivity towards variances in perceived causality (i.e. source of internal or external control) of
persons and events that request individuals to enact particular responses (e.g. attitudes, beliefs) or
actions (e.g. behaviors).

Children who do not perceive caregivers as to be sufficiently available, responsive, or
emotionally invested in supporting their exploratory efforts may remain preoccupied with needs
to maintain anxious proximity to caregivers (Sroufe & Waters, 1977), adopt an avoidant stance
to enable their active disengagement from learning processes or exhibit negative behaviors that
serve in deflecting pain linked to unmet needs for security (Grossmann et al., 1999).

Associations between perceived insecurity with significant caregivers in children’s lives
have been linked to suppression of exploratory drives, inhibition or exaggeration of affect and
behaviors characterized as reckless, accident proneness or precocious competence (Lieberman &
Pawl, 1990). The suppression of exploratory play represents a “paradoxically unfortunate
compromise, since the exploration required for development is sacrificed for the sake of security.
These ... self-defeating behaviors represent the best solution available within the child’s limited
level of logical thinking and the options available within the environment” (Lieberman & Pawl,
1988, p.146).

**Variations in developmental security.** Throughout the developmental process, children
require varying degrees of proximity to caregivers in the absence of perceived threats but may
‘check back’ (Mahler, 1975) when presented by novel or threatening aspects of the environment
(Tracy, Lamb & Ainsworth, 1976). While the presence of attachment figures remains significant
across the life span (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Caffery & Erdman, 2000); periods of
transition, exploration, and exposure to perceived threats may heighten the salience of a
supportive figure (Allen & Land, 1999). Whether or not children require proximity when under duress, Bishof (1975) postulates, remains conditional upon a variety of internal and external parameters in terms of an individual’s subjective sense of relative security or insecurity. The relative adaptiveness of children’s attachment behaviors relationships with caregivers hinges upon the degree to which both support individuals’ successful exploration and mastery of their environments rather than the merits of a specific behavior or relationship in of themselves (Sroufe & Waters, 1977).

Reproductive fitness or major problems of adaptation. Theoretical advances beginning in the mid-1960’s and early 1970’s gradually expanded Bowlby’s earliest conceptualizations of attachment systems’ (a) “exclusive focus on the differential survival of individuals” to (b) the concept of reproductive fitness, defined as the “differential reproduction of one’s genetic material- that is, being able to maximize the representation of one’s genes in future generations” (p. 116) and again to contemporary perspectives that view evolutionary development as targeting “the major problems of adaptation that humans were likely to have confronted throughout different stages of evolutionary history” (Simpson, 1999, p. 116). Modern’ theoretical perspectives view different patterns or styles of attachment, therefore, as “adaptive, ecologically contingent behavioral strategies that exist because they facilitate the basic functions that attachment systems evolved to serve, given different rearing environments” (Simpson, 1999, p. 117).

Affiliative System

The affiliative or sociable system represents a unique entity that exists both independently and in relationship to the primary attachment drives for proximity-maintenance that prioritize secondary attachment systems’ (i.e. exploratory, affiliative, and caregiving)
demands so that survival threats will always be addressed before the other systems’ can be addressed. Bowlby (1988) describes the affiliative system as “all manifestations of friendliness and goodwill, of the desire to do things in the company of other” that are not necessarily “directed toward one or a few particular figures” (p. 229). Cassidy defines ‘sociable system’ as the “organization of the biologically based, survival-promoting tendency to be sociable with others” (p. 9). Human relatedness is not considered to represent a novel emergent trait but instead "an element of a deep structure that became increasingly elaborated and refined under selective pressures." Derived from existent tendencies for humans to protect and care for their offspring (e.g. as emphasized in attachment theory, stressors experienced by early hunter-gather-societies from the prolonged dependency of the human neonate are hypothesized to have exerted pressures through processes of natural selection to trigger the altruistic reciprocity (e.g. pooling of resources) that led to human tendencies to seek a sense of relatedness to non-kin social group members (Wilson, 1993).

The hostile conditions encountered by early hominids in ancient environments triggered the activation of natural selection processes that pressured humans to seek- and to value- the kinds of cooperation (Stevens & Fiske, 1995) that would optimize chances of not only individual, but species-wide survival (Sheldon, Sheldon, & Osbaldiston, 1999). As humans began to coalesce with one another, they benefitted from enhanced adaptive benefits gained from sharing of physical (e.g. shelter, water, and food) resources, expenditures of resources (e.g. time, energy; Fiske, 1995), expertise (e.g. hunting, food-gathering, and child-rearing), and diminished exposures to individual and collective risk (e.g. mutual protection from predation).

The need for relatedness in humans has retained its own species-specific forms of expression, however, these expressions continue to undergo elaboration throughout biological
and cultural evolution (Ryan, 1993). Human drives for relatedness with others encountered in proximal social ecologies has expanded progressively from infant/maternal and mating dyads to youth friendships, small groups, tribal entities, and larger communities requiring increasingly complex levels of organization.

Although the nature of human relatedness has changed in form, variances in the relative advantages offered- and risks suffered have remained constant. While its purpose to secure human young from threats posed by predation assures the preeminent status of proximity-maintenance, Main (1999) notes the close alignment of affiliative system’s goals to respond to other types of perceived threats similarly associated with survival increases the likelihood of predation” (p. 852).

Contemporary analogies to risks associated with alienation from peer groups and broader school communities and their linkages to lethal violence in schools emphasizes the depth of the fury and pain that are associated with fears of failing to keep up “with nomadic ground-living primate troops” and the loss of potential “protection from injury and death stemming from attacks by other troop members” (Main 1999, p. 852). Groups characterized by greater levels of cohesion, cooperation, and order provide broader ranges and higher qualities of benefits to members that groups that do not (Stevens & Fiske, 1995). Separation from the forward-moving troop, like separation from the attachment figure, rapidly increases the perceived likelihood that individual may come to harm.

At the evolutionary level, positive associations between elevated levels of group cohesiveness and enhanced survival benefits experienced by groups and their individual members- accrue in proportion to the degrees to which individuals (a) experience a sense of connection, belonging, and relatedness to group members and (b) succeed in internalizing group
needs and goals, and (c) retain access to avenues for communication in order to maintain
effective functioning (Stevens & Fiske, 1995). Natural selection processes are posited to have
pressed the organization of evolutionary adaptations that prompted the onset of affective and
behavioral expressions through which early hominids first signaled their willingness and
commitment to join in assuming their share of cooperative tasks in order to gain access to mutual
benefits offered by group membership (Stevens & Fiske, 1995). Individual and collective
benefits were also realized with the triggering of motivational drives exerted by evolutionary
pressures upon youth- to internalize group knowledge, norms, and values, thereby, ensuring the
transmission of the groups’ successful practices to the next generation to secure their survival as
a renewable source of labor (Sheldon, Sheldon, & Osbaldiston, 1999).

The more robustly youths’ motivations to internalize group norms and cultural practices
contributed to individuals’ capacities for acquiring targeted resources (e.g. food, shelter, and
companionship) required for survival and positive adaptation, the more the groups to which they
belonged were likely to prosper- and the more their groups were likely to value and protect
individuals’ membership status. Groups that displayed greater capacities for communicating
effectively with one another, planning cooperative efforts, solving problems, and resolving
conflict were less likely to face risks posed by dissolution of their bonds and consequential losses
of mutually-shared benefits (e.g. protection from predation and attack; food-gathering, shelter
procurement, and child-rearing). Effective socialization of youth, therefore, included adult
modeling and scaffolding of these skills and providing opportunities for the young to practice
building competencies for enabling them to function both autonomously- and cooperatively in
their groups. Adult abilities to tailor socialization and instructional practices to specifically
match youths’ strengths enhanced their confidence and motivation for future learning.
Instructional efforts that were mismatched to youths’ unique genetic endowment thwarted their confidence and engagement in future learning and thereby put at risk- the value of their specific talents and their potential contribution to the group. Socialization practices that focused on building upon strengths and offsetting relative weaknesses by discovering unique contributions that youth could make ensured the discovering unique contributions that youth could make-served to optimize adaptational outcomes for the group and individuals alike.

**Caregiving System**

Bowlby describes the primary ethological goal of caregiver attachment *behavior* as the provision of protection for the child while the caregiving *system* is defined as the altruistic motive to meet the needs of individuals who are either chronically dependent or temporarily in need of care, protection, and/ or assistance necessary for the alleviation of distress (Bowlby, 1969). Researchers have postulated that the caregiving system belongs to a larger configuration of behavioral systems that exist independently from, while remaining developmentally and behaviorally linked to attachment (George & Solomon, 1996). According to Main (1999), Bowlby considers specific caregiving aspects of the “behavioral system seen in adults as directly complementary to infant attachment” (p. 846), however, the necessity of distinguishing attachment-caregiving mechanisms from other components of child-adult relationships (e.g. providing opportunities for play, modeling affect and behaviors, disciplining, teaching, and offering the provision of physical care) remain necessary for understanding the concept of attachment and its role in mediating behaviors within relationship.

**Variance in caregiving outcomes.** Throughout the span of development, the mental representations constructed by infants from early experiences with caregivers continue to influence individuals’ behaviors and expectations of self, other, and the nature of social
interaction- from childhood to roles as caregivers (Bowlby, 1969; 1982). Parenting behavior in humans is certain not the product of some unvarying parenting instinct, but nor is it reasonable to regard it as the product of simply of learning”. While the strength of the parental affectional bond may be linked to biological components of evolutionary functions, “the detailed form the behavior takes in each of us turns on our experiences- experiences during adolescence, experience before and during marriage, and expectations with each individual child” (Bowlby, 1982, p. 4). Models of self and other are inter-related within the caregiving system and, according to Bretherton (1987) cannot be conceptualized without reference to each other. Rejecting caregiving styles, for example, influence negative views of self and others and both sides of these negative relationships will be internalized and ultimately drawn upon to govern the ways in which individuals will respond as attachment figures to their own children (Ricks & Noyes, 1998).

George and Solomon’s (1999) conceptualization of caregiving employs a behavioral system process-approach emphasizing the developmental changes that occur between the child’s perspective of ‘being protected’ and the adult goal ‘to provide protection. To explore an understanding of the significance of the developmental shift from cared for to care-giving, George and Solomon assert (1999), is fundamental to understanding the meanings, motivations, and cultural difference associated with critical aspects of caregiving behavior. Such knowledge provides insight into the differential development of infant attachment; individual, cultural, and environmental constraints; mechanisms underlying intergenerational transmissions of patterns of attachment, and directions for guiding the design of interventions with caregivers of children ‘at risk.
Dimensions of individuality and reciprocity. Solomon and Main (1999) note the “extreme complexity” involved in determining outcomes surrounding variations of caregiving quality suggesting that the “information and affect that contribute to a parent’s response have more to do with the internal organization of his or her caregiving system than with the child’s cues or behavior” (p. 653). While the child’s attachment system is activated by “internal or external cues or stimuli associated with situations the child perceives as frightening, dangerous, or stressful” (p. 652). In similar fashion, the caregiving system is assumed to be activated by those internal and external cues associated with situations that the caregiver perceives as frightening, dangerous, or stressful for the child. George and Solomon (1999) identify situations that include but are not limited to separation, child endangerment, and the child’s verbal and nonverbal signals of discomfort and distress. “Once the caregiving system has been activated, the caregiver must ‘decide’ whether and how to behave. [Caregiver determinations are based upon] conscious and unconscious evaluation of competing sources of information ...” (p. 652) including the (a) caregiver’s evaluation of the child’s signals, (b) the caregiver’s own perception of danger or threat, (c) the caregiver’s evaluation of the context and personal past experiences both as a parent and a child, as well as the (d) caregiver’s relative cognitive abilities and level of maturity (Solomon & George, 1999).

 Structural conflicts of interest. In concordance with ethological theory (Hinde, 1982), emphasize the importance of examining the interaction between parental caregiving systems and other behavioral systems that may compete with providing care for a particular child (Bowlby, 1969/1982; Solomon & George, 1996; Stevenson-Hinde, 1994). Caregivers’ other behavioral systems include adult roles as friends (affiliative system), sexual partners (sexual systems), workers (exploratory systems), and child to his or her own parents (attachment system). Several
assumptions remaining fundamental to an evolutionary analyses of adaptation (i.e. reproductive fitness) are: (a) although caregiver and child have overlapping interests, they will also experience inherent and inevitable conflicts in interest (Belsky 1991; Solomon & George, 1996), (b) while children act to protect their own survival and reproductive success, caregivers’ fitness depends upon the fitness of all children for which an caregiver is responsible, (c) the quality of care provided by a caregiver is related to that individual’s capacity to maintain a dynamic balance between the need to provide protection and care and the need to pursue other goals, meet additional expectations, and fulfill other responsibilities (Solomon & George, 1996).

Bowlby (1969) recognized the presence of multiple relationships of significance in infants’ lives and observing, “almost from the first, many children have more than one figure to whom they direct attachment behaviors” (1969, p. 304). While the mother serves as the primary attachment figure in many societies, biological parents, older siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles, and other siblings are also likely to serve as attachment figures (Cassidy, 1999). The number of attachment figures is not unlimited, however, and is believed to be constrained to “a small hierarchy of major caregivers” (Bretherton, 1980, p. 195) as opposed to other meaningful social relationships comprising the infant’s social sphere of interactions (Weinraub, Brooks, & Lewis, 1977).

**Child monotropy.** The individual status of caregivers among infant’s multiple attachment figures varies, as children tend to maintain strong preferences for seeking comfort and security from a principal attachment figure when needed. Defined as *monotropy* by Bowlby (1969/1982), infants prefer to seek proximity and soothing from a single primary attachment figure when most distressed though they may derive comfort from others in the absence of the preferred primary caregiver (Rutter, 1990). Patterns surrounding infants’ monotropy may offer survival benefits
when the establishment of a strong primary relationship contributes to (a) an attachment figure’s assumption of responsibility for a single child, (b) diminished likelihood that caregivers with multiple offspring “might leave any individual child-falling between the cracks, and (c) enhanced efficiency “when faced with danger the child does not have to make a series of quick assessments about who must be readily available, most responsive, and best suited to help” (Cassidy, 1999, p. 15).

**Stability and change.** Once established, interaction patterns (whether their nature and quality is satisfactory or unsatisfactory to the individuals involved) tend to persist “in part because each member expects the other to behave in a certain way and each, as a rule, cannot avoid eliciting in the other whatever behavior is expected, if only that the behavior is the customary response to the other. Expectations tend to be confirmed, therefore, leading to processes where customary patterns achieve a stability of their own, independent of each partner considered separately” (David & Appell, 1966, as cited in Bowlby, 1982, p. 348). “While stable in nature, evidence has also confirmed that persistent patterns within early attachment relationships between caregivers and children can be “materially changed by events occurring in subsequent years” (p. 348). Events that precipitate caregiver responses to become more perceptive and accepting of child’s attachment behavior may greatly reduce the intensity of negative behaviors, increasing the ease with which the caregiver can meet the child’s attachment needs.

**Ethological Aspects of Caregiving**

Contemporary evolutionary, anthropological, and archeological assumptions surrounding human caregiving (Edgerton, 1992) are grounded in premises surrounding early human’ environments of evolutionary adaptedness (EEA) are suggesting that individual ecologies varied
widely (Belsky, 1999) across the dimensions of time and geography and were most likely “neither uniform nor benign” (Chisholm, 1996, p. 14). Research findings from developmental psychology (McLoyd, 1990), primatology (Rosenblum & Paully, 1984), and anthropology (Scheper-Hughes, 1992) converge to suggest positive relationships between caregiving sensitivity, availability and quality of resources, and degrees of survival risks presented by variances among the differing ecological niches inhabited by early hominids (Belsky, 1999).

From this perspective, attachment theorists emphasize that the evolution of caregiving styles that resulted in the ultimate promotion or failure of children’s survival would have been additionally constrained and/or determined by environmental factors such as the distribution of resources and environmental hazards (Kaplan, 1996). “Under the diverse conditions in which hominids evolved, it ... is reasonable to presume that no pattern of attachment was primary, and others secondary, but rather that what evolved was a repertoire of attachment behaviors that could be flexibly organized into different patterns contingent on caregiving and ecological conditions” (Belsky, 1999, p. 143).

Specific characteristics of attachment behaviors do not in themselves, therefore, represent the final end-goals of evolutionary processes but the “ability to organize those behaviors into a pattern that fit the rearing conditions and in so doing promoted evolutionary fitness- not just survival” (p. 143). “Infants, of course, do not have the cognitive ability to appraise the ‘quality’ of local environmental conditions [e.g., whether the local environment is safe, plentiful, and rich in resources vs. threatening, harsh, and impoverished]. However, they do have the ability to discern whether their caregivers are providing them with the level of sensitivity, responsiveness, and attention dictated by their developmental needs” (Simpson, 1999, p. 125).
Attachment Research Traditions: Empirical Evidence for Evolutionary Perspectives

Ethological studies have linked caregiving and affiliative processes to a broad range of developmental outcomes among non-human primates suggesting significant parallels for understanding expanded understanding of human growth and social development. Variations in the quality of caregiving among primates have been linked to unfavorable outcomes, both short and long-term, across behavioral and physiological domains (Rosenblum et al, 1994). Rosenblum (1999) manipulated the food supply of normal bonnet macaque monkey mothers to require marked increases in the time and effort of maternal foraging in order to acquire adequate food supplies. Main (1999) described the long-term effects on mothers’ infants as “...striking: The infants of these mothers were submissive, unsuccessful in affiliation, and vulnerable to depression.

Behavioral outcomes based upon the ethological assumptions underlying attachment theory have been supported in studies confirming the presence of permanent alterations found in social mammals’ serotonergic and noradrenergic pathways (Amini et al.’s (1999) study has offered interpretations describing the constitution of social mammals’ nervous systems as a number of homeostatic loops that require continuous “external output in order for homeostasis to be maintained. “The manner in which this input is achieved is through social contact and biobehavioral synchrony attained with attachment figures” (Field, 1985). The attachment relationship, from this perspective, is postulated to function as a “crucial organizing regulator of normal neurophysiology for social mammals” (as cited in Main, 1999, p. 867). Kraemer (1992) observes “the attachment system is not only an organizing feature of basic neurophysiologic function, but the central organizing system of the brain of higher social mammals” (as cited in Main, 1999, p. 884) Levels of social adaptation within the affiliative system have been linked in
studies examining relationships among the quality of caregiving among primates and unfavorable outcomes, both long and short-term, across a broad spectrum of behavioral and physiological domains. When viewed from attachments evolutionary perspective, Harlow’s research offers evidence of the importance of the affiliative system in studies examining the developmental effects upon young monkeys of being raised with their mothers but without interaction with peers. The social development of young monkeys who were denied contact with peers was significantly impacted in young adulthood with adolescent and adult monkeys exhibiting impairment in abilities to mate, reproduce, and care for their young (Miller, Caul, & Mursley, 1967). Hinde (1974) posited the “crucial adaptive importance” of nonhuman primates’ play with peers due to the vast amount of “time and energy” directed to this activity. Bowlby (1969) emphasized differences between humans as ground-living primates and other mammals that serve to heighten the importance of relying upon attachment figures in providing infants “primary solution to situations involving danger and fright” (p. 290).

**Physiological Attunement**

Results from contemporary attachment studies utilizing more rigorous research designs continue to support early attachment theorists’ findings from observational studies. Sethre-Hofstad, Stansbury and Rice’s (2002) controlled study examined the degree to which mothers’ adrenocortical fluctuations ‘matched’ their children’s responses to exposures to a series of novel tasks of which some were relatively benign (assembling a puzzle with mother) and others were potentially stress-provoking (walking across a balance beam under a stranger’s supervision). The researchers hypothesized that adult sensitivity would act as a moderating factor in the concordance of adult/child responses to the child’s engagement in a challenging task. The study used Ainsworth’s maternal sensitivity scale (Ainsworth et al., 1978) to assess the temporal,
contiguous, and synchronous nature of maternal behaviors during the non-threatening task
mother and child assembling a puzzle together. Mother-child interaction quality was rated after
the dyad’s completion of the puzzle-assembly teaching activity for (a) appropriateness of
mothers’ responses, (b) levels of engagement, (c) consistency, (d) intrusiveness; (e)
preoccupation with own (maternal) needs, and (f) modification of instructions to meet the child’s
needs, ideas, and/or affective state. Mothers next observed their children on a monitor as
experimenters supervised children’s attempts in learning how to walk across a balance beam.
Mother/child saliva samples (utilizing standard procedures recognized for use with young
children and adults (Gunnar, 1991) were taken before and after the balance beam activity,
following which mothers completed written reports describing their own affect/comfort level as
well as maternal perceptions of child’s affect/comfort level during the completion of the beam
task. The study’s results confirmed Gunnar’s hypothesis suggesting that highly sensitive mothers
would demonstrate (a) higher degrees of physiological and behavioral attunement with their
children, (b) greater accuracy in describing their children’s emotional responses to the beam task,
and (c) maternal attunement (mothers’ own responses) to children’s emotional responses. The
mechanisms explaining less sensitive mothers’ responses in this study were less conclusive as to
relationships between accuracy in recognizing and interpreting child’s experiences and
attunement of physiological responses. The research suggests, however, that caregiver sensitivity
allows adults to perceive, interpret, and empathize (as measured in mirroring patterns of
child/mother cortical responses) with children’s experiencing of challenging, stress-provoking
situations representing a type of one-to-one correspondence.

In extending exploration of the linkages between adrenocortical activity and child/mother
relationships, Sethre-Hofstad et al. (2002) suggested that the study’s findings offer insight into
understanding how individual differences in “mothers’ ability to teach, model, and facilitate the use of efficient coping for young children” may moderate the impact of environmental stressors of a challenging nature. Specifically, adults who are “less attuned to their children may expose them to situations with which they are not ready to cope. If stress and coping failure, as many have suggested, leads to adrenocortical activation (Gunnar et al., 1996), such children might more frequently experience adrenocortical surges, or maintain higher-than-normal cortisol levels” (p. 740).

Social Contingency

Main (1999) has suggested the need for studies examining the mechanisms under which attachment relationships are formed across varying caregiving contexts and the frequency, quality, and degree to which children perceive interactions with significant adults to be socially contingent. Main describes a study originally intended to investigate the earliest age at which infants could be operantly conditioned, Watson (1972) determined that 2-month old infants were beginning to exhibit ‘preattachment behaviors’ (e.g. exhibiting heightened attentions such as smiling and cooing) to electronically-programmed mobiles that hung over their cribs. As opposed to the control condition where the mobiles turned for the same length of time and at similar intervals, experimental mobiles were programmed to move in a contingent manner that exactly mirrored infants’ head movements (responding to electronically-responsive air pillows). Parents described their infants were “so entranced with the contingently turning mobiles that they would entertain themselves with them for many hours. In anecdotal reports, one developmentally delayed infant was described as behaving ‘depressed’ at the removal of the mobile, and appeared ‘angry’ upon its return” (p. 848) leading Watson to conclude that the strength and appeal of ‘contingent social interaction’ was sufficient for inducing infants to bond
with the mechanized mobiles (Main, 1999). The study was discontinued for ethical reasons suggesting potential risks to infants exhibiting strong preferences (e.g. signs of rage) for engaging with the perfectly-contingent electronic mobile instead of their less acutely-attuned parental figures.

The Study of Attachment

The following sections describe the evolution of attachment theory’s research traditions and their study of human behaviors within significant interpersonal relationships. As Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) classic model has been described by Woodhouse et al. (2003) as “an historical way point in the development of attachment research,” each of the following bodies of research continue to expand understanding and contemporary views of attachment systems and their roles in interpersonal relationships (p. 396).

Child-Caregiver Relationship Quality

The secure-base concept and the preferential seeking of a trusted care-giver under stress are central in an organizational definition of attachment (Ainsworth, 1974). The existence of an attachment bond allows the infant to derive security as well as feel affection for the caregiver. While possessing strong exploratory and affiliative tendencies, infants are, as well, often wary of novel situations (Bretherton & Ainsworth, 1974). When exploratory activities are disrupted by unfamiliar and/or distressing stimuli within a learning environment, children’s capacity to return and resume full-engagement in their learning environments are expected to occur only after children have successfully established contact with a trusted caregiver within an existing relationship that is characterized by perceptions of the mutual expression of affection (Tracy, Lamb, & Ainsworth, 1976). The familiarity derived from countless interactions, continued exposure, and coordination of reciprocal behavior patterns, “would become a source of security
(or insecurity)... that is highly portable and which ultimately could be internalized” (p. 1188).

From an attachment perspective, variations in caregivers’ availability and competencies in reliably providing sensitive and responsive care are hypothesized to lead to individual differences in the security children derive from significant relationships with the caregivers in their lives (Sroufe & Waters, 1977).

Bowlby formulated the theoretical frameworks underlying attachment from a synthesis of numerous researchers’ observational studies of infant-mother interactions. Attachment studies have focused upon specific aspects of maternal sensitivity (Ainsworth, Sroufe, & DeWolf) including attuned co-regulation (Fogel, 1993) and repair of mismatch (Schore, 1996) that have been linked to secure attachment (DeWolff & van IJzendoorn, 1997), overall well-being (Thompson, 1999), and decreased risks for behavioral problems and psychopathology (Sroufe & Rutter, 1994). Traditions in attachment research have continued to build upon foundations established by Bowlby’s seminal work synthesizing multiple researchers’ observational studies of infant-mother interactions, to refine researchers’ understanding of patterns within caregiving quality across a broad spectrum of settings.

Early research efforts (Bowlby, 1982) focused upon the timing, intensity, and degree of match between caregiver responses and infant signals; mothers’ regulation of the environment so that infants perceived a sense of autonomy and competence, the expression of ‘mutual delight’ that caregivers and children experienced in one another’s company (Ainsworth & Wittig, 1969) and the degree to which infant social initiatives generated predictable, reciprocal exchanges with caregivers (David & Appell, 1966; Sander, 1964).

**Reciprocity.** Traditional attachment theorists have focused upon associations between the varying levels of reciprocity that characterize individual child/caregiver relationships and
emotional and social developmental outcomes for children (Bowlby, 1958). Bowlby (1988) observed relationships between infant development and early maternal responses that reflect mothers’ subtle recognition and acknowledgements of their infants’ autonomy. Bowlby (1988) emphasized the reciprocal nature of attachment processes in acknowledging that differences among children will interact with caregivers’ styles and temperaments to influence mutual patterns of interaction. When caregiver’s responses are tuned to correspond with their infants’ spontaneous interest in their environments, a shared positive experience is the likely outcome. Finely tuned maternal responses not only support infants’ sense of contentment but also form the foundation upon the sense of shared experience evolves between caregiver and child. Studies suggest that established patterns of shared experiences with caregivers, especially when linked with the expression of positive affect, represent early stages of behaviors that may lead to the development of cooperation as children continue to mature.

**Synchrony.** Described as synchrony, a significant aspect of the quality of caregivers’ responses is determined by the degree to which caregivers remain attuned to the unique patterning and naturally occurring rhythms embedded within individual child’s behavioral repertoires. The reciprocal ‘dance’ between mother and neonate has been noted in numerous cross-cultural studies (Brazelton, Koslowski, & Main, 1974; Sander, 1977; Schaffer, 1979; Stern, 1977, 1985) where ‘sensitive’ mothering has been observed as a calibration of maternal behaviors to “mesh” (p. 7) with the pace, intensity, and rhythm of infants’ autonomous initiation of, and withdrawal from, interactions with caregivers. “Timing, contingency, and synchrony” are relevant features when considering the quality within child-caregiver relationships where what a child does will change the caregiver’s response, and that response from the caregiver “will modify the child’s experience” (Hofer, 1981, p. 213), creating a mutual bidirectionality that is
both “complex and reciprocal” (Sethre-Hofstad et al., 2002, p. 731). Sethre-Hofstad et al. (2002) describes ‘behaviorally attuned’ adult/child relationships as ‘highly sensitive’ interactions characterized by mutually “bidirectional, appropriate, synchronous, and contingent responses” (p. 731). The authors differentiate patterns of attuned (i.e. both parties engage in bidirectional interactions in which each influences the other’s subsequent responses) behaviors from enmeshed (i.e. neither party in a dyad can function without the other) behavior or mirrored (i.e. one party’s behaviors simply reflects mirror-images of the other’s behaviors) behaviors. Bowlby (1988) references Kaye’s study (1977) examining the autonomous rhythms that characterize infant initiation and withdrawal from interaction with caregivers. Bowlby describes the “precise synchrony” (1988, p, 9) embedded within reciprocal maternal responses to infants during breastfeeding interactions where mothers remains quiet and inactive as infants are sucking and begin to speak quietly and stroke infants when there is a pause in infants’ sucking. Studies have documented similar patterns of reciprocity between mothers and infants across multiple settings such as visual tracking of brightly colored objects (Collis & Schaffer, 1977) and the pausing and turn-taking occurring within preverbal vocal exchanges (Schaffer, Collis, & Parsons (1977) among mothers and groups of children, age 12 to 24 months.

Mary Ainsworth expanded on Bowlby's original theory, contributing the concept of the caregiver as a secure base from which the infant explores the environment as well as examining the role played by levels of caregiver sensitivity in the development of infants’ attachment patterns. Ainsworth augmented Bowlby's theoretical approaches with the development of an experimental protocol known as the ‘strange situation’ for assessing attachment status in one-year-olds (Ainsworth, 1982; Ainsworth et al., 1978). The strange situation is a 24-minute laboratory procedure that involves observing the infant in a comfortable but unfamiliar room
with and without the child’s mother, with the mother and a stranger, with the stranger alone, and alone without an adult across a series of 3-minute episodes. Infant and mothers’ interactions were observed and infants’ responses to the mild stress of separation within the varied contexts were classified. Ainsworth et.al (1978) have noted that infants whose mothers responded sensitively to their signals during the first year of life not only cry less ... than do babies of less responsive mothers but are more willing to fall in with their parents’ wishes.

Bowlby describes Yarrow’s (1963) observations of 40 infants during the first six months of life noting a range in the quality of maternal engagement and frequency of caregiving behaviors from highly responsive, almost continuous interactions to caregivers who ignored infants’ initiatives and failed to offer any response. Early studies found strong associations between infants’ capacity to cope with frustration at six month of age and the extent/degree to which caregivers (a) engaged in physical contact, (b) matched own behavior to child’s characteristics and rhythms, (c) offered effective soothing, (d) stimulated and encouraged social responses, expression of needs, or developmental progress, (e) offered materials and experiences that matched child’s individual capacities, and (f) exhibited positive feelings (frequency and intensity) toward child. Bowlby (1982) noted that while all correlation coefficients were + 0.50 or greater, the extent to which caregivers adapted themselves to children’s rhythms and levels of development were the highest.

According to Bowlby(1982) “the ordinary sensitive mother is quickly attuned to her infants’ natural rhythms and, by attending the details of his behavior, discovers what suits him and behaves accordingly. For although initially his capacity to adapt is limited, it is not absent altogether and if allowed to grow in its own time, is soon yielding rewards ...” (p.7), Bowlby
(1982) concludes that “human infants ... are preprogrammed to develop in a socially cooperative degree; whether they do so or not turns in high degree on how they are treated” (p. 9).

**Adult Attachment Measures: Typologies vs. Dimensions**


Hazan and Shaver (1987) described three attachment prototypes as a) *avoidant* “I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others: I find it difficult to trust them completely; difficult to allow myself to depend on them. I am nervous when anyone gets too close, and often, love partners want me to be more intimate than I am comfortable being”; b) *anxious-ambivalent*: “I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I often worry that my partner doesn’t really love me or won’t want to stay with me. I want to get very close to my partner, and this sometimes scares people away; and c) *secure: I find it relatively easy to get close to others and am comfortable depending on them. I don’t often worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close to me.” Hazan and Shaver’s original measure (1987) was followed by “a steady stream of variants and extensions” (Bartholomew & Shaver, 1998) resulting in multiple measures representing considerably diverse approaches to the study of attachment phenomena.
Four Prototypes

Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) describe the existence of four generalized patterns associated with individuals’ individual internal working models, classified as styles or prototypes (secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful). These internal working models can be broadly dichotomized along a continuum representing individual models of self and other. Each working model is characterized by affective, behavioral, and cognitive patterns in the way that individuals “perceive, interpret, and respond” (Pietromonaco & Barrett, 1997, p. 1409) within interactions of self and other. Over time a multitude of studies contributed to the gradual emergence of what became a commonly-held assumption that attachment styles or patterns represented discrete behaviors that could be observed, conceptualized and later analyzed as distinctly separate “categories” or “types”. In an effort to clarify both the nature and relative benefits and limitations of the numerous measures used in researchers’ varied approaches to attachment, Brennan, Clark & Shaver (1998) conducted a large-sample study with over 1,000 participants to examine a compilation of all of the extant measures designed to assess 60 named attachment-related constructs. A principal components-analysis on the responses produced two essentially independent factors corresponding to (a) the original (Ainsworth et al., 1978) dimensions of avoidance e.g. discomfort with closeness and dependence on others, and anxiety e.g. fear of abandonment and failure to explore one’s environment, and (b) and the four-category (Bartholomew & Horwitz, 1991) conceptualization of attachment organized around models of self and models of other

Brennan et al.’s (1998) findings determined that patterns within adult attachment are best conceptualized as two orthogonal dimensions: avoidance and anxiety. The two-dimensional empirical and conceptual structures underlying attachment orientations were articulated further
when researchers “realized that a two-dimensional space makes room for four rather than three quadrants or conceptual patterns” (Brennan, et al., 1998, p. 49). The fourth category added to Brennan et al.’s three styles was identified as avoidant-anxious representing a mixed pattern that had been identified earlier by researchers (Cittenden, 1988; Main & Solomon, 1990) as a “disorganized, disoriented” pattern in work with infant/caregiver dyads from troubled and abusive families (Brennan, et al, 1998).

**Two Dimensions/Four-Style Analyses**

Brennan, Clark, and Shaver (1998) have asserted that the four attachment prototypes exist within a region of two-dimensional space, described as avoidance (self-reliance/discomfort with closeness) and anxiety (Need for approval/fear of rejection. Attachment anxiety is represented within a negative model of self with a positive view of others. Avoidance is characterized by Brennan et al. (1998) as a positive view of self and a negative view of others. Secure attachment is conceptualized by low scores on both of the avoidant and anxiety axes. Variances in individuals’ scores indicating low- anxiety and avoidance (i.e. secure) or elevated scores in combinations of anxiety, avoidance, and/or both are represented in three additional adult attachment styles described as anxious-preoccupied, dismissive avoidant, and fearful avoidant. Relative to the current study, the SPSS-scoring procedures for Brennan et al.’s (1998) instrument, The Experiences in Close Relationships (ECRS), provides for the categorization of avoidant/attachment scores into discrete attachment styles (abbreviated as secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissing).

The secure attachment style described by Ainsworth’s infant/mother observational studies corresponds to secure attachment styles in adults. The anxious-preoccupied style in adults corresponds to the anxious/ambivalent style in children. A single avoidant attachment style in
children, however, corresponds to two distinct types in adults, the dismissive-avoidant and fearful avoidant styles.

**Attachment Styles and Strategies**

Mirroring their counterpart for infants and children, adult attachment systems are configured surrounding the dual goals of achieving and maintaining an individual’s perceived sense of security and/or protection. These attachment goals depend upon individuals’ recognitions of real or imagined perceptions of threat. As with infants and children, once activated adult attachment systems remain active until perceptions of security are restored. Deactivating the ‘primary’ attachment strategy for ensuring security among adults will occur when individuals obtain either actual or symbolic proximity to an attachment figure. While infants expressed attachment behaviors occur in the form of non-verbal or motor expressions of need or distress, adult attachment does not require the presence of physical proximity to a trusted figure, relying instead upon the activation of comforting mental representations or even self-representations associated with these partners (Mikulincer & Berant, 2008). The attachment-relevance of any given interaction within relationships exists when interactions involving familiar figures occur within the context of a stressful situation in which expectations of comfort, protection, or support are literally or symbolically present. The knowledge of the presence of a reliably responsive caregiver upon which one can rely if needed provides adults, as children, with a secure base from which other behavioral systems may be activated (exploratory, affiliative, caregiving).

Researchers have studied differences among attachment styles and relationships to individuals’ beliefs and expectations surrounding close interpersonal interactions, cognitive and behavioral orientations when facing conflict, and patterns in the recognition and self-disclosure
of strong affect (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Attachment styles are associated with different behavior/strategies/approaches involved in managing negative affect within interpersonal relationships. Patterns within the internal working models of attachment styles have been specifically linked with the regulation, control, and mitigation of negative affect; and to differentially predict both relationship status and stability (Mikulincer, Gillath, Halevy, Avihou, Avidan, Eschkoli, 2001).

Researchers have integrated Bowlby’s (1982/1969, 1973) early theoretical findings along with the work of Ainsworth (1991) to offer an expanded model of the interactional dynamics associated with the activation of the attachment system (Cassidy & Kobak, 1988; Fraley & Shaver, 2000; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002). According to Mikulincer and Orbach (1995), conceptualizations of adult attachment styles are “defined on the bases of negative emotional experiences that demand affect regulation” and individuals classified as either securely or insecurely attached are hypothesized to differ in the ways they respond to and manage multiple affective dimensions within interpersonal relationships. Adult attachment research continues to build upon knowledge of the processes and mechanisms operating within differing attachment styles that contribute to individuals’ approaches to regulating “their emotional worlds”, defending themselves against negative affective states, and cognitive processing of the emotional experiences of anxiety, sadness, and anger (Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995, p. 918).

In disrupting an individual’s sense of security, perceptions of insecurity will actively prioritize possible behavioral responses, overpowering less primary drives such as exploration, affiliation, and caregiving in favor of those behaviors that will most directly address perceived threats and restore a sense of safety (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003). “Insecure individuals, or anyone suffering from a moment or period of security, are occupied or preoccupied with
confronting the distress-eliciting situation and thus have fewer resources available for exploring the environment... Only when relief is attained and security restored can people direct energies to activities that broaden their perspectives and skills. Moreover, with confidence that support is available when needed, people can take risks and engage in autonomy-promoting activities [that] facilitate the development of autonomy and individuality and promote self-actualization” (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003, p. 84-85).

The current study proposes attachment theory’s relevance for addressing the complex relational factors embedded within widening diversity and achievement gaps among students and concerns surrounding negative climate issues in contemporary schools to increase understanding surrounding associations between teacher-student relationships and their potential to enhance or detract from interpersonal dynamic in the classroom. This proposal suggests that attachment theory provides a parallel perspective for linking findings from child/caregiver (attachment theory’s proximity-maintenance) studies to the learning (exploratory system) and social (affiliative system) environments in today’s schools.

Research comparing teacher/student relationships to child/attachment figure relationships has established linkages to common interactional elements shared among relationships between teachers and their students and the nature and quality of attachment-relevant dynamics found within attachment theory’s caregiving system. Levels of teacher availability, responsiveness, and sensitivity in accurately assessing and responding to the unique needs of individual students will be considered from attachment theory’s constructs describing caregivers’ roles as the provision of a ‘safe haven’ and ‘secure base’ while supporting children in learning about and mastering their social and physical worlds. As such the unavailability of teachers may compound not only students’ distress upon encountering threats in the classroom, but force the
decision, whether conscious or unconscious, about the viability of seeking proximity to their teachers as a means of self-regulation and protection (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002).

Baldwin’s (1997) conceptualizations of relational schemas for describing dependency, closeness, and trust within relationships has been characterized as an “IF-Then” proposition: (a) If threatened, seek proximity and protection from an attachment figure (i.e. teacher) perceived to be stronger and wiser, (b) If an attachment figure/teacher is available and supportive, it is safe to relax and enjoy the comfort and assurance of perceived care and security- and confidently return to other activities (secure attachment style), and (c) If an attachment figure/teacher is unavailable, either intensify efforts to achieve proximity and comfort (anxious attachment style)- or deactivate the attachment system (avoidant attachment style). In this manner it is expected that teachers, paralleling adult studies in general attachment literature, whose early caregiving experiences repeatedly confirmed the messages that others and the world in general can not be trusted for the reliable provision of safety, comfort and support may develop secondary attachment-related responses described as hyperactivating or deactivating patterns of affect regulation (Cassidy & Kobak, 1988). The following section describes secure, anxious, and avoidant attachment styles and associated attachment strategies characterized as secure, hyperactivating, and deactivating approaches for appraising self, others, and relationships; and coping mechanisms utilized in the management of distress and conflict.

Secure Attachment

Early attachment research established that upon reunion with mothers following a brief separation; secure infants actively seek proximity or contact with mothers, are soothed by their presence, and once comforted by their mothers, return easily to play (Ainsworth, Blehar, & Waters & Wall, 1978). When individuals have developed a pervasive sense of security
surrounding the knowledge that a relationship partner will be available in times of need, individuals are characterized as ‘securely’ attached. Attachment security is embodied within individuals’ global perceptions that the world is a safe place, others can be relied upon in times of need, and that it is possible to explore one’s physical and social environment and engage in rewarding interactions with others (Bowlby, 1985). Secure internal working models are conceptualized within attachment theory as evolving from individuals’ recurring confirmation that proximity-seeking results in protection, support and reduction of distress (Ainsworth, Blehar, & Waters & Wall, 1978). Individuals’ positive affirmations of attachment figures’ reliable availability, literal and/or symbolic, lead to an overall sense of attachment security and related set of strategies for the regulation of affect.

**Secure appraisals: self, others, relationships.** Warm, open, and flexible patterns within family communication patterns during childhood in which emotional experiences are acknowledged, expressed, and valued are associated with securely-attached individuals’ high levels of empathy (Mikulincer et al, 2001) exhibition of altruism among young children and responsiveness to others’ expressions of need and/or distress (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2001). Main & Goldwyn (1993) classify secure adults as autonomous individuals who value attachment figures’ presence in their lives and view them as significant influences in their personality development. In a study of freshman college students, individuals who were classified as securely attached/autonomous described their own maternal relationships as nurturing, protective, affectionate, and encouraging of an internal locus of control throughout early development (Katkovsky, Crandall & Good, 1967). College students who were classified as securely attached reported their own self-esteem as higher throughout childhood (Cassidy, 1988), greater perceptions of parental security in adolescence (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987), and were
described by college peers as currently more ego-resilient, less anxious and less hostile (Kobak & Sceery, 1988).

Represented by individuals scoring relatively low on attachment anxiety and avoidance dimensions (Morris-Rothschild & Brassard, 2006), secure attachment prototypes are characterized by high perceptions of self-worth, positive representations of others, and optimistic beliefs and expectations surrounding close interpersonal relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1985). Secure attachment styles in adults correspond with secure attachment style in children (Pietromonaco & Barrett, 2000). Secure attachment is associated with individual reports of self-organization schemas that are highly differentiated and integrated, providing access to both positive and negative self-attributions, low discrepancies between ideal- and actual-self (Mikulincer, 1995); and low bias rates among appraisals of self (Mikulincer, 1998).

In their study examining the role of attachment security upon perceptions of personal threat experienced during social interactions, Mikulincer and Horesh (1999) observed secure individuals’ appraisals of others to be relatively free from biases emerging from projective mechanisms and suggested that attachment security may reduce attachment-related threats and thereby reduce individuals’ defensive needs to project negative self-views and unwanted self-aspects onto others. Researchers suggest that attachment security provides for the enhanced capacity, not only to tolerate ambiguities and contradictions within one’s self-view but for the tendency to extend greater acceptance upon encountering inconsistencies exhibited within others (Mikulincer & Horesh, 1999) and the demonstration of higher levels of empathic responses to others in need (Mikulincer et al, 2001; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2001) exhibited by securely-attached individuals.
Coping mechanisms. Securely attached individuals are able ‘internalize’ the roles of security-enhancing attachment figures in their lives, transforming those models to add to their own “personal strength and resilience” (p. 83). Described by Fredrickson (2001) as a ‘broaden and build’ cycle of attachment security, secure strategies function to enhance an individuals’ capacity for maintaining mental health under stressful circumstances and expanding personal perspectives and overall capacities. Securely-attached individuals’ strategies have been referred to as “constructive, flexible, and reality-tuned mechanisms” (p. 82) that functioning effectively in reducing emotional distress and promoting optimal emotional and social development (Mikulincer, Shaver & Pereg; 2003).

Described as constructive coping (Epstein & Meier, 1989), securely-attached individuals actively initiate attempts to addresses sources of distress, manage problematic situations, and restore equanimity without creating socioemotional side-effect through the maintenance of positive attitudes and effective mental functioning in distressing situations (Collins & Read, 1994; Mikulincer, 1995, Mikulincer & Florian, 1998). Secure attachment, according to Mikulincer and Shaver (2003) inhibits maladaptive means of coping, ruminative and passive emotion-focused strategies, withdrawal and escapist strategies, and primitive defense mechanisms that distort perceptions and escalate the potential for interpersonal conflict.

As compared to anxious and avoidant attachment styles; the effectiveness of secure attachment strategies’ is linked to stress-buffering effects embedded within the combination of secure individuals’ problem-focused approaches, favorable appraisals of self and others, optimistic expectations for positive outcomes, and high levels of personal self-efficacy (Fraley & Shaver, 1997).

Management of distress. Based upon past experiences with caregivers who sensitively
perceived, accurately interpreted, and competently responded to childhood signals of need and/or distress, develop secure internal working models which include individual beliefs that turning to others when threatened is both an appropriate and effective route towards enhanced coping (Waters, Rodríguez & Ridgeway, 1998). Secure individuals' coping strategies emerge from associations between responsive patterns of interactions and early experiences linked to positive personal and relational outcomes (Mikulincer, 1998) leading to stable assumptions valuing mutual benefits to be gained in both receiving and providing emotional and/or instrumental support from significant others when needed (Berant et al., 2001) within close relationships. Individual expectations include beliefs that expressing distress is likely to elicit supportive responses from others and that assistance provided by others is likely to facilitate the reduction of stress and removal of obstacles in one’s life (Mikulincer & Florian, 1998). Secure individuals are comfortable with self-disclosing personal information and sharing accounts of negative affective experiences (Fuendeling, 1998) without increasing perceptions of their own vulnerability, failure, or dependence upon others. A study examining the impact of attachment styles upon Israeli youth’s reaction to the real-life stressors associated with missile attacks near their residences (Mikulincer et al., 1993) described securely attached youth as experiencing lower levels of posttraumatic stress after seeking support from others.

**Management of conflict.** Securely attached individuals utilize more proactive approaches in the management of conflict, maintain expectations that conflict may be resolved in a manner that is favorable to all involved parties, believe that effective problem-solving can result in the restoration of equanimity without negative social side-effects, and remain committed to relational repair (Mikulincer, 1998). A secure relational history provides the foundation for securely-attached individuals preferences for (a) approaching others in relationship to (b) valuing
the acknowledgement, disclosure, and expression of emotions; (c) responding sensitively to others’ disclosures, (d) maintaining non-defensive stances (e) that provide access to evaluating their own roles in contributing to relational stressors, (f) build upon lesson learned from past relational negativity, and (g) remain committed to relational repair (Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995). Secure individuals can elaborate on negative memories, describe how they have come to terms with relational negativity in their pasts, and provide relevant examples in demonstrating how they worked through painful events to arrive at more positive outcomes (Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995).

In a study examining the recall of highly emotional experiences (Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995), securely-attached undergraduate students reported less anxiety and were able to maintain access with more positive memories to in order to minimize the tendency to become overwhelmed. Securely-attached individuals tended to refrain from attributing more stable and global attribution of cause to distressing events allowing them to ‘encapsulate’ negative memories and prevent their spread to other people, situations, and relationships (Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995).

Management of dissimilarities and novel situations. Openness to exploring new stimuli, environments, and relationships may underlie securely-attached individuals’ tendencies toward reporting lower levels of hostility towards outgroup members (Mikulincer, 1997) as erroneous assumptions made from initial appraisals of others may be revised with the addition of new information or subsequent knowledge (Mikulincer & Arad, 1999) gained through increased familiarity with individuals and/or contexts. Secure individuals’ openness towards others is also associated with lower scores on cognitive closure, dogmatic thinking, and tendencies towards making stereotype-based judgments. Predisposed to view others favorably with lower levels of
personal bias and distortion, secure individuals generally attribute hostility to others only in the presence of clear and contextual evidence of hostile intent (Mikulincer, 1998).

**Anxious Attachment**

Attachment anxiety’s origins are rooted in individuals’ perceptions that attachment figures are intermittently available, but only unreliably so resulting in individuals’ experience of a partial reinforcement schedule that appears to reward overt and persistent attempts to gain attention. Individuals scoring high on attachment anxiety are guided by persistent efforts to achieve increased proximity to attachment figures in order to satisfy perceptions of need for attention, protection, and support (Mikulincer & Berant, 2008). Attachment anxiety reflects a strong desire for closeness and protection, persistent and intense worries that a partner will be unavailable if needed, accompanied by feelings of low personal worthiness.

**Anxious appraisals: self, others, relationships.** Anxiously-attached individuals tend to adopt intense strategies involving persistent approaching of one’s partner in an attempt to elicit frequent signs of care, involvement, and support. Relationships are marked by overdependence upon one’s partner as a source of support and protection (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002). Clinging-like responses and other cognitive and behavioral efforts are consistently aimed at minimizing distance from significant relationships (Shaver & Hazan, 1993).

Individuals who score highly on the anxiety dimension of attachment tend to overemphasize others’ unreliability and their own sense of helplessness in situations where an attachment figure is absent. These ‘hyperactivating’ (i.e. acutely sensitivity in appraising stimuli for potential activation of attachment systems) strategies require individuals’ constant vigilance, concern, and effort until attachment figures are perceived as available and security has been reestablished. Anxiously-attached individuals maintain a hypervigilant approach to relationships,
operating continually to exaggerate the primary attachment security-seeking strategies, remain overly dependent upon partners, and chronically preoccupied with concerns surrounding potential relational loss, risk, and/or distress (Mikulincer 1990, 1993; Shaver & Hazan, 1993). “The psychological cost of recognizing the non-viability of proximity seeking is so great that the person searches for even minimal signals of availability or interest and either pleads or expresses anger when they are not forthcoming” (Mikulincer, et al.,1993, p. 97). Insecure relationships characterized as anxious are commonly described by individuals as enmeshed, entangled, and obsessive with individuals reporting strong physical attraction and desires for union with attachment partners (Hazan & Shaver, 1989). Attempts to establish closeness include the desire for physical closeness as well as perceiving self-other similarity, intimacy, and “oneness” (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003, p. 85).

Individuals who are anxiously-attached tend to hold pessimistic views of self, social interactions with others, and the nonsocial world; viewing themselves as unworthy, helpless, and vulnerable (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Low self-efficacy and undifferentiated self-views tend to enhance access to negative self-attributes and contribute to large discrepancies between ideal- and actual-self (Mikulincer, 1995). In their relationships characterized by overdependence upon partners as sources of support and protection (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002), anxiously-attached individuals perceive themselves as incompetent in maintaining their own personal regulation of affect (Mikulincer & Florian, 1998).

In their study asking subjects to complete partial word phrases, Mikulincer et al. (2002) observed heightened accessibility to death-related thoughts in the words selected by anxiously-attached individuals, especially following requests to recall a situation involving personal loss and/or separation. Anxious attachment styles predispose individuals not only to increased and
rapid access to intensely negative affective experiences but compound distress with associations between individuals’ appraisals of personal threat and increased focusing upon negative self-attributes, appraisals, and devaluation. Mikulincer and Florian (1998) note that experiences of personal failure and/or frustration lead more frequent outbursts of task-related worries for individuals who scored high on attachment anxiety (Kogot & Mikulincer, 2002).

Tendencies to appraise others as untrustworthy and non-supportive may be linked to low relationship satisfaction reported by anxiously-attached individuals, lower than reports made by individuals holding secure and avoidant styles of attachment. Individuals characterized with anxious attachment styles tend to (a) score higher than securely-attached individuals on cognitive closure and dogmatic thinking, (b) judge others on early impressions, (c) are unlikely to revise initial impressions, even when erroneous, with later data, leading to (d) the higher likelihood of retaining stereotype-based judgments. At the same time, anxiously-attached individuals are more likely to (a) perceive others as similar through the manifestation of a false consensus bias (Mikulincer, Orbach & Lavnieli, 1998), (b) anxiously project actual-self traits onto others (Mikulincer and Horesh, 1999), (c) while engaging in an intense search for connectedness that tends to dominate their perceptions of others. The hyper-focused attention to the details of an attachment relationship combine with affective and cognitive attributes to distort attachment-related information and obstruct individuals’ capacities for drawing sound generalizations about their relationships.

Coping mechanisms.

Management of distress. Patterns of affect among individuals scoring high on attachment anxiety are configured around heightened access to painful memories, fear of loss, and threat-related thoughts ranging in intensity from reporting feelings of anxiety, sadness, and anger to
bouts jealousy, rage, and mental ruminations (Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995). The combination of attributes related to mood, cognition, and regulation of affect combine to detract from anxiously-attached individuals’ capacities for managing distressful circumstances within interpersonal relationships. Mikulincer (2003) characterizes anxious-ambivalent patterns as reflecting difficulties in “regulating inner distress … seeming to lack control capacities that characterize secure people. Although they allow themselves access to the inner world of unpleasant emotional memories, they cannot control limit the autonomous spreading of distress to other schemas” (p. 923). Individuals who score high on anxiety dimensions of attachment maintain a hypervigilant approach to relationships associated with potential distress (Mikulincer 1990, 1993; Shaver & Hazan, 1993). Such a preoccupation with one’s internal life leads to a “self-amplifying cycles of distress in which chronic attachment activation interferes with non-attachment activities mingle old and new sources of distress, resulting in chaotic and undifferentiated mental architecture” (p. 85).

Personal characteristics of individuals with anxious attachment styles include tendencies to (a) detect threat in nearly every transaction within the physical and social world (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), (b) activate attachment-related worries when no external threats exist (Mikulincer et al., 2000; Mikulicer, Gilbraith, & Shaver, 2002), (c) exaggerate potential negative consequences (Mikulincer, 1995; Mikulincer & Kobak, 1998), and (d) intensify negative emotionality that heightens the impact of negative events through preoccupation with intense ruminate-related worries (Mikulicer & Kobak, 1998) (e) that maintain negative affect in the forefront of working memory (Mikulincer, et al., 2003).

A study examining the impact of attachment styles upon Israeli youth’s reaction to the real-life stressors associated with missile attacks near their residences (Mikulincer et al., 1993)
described anxiously-attached youth as experiencing higher levels of posttraumatic stress and coping with the event primarily with the use of emotion-focused coping mechanisms. The mood-congruent cognitions that characterize individuals with anxious attachment styles tend to exacerbate affective sensitivity by promoting heightened access to negative emotions and the rapid activation of self-protective responses (Pereg & Mikulincer, 2002) that promote the contamination of neutral and/or even positive associations with negative emotional tones. In a study examining undergraduate students recall of experiences linked with memories of strong affect, Mikulincer and Orbach’s hypothesis was confirmed “The tendency of anxious-ambivalent people to ruminate and mentally re-experience negative affects may create strong associative links among distinct emotions so that the arousal of one emotion automatically elicits high levels of other associated emotions” (1995, p. 919). Anxiously-attached individuals inability to suppress negative thoughts (Fraley & Shaver, 1997) supports the intensification of distress as emotion-focused coping mechanisms continue to activate negative appraisals and self-devaluation that enhance persistent worrying when little/no threat exists (Mikulincer et al., 2000; Mikulincer, Gilbraith, & Shaver, 2002), spreading negative emotions throughout non-related areas of individuals’ lives (Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995).

**Management of conflict.** While individuals characterized by anxious attachment styles are prone to engage in indiscriminate self-disclosures in their continuing search for connectedness and approval, these individual also tend to be less responsive to others’ self-disclosure, exhibit lower levels of altruistic empathy, and report more intense personal distress upon encountering others’ needs. Mood-congruent cognitions exacerbate negative mood and rapid activation of self-protective responses that detract from capacity to resolve interpersonal problems, negative expectations of others’ responses (Mikulincer, 1998), attribute hostility to
others with minimal cues as to hostile intent (Mikulincer, 1998), prone to anger associated with increased mental rumination individuals react to stress with intense ruminate-related worries (Mikulicer & Kobak, 1998), and negative affect following anger episodes (Mikulincer, 1998).

Individuals characterized as anxiously-attached tend to report less satisfaction with work and work-related activities. As anxiously-attached individuals tend to view work, foremost, as a venue for gaining social acceptance and approval, the current proposal suggests the likelihood that working conditions continually placing responsibility upon these individuals for conflict management among multiple parties may serve in heightening attachment-related anxiety. Especially when the possibilities for resolving conflict favorably from all involved parties’ perspectives may appear especially taxing, it appears likely that the potential for work conditions to substantially meet anxiously-attached individuals’ attachment needs for constant reassurance of approval may be consistently placed at risk.

Adding anxiously-attached individuals’ reports of diminished curiosity-proneness and cognitive creativity when faced with induction of not only negative affect but positively and neutrally-charged events and relationships as well, suggests the imposition of potential limitations for dealing with conflict in creative and emotionally deliberative ways, perhaps especially, when conflictual situations are compounded with the presence of cultural dissonance among the involved parties. Strong associative links between affect and negative emotions and memories lead anxiously-attached individuals to react to threat inductions with both higher frequency and severity of judgment and punishment but to default to culturally-derived defensive enhancement of personal self-esteem (Mikulincer, 1998).

**Avoidant Attachment**

The primary attachment goals linked to avoidant attachment styles are rooted in individuals’
efforts to avoid the pain, frustration, and distress activated by the attachment system when caregivers are perceived as chronically unavailable, disapproving of closeness, intimacy, and the expression of need or vulnerability. Avoidantly-attached individuals come to gradually block their own desires for proximity as they learn that better outcomes from caregiver interactions can be expected when individuals suppress their needs and vulnerabilities and attempts to deal with threats to security on their own. Deactivating strategies are likely to emerge when strong links between proximity seeking and negative affectivity are established in response to conditions of nonreward/punishment such as when attachment figures respond to proximity-seeking attempts with (a) chronic inattention, rejection, or anger, (b) threats of punishment, (c) traumatic/abusive experience, and (d) implicit or explicit messages encouraging self-reliance and/or discouraging vulnerability or neediness (Mikulincer et al. 1998).

**Avoidant appraisals: self, others, relationships.** Individuals who score high on the avoidance dimension tend to deactivate their urges to seek proximity, actively avoid seeking help and support from others, and maintain an independent stance in handling distress alone (Mikulincer et al., 2003). While these individuals’ primary goal is to ward off the ongoing frustration and future distress associated with expectations of attachment figures’ continued lack of availability (Cassidy & Kobak, 1988), the distancing effect of deactivating strategies contribute to the likelihood that needs for support will remain unfulfilled from any source.

Avoidantly-attached individuals tend to repress negative images of self as they project negative self-traits onto others. Interpersonal relationships are characterized by failing to acknowledge one’s fears or negative feelings (Dozier & Kobak, 1992; Fraley & Shaver, 1997; Mikulincer, 1995; Mikulincer, Florian, & Tolmacz, 1990; Mikulincer & Orbach) and pervasive lack conscious access to attachment-related worries (Mikulincer et al., 2000).
Coping mechanisms.

Management of distress. Deactivating strategies result in emotional, social and cognitive detachment from others and the avoidance of connectedness to others in terms of closeness, dependence, or the sharing of distress. Avoidantly-attached individuals maintain an active inattention to threatening thoughts, events and emotions that may evoke distress and feelings of vulnerability. A study examining the impact of attachment styles upon Israeli youth’s reaction to the real-life stressors associated with missile attacks near their residences (Mikulincer et al., 1993) described securely avoidantly-attached youth as experiencing higher levels of posttraumatic stress, preferring not to seek support from others, processing the event primarily by activating distancing coping methods for removing anxiety and depression from their awareness, and limiting any expression of their distress through somatomization.

Management of conflict. In studies (Pereg, 2001) utilizing affect induction of while subjects worked with research partners. More securely-attached individuals tended to recall more positive messages and activate more competing positive cognitions. These constructive strategies enabled them to maintain a more positive view of their research partners while inhibiting the spread of negative affect throughout their working memories. In the same study, those who scored higher on anxiety dimensions of attachment recalled more negative messages, facilitating the spread of negative affect into their working memory and cognitions. More negative views towards a research partner were attributed even when the partner was not the source of the negative affect.

Summary of Attachment

Sethre-Hofstad Investigating contemporary school contexts from an ethological perspective, therefore, provides a systematic approach for conceptualizing relationships
stretching across multiple variables (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978) such as (a) individual characteristics (e.g. age, gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and levels of relative ability), (b) areas of concern (e.g. academic achievement, emotional/social development, and behavioral issues linked to conflict and discipline), and (c) levels of influence (e.g. teacher-student/peer relationships, classroom instructional strategies and educational policies, and overall school climate)- from the perspective of a single universal variable- the human drive to seek physical and emotional security within proximate social environments such as schools. The current study proposes that components of the attachment behavioral system in their entirety (proximity-maintenance and the exploratory, affiliation, and caregiving systems) combined with the concept of reproductive fitness.

Reproductive fitness will be expanded in the current study from a limited focus on reproduction and sexuality to include individuals’ drives to maximize their individual and collective position or status (e.g. degree of acceptance, respect, and/or prestige) within the school community. The expanded definition for reproductive fitness creates accessibility for exploring any and all salient aspects of individual (e.g. student, teacher) or collective (race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, etc.) identity including any role that is ‘valued’ by individuals (academic and/or athletic achievement; nature and scope of social inclusion, behavioral reputations with peers and/or teachers, etc.).

The current study suggests that the more inclusive view of environmental fitness parallels the original ethological perspective (e.g. individuals’ status in competing for access to sexual partners via competition for demonstrating competencies attached to the capacity to bear young, offer protection, and acquire physical resources such as food and shelter) in a manner that reflects appropriate developmental and contextual adjustments relevant to contemporary school
ecologies. Linking the degree, nature, and strength of affect embedded within evolutionary drives for (a) security (e.g. threatened within teacher-student relationships and by conflict, violence, and peer aggression within school climate), (b) exploration and mastery of the learning environment (e.g. threatened by teacher-student relationships, conflictual and disruptive classroom climate, and lack of instructional and/or curricular ‘fit’ with students’ learning styles, abilities, and/or sociocultural identities), (c) affiliation (e.g. threatened by teacher-student relationship and victimization, rejection, and alienation within peer climate), and congruity and attunement with school (d) caregiving (e.g. teachers) system (e.g. threatened by students’ perceptions of teachers’ levels of sensitivity; accessibility; accuracy and empathy in responding appropriately to students’ educational and sociocultural needs and realities; and competency in maintaining emotionally, socially, and physically secure classroom environments including conflict management) creates a theoretical bridge for conceptualizing the emotional and social roots of contemporary issues such as the eruption of deadly violence and the chronic stressors associated with students’ negative self-appraisals linked to widespread achievement gaps in contemporary schools.

Attachment researchers have examined relationships between infants’ early attachment classification and the quality of exploratory play (Hazan & Durrett, 1982), enhance attention span, positive affect (Main, 1983), and prosocial play with peers (Roggman et al., 1987); autonomous problem-solving (Matas, Arend, & Sroufe, 1978), sociability with unfamiliar adults (Main & Weston, 1981), open and effective communication between parents and children (Main, Tomasini & Tolan, 1979); decreased levels of distraction and need for disciplinary intervention (Bus & van IJzendoorn, 1988).
Predictive validity of infant attachment classification has been established in longitudinal studies examining children’s social and emotional development throughout early school years with findings linking secure attachment to indicators of social functioning including empathy, compliance, positive peer relationships (Youngblade & Belsky, 1992) and effectiveness in the constructive communication of negative affect (Main et al., 1985). Studies examining the clinical implications of attachment have produced empirical support for associations between early attachment insecurity and subsequent manifestation of behavioral problems (Lyons-Ruth, Alpern & Repacholi, 1993). For other studies, the nature of these associations was not perfect with null results in some research (Bates & Bayles, 1988) suggesting the limits of the robustness of these associations and possibility of numerous potential factors in mediating course of later development (Belsky & Nezworski, 1988).

**Secure Teacher/Student Relationship Quality**

The single most important clue for enhancing positive adaptation for youth, according to Kennedy and Kennedy (2007), may lie in understanding how the quality daily interactions between teachers and students impact a wide range of learning and developmental outcomes. Qualitative studies have explored the experiences of increasingly diverse student populations (Ayers & Ford, 1996; Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994, Sleeter & McLaren, 1995, Valenzuela, 1999) to examine “how children and youth of non-dominant cultural and linguistic groups succeed in school despite the barriers they continue to face” (Bedard, 2004, p. 66). Findings indicate that “Depending on the quality of the school environment, the outcomes for these students range from high engagement and college attendance to dropout rates of up to 75 percent” (Bedard, 2004, p. 67). Protective factors identified in these studies include the presence of “caring relationships, high expectations, and opportunities for participation.”
Studies have demonstrated that students’ needs and expectations surrounding teacher relationships vary in nature and intensity throughout the course of students’ development in school. Relationships are important as young children enter elementary school and are building early beliefs about their academic capabilities and expectations for future educational failures and/or successes (Baker 1999) and remain important through adolescence as youth navigate critical developmental transitions (Ryan, Stiller, & Lynch, 1994; Wentzel, 1996) marked by significant biological, cognitive, social-emotional changes. Evidence supports that the effects of early student-teacher relationships in early grades remain relatively stable throughout students’ daily lives in schools, impacting teachers’ reports surrounding academic achievement, grade retention, special education referrals, behavior, and peer relationships (Birch & Ladd, 1998; Hamre & Pianta, 2001).

Literature focusing on teacher-student relationships has identified several relational patterns including warmth/security, conflict/negativity, and dependency. In order to maintain clarity and consistency with the theoretical foundations of attachment theory, the current study will refer to teacher-student interaction patterns characterized by warmth/security as secure and interaction patterns characterized by conflict/negativity and dependence as insecure.

**Secure Relational Patterns in Teacher/Student Interactions (proximity-maintenance)**

Positive teacher-student relationships have been linked not only to increased academic achievement, but to adaptive outcomes across a broad range of social and emotional developmental outcomes (Battistich, Watson, Solomon, Lewis, & Schaps, 1999). Youth’s self-reports describe a greater sense of control, autonomy, school engagement, and social responsibility (Ryan, Stiller, & Lynch, 1994).
Positive affective climate. Teachers can create positive affective climate by providing a sense of emotional security and social support in times of distress (Roeser, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2000). Positive emotional states, such as warmth and security, within teacher-student relationships and the overall tone of classroom atmospheres have been linked to students’ perceptions of well-being and outcomes associated to learning such as students’ task goal orientations, academic self-efficacy beliefs, and actual achievement as measured by grades (Ames, 1992a; Brown & Lent, 1991). According to Roeser et al. (1996), youth who perceive interactions that occur and relationships formed- with their classroom teachers to be characterized by positive affect are more likely to report an overall sense of belonging with peers as well as their memberships within both classroom and school-wide communities. Other studies (Boekaerts, 1993; Connell, 1990) report relationships between students’ perceptions of belonging in school with increases in a personal sense of self-efficacy and decreases in feelings of self-consciousness surrounding academic competence in the classroom. “Feeling positively about how teachers and students interact in school may provide a secure emotional basis from which students can both enjoy school and develop their academic competence without feeling self-conscious or worried about failure” (Roeser et al., 1996, p. 419).

Open communication patterns. The bonds that are generated between teachers and students as well as those generated between children and caregivers are more likely to be sustained throughout conflictual and/or threatening circumstances when interpersonal exchanges are characterized by perceptions of shared understanding, closeness (Laursen & Collins, 2004), and expectations that communication will result in the resolution of difference and levels of distress (Freitag, Belsky, Grossmann, Grossmann, & Scheuerer-English, 1996). Especially during adolescence, youth-adult communication patterns that share an overall history of
generally positive interactions (Arnold, Pratt, & Hicks, 2004) are more likely to foster mutual understanding and acceptance of youths’ changing developmental needs during critical periods of transition (Sillars, Koerner, & Fitzpatrick, 2005). Studies have linked the qualities of relationships that serve students’ emerging developmental needs with adult patterns of communication that are characterized by understanding, reciprocity, and openness (Sillars, Koerner, & Fitzpatrick, 2005; Laursen & Collins, 2004). Within the context of conflictual communication patterns, reciprocity is associated with mutual communication exchanges that are knowingly available while synchronous interactions are delivered in a manner that is perceived as smooth and harmonious (Segrin & Flora, 2005).

Caregivers who are responsive, inductive, warm and accepting of children’s emotions when they are distress support the development of children who are emotionally well-regulated and responsive themselves. In assisting children in the management of negative affect, parents who empathize with children’s distress do not escalate children’s negative behavioral responses by contributing to higher levels of emotional overarousal. Rather, such caregivers model and demonstrate the “rewarding socialization of emotion” (Denham, 1998, p. 167). “Negative, overbearing parental reactions to children’s distress exacerbate child negativity and exemplify punitive socialization of emotion” (Grolnick, 1997). Fostering children’s awareness and attention to their own emotions fosters emotional regulation, while overly strict sanctions about emotional expressiveness motivate children to hide, not regulate their emotions” (Denham, 1998, p. 167).

**Secure Classroom Management Strategies**

**Perceptions of equal status, justice, fairness.** For minority students, research suggests that perceptions of differential status and treatment in the classroom may be linked to teachers’ manifestation of behaviors that succeed in creating both a safe haven (confidence that caregiver
is available, responsive to needs, warmth and positive affect) and a secure base (students perceptions of felt security foster students’ freedom in engaging in exploratory and learning processes). Studies utilizing cooperative learning settings to examine the effects of high and low status in the classroom have “found equal status to be an essential factor in increasing minority academic achievement” in diverse classrooms (Alder, 2000, p. 28) contributing to increases in all students’ test scores; enhanced respect, self-esteem, and mutual concern across racial groups; as well as behaviors associated with improved problem-solving techniques (Beilin & Rabow, 1981).

Classroom justice research has focused largely on students perception as “predictors of student antisocial or potentially destructive behaviors” (Chory, 2007, p. 92), display of indirect interpersonal aggression, hostility, (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004b), and/or resistance to instructor requests (Paulsel & Chory-Assad, 2005). Chory–Assad and Paulsel (2004) describe classroom justice as multidimensional in nature, capturing student perceptions of fairness that are oriented towards processes outcomes, and styles of interaction. Chory’s (2007) study investigating student perceptions of what is fair identified concerns encompassing more than the outcomes of transactions (e.g. a grade reflects students’ expectations), identified as ‘distributive justice’ in the instructional context (Deutsch, 1985). In addition, students were concerned with the “fairness of the processes used to arrive at outcomes (e.g. subjective versus objective grading criteria) and allocate classroom resources, described by Byrne and Cropanzano (2001) as procedural justice. Interactional justice (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004a fair) captured students’ perceptions surrounding how fairly individuals are treated, interpersonally, within a teacher’s implementation of classroom policies and procedures (Chory, 2007). College students described effective instructors in terms of “fairness” as having “high character”, defined by students as ‘do
not verbally abuse or embarrass their students’ (Twen & Hanson, 2004), ‘treat students with politeness, dignity, and respect’ (Colquitt et al., 2001), and maintain interpersonal (DeVito, 1986; Frymier & Houser, 2000) relationships reflecting ‘shared control, trust, and intimacy’ (Chory, 2007).

*Opportunities for participation.* Research examining characteristics of school environments suggest that autonomy-supported classroom practices are associated with students’ sense of mastery, curiosity, positive problem-solving, and commitment to democratic values (Benard, 2004); as well as increased self-efficacy (Chirkov & Ryan, 2001; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Creating opportunities for student participation and contribution is a natural outgrowth of strength-based teaching perspectives and gives youth the “opportunity to be heard in a physically and psychologically safe environment... to which they feel connected...(T)he connection between autonomy and belonging is mutually reinforcing: the stronger someone’s sense of self, the more able he or she is to form healthy connections to other people, with those connections in turn, further nurturing the sense of self” (Chirkov & Ryan, 2001, p. 79). “Each component of autoritativenss, warmth, firmness, and psychological autonomy-granting, makes an independent contribution to healthy adolescent development, in overlapping, although slightly different ways” (Chirkov & Ryan, 2001, p. 173). Longitudinal research, investigating outcomes for a preventive program for preschoolers (Schweinhart & Weikart, 1999), linked positive outcomes (personal, social, and economic) for adults who attended preschools utilizing child-initiated, highly participative approaches.

**Secure Home-School Connections**

Strategies that combine positive teacher-student relationships while building enhanced
connections with families and student investment through increased connectedness to school (Marcus & Sanders-Rio, 2001) have been positively related to student achievement, motivation and commitment to learning, positive affect, self concept; and higher levels of parental cooperation (Greenberg & Hickman, 1991). Studies have indicated that transition activities (i.e., arrangement for child/parent school visits and establishing teacher/parent communication and curriculum planning that provides information about school expectations and parent rights) promote better developmental outcomes for children (Smolkin, 1999). Transition activities have been linked to increased child/parent familiarity and sense of connectedness to the school as well as increased teacher familiarity and awareness of student/family backgrounds- which combine to support children’s perceptions of continuity between home and school experiences. Achievement correlated significantly with teacher reports of the relational climate of the school, which was operationalized as the teachers’ willingness to participate in transitional activities characterized by positive engagement and interactions among teachers and children and with parents and community participants.

**Secure Learning Environments (exploratory system)**

Studies describing child-centered developmentally appropriate instructional practices have linked the quality of classroom climate to healthy emotional development (Dunn & Kontos, 1998) and positive child outcomes (Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2001; Pianta et al., 2002). This research has determined that positive teacher-student relationships and student perceptions of emotional security in the classroom are related to increased academic performance suggesting that teacher provision of emotional support and encouragement, especially during activities perceived as particularly challenging or difficult, may enhance students’ achievement-related motivation (Roeser, Ecceles, & Sameroff, 2000).
In qualitative studies, adolescents have reported relationships between their willingness to engage in learning and the degree to which they feel safe and cared for by others in the classroom setting (Wentzel, 1996). Wentzel (1998, 2002) has argued that positive interactions with teachers and peers can increase students’ motivation and pursuit of academic goals. Students who perceive their teachers as supportive are more likely to pursue academic goals (Hamre & Pianta, 2005). Supportive relationships with teachers have been positively correlated in other studies with overall social, emotional, and academic adjustment among students with disabilities (Murray & Greenberg, 2001). Additionally, among students who describe the presence of affective warmth within positive teacher-student interactions, the protective effects of teacher-student relationships extend to specific outcomes such as reductions in the rates of teacher referrals to special education (Pianta, Steinberg & Rollins, 1995). Studies suggest that positive teacher/student relationship are more predictive of the acquisition of pre-reading skills among African American students than for Caucasian classmates.

**Mastery-approaches to learning and teaching.** Urdan and Schoenfelder (2006) study examined features of the learning environment that enhanced or undermined student engagement with learning. Their findings supported the work of other researchers (Elliot, 1999) who found correlations between mastery-oriented teacher styles and student tendencies to approach rather than avoid learning. Defined as the concern with the development of competence and skills as evaluated against internal norms, mastery teaching approaches are associated with greater intrinsic motivation, the use of deeper-level cognitive processes, a willingness to attempt and persist in the completion of challenging tasks, and positive affect surrounding their educational experiences at school (Elliot, 1999). Mastery-approaches in teaching create learning environments that build early success in students’ learning so that success at “one level
encourages learners to engage in efforts to attempt to learn tasks involving greater complexity (Ormrod, 1995) building self-efficacy and confidence in believing “they can succeed at a task when they have succeeded at that task or similar ones in the past” (Ormrod, 1995, p. 151).

Ames (1992) summarizes teacher approaches that foster mastery approaches to student learning in the classroom as (a) the assignment of appropriate, challenging, and meaningful work, (b) emphasize and reward students’ individual growth and improvement over social comparison and competition, (c) offer students opportunities for making choices and functioning autonomously in the classroom (Ames, 1992), and (e) balance high academic demands while consistently offering motivational, emotional, and social support during instruction (Turner et. al, 2002).

**Secure Peer Cultures (affiliative system)**

Schools are defined as places “where children develop or fail to develop a variety of competencies that come to define self and ability, where friendships with peers are nurtured, and where the role of the community member is played out.” Occurring within highly formative periods of development, the “building of self-esteem, interpersonal competence, social problem-solving skills, responsibility, and leadership” are important not only in their “own rights ... [but] as critical underpinning of success in academic learning” (Good & Weinstein, 1986). The overall competence and well-being of students as persons encompasses “not only intellectual gains but also the development of emotional, social, and moral capabilities” (Reynold & Teddlie, 2000).

In the present era of unease surrounding highly publicized incidents of violence in schools, recognition of the value of a classroom teacher’s vigilance and capacity for perceiving, accurately interpreting and competently responding to students’ peer-related distress has become increasingly evident. Researchers have noted that while the occurrence of violent crime or the
tragedy of a school shooting may be unlikely in many schools, the etiology of deadly violence appears to be embedded within common everyday aspects of social climates in today’s schools (Walker et al., 1996), frequently representing the final piece in the chain that began with an abundance of chronic harassment and lack of respect (Skiba et al., 2004).

As proposed by the current study, the definition of teacher-student relationship quality within the contexts of contemporary society suggest the inclusion of teachers’ responsibilities, attitudes, and competencies for attending to the maintenance of a sense of classroom community. Community has been defined by Sergiovanni (1994) as a shared social contract made up of complementary relational bonds affording individuals (a) the perception of shared purposes, goals, and social meanings; and (b) a psychological sense of membership and belonging has been identified in violence prevention research as an antidote to school violence. The emotional significance attached by students to the everyday social interactions (Roeser, 1998) in school have led researchers that assert that the breakdown of youth’s sense of identity and belonging represents a failure of community in schools (Baker). Children who experience positive, supportive relationships with their teachers (Howe & Smith, 1995) demonstrate greater competence with both peers and adults in school, are active participants within peer social networks that tend to be more supportive, have fewer behavior problems and demonstrate higher achievement orientation and academic performance (Howes et al., 1994; Pianta, Steinberg, & Rollins, 1995) when compared to peers with insecure relationships. Strong teacher-child relationships have been identified by researchers as particularly important assets for children with social or relational challenges (Gregory & Weinstein, 2004; Nom & Herman, 2002).

**Quality of social support and classroom intervention.** Research suggests that positive interactions with teachers at school may hold even greater significance for “at risk” children who
experience negative relationships with parents and peers (Ainsworth, 1989, Bracken & Crain, 1994; Hamre & Pianta, 2001). Findings underscore the important roles that teachers play in interrupting cycles of coercive interactions with students (Arnold et al., 1998), enhancing adaptive social outcomes. Positive social interventions where teachers invest time and effort in consistently pairing emotional support, explanatory communication, and processing of behaviors when necessary to interrupt children’s play to intervene in problem behaviors were linked to declines in young children’s verbal aggression (Ladd & Burgess, 2001). Research indicates that adult interventions designed to promote peer acceptance, build social competencies, and alleviate students’ emotional distress. In a systematic intervention designed to support students in the first year of their transitions to high school (Felner, Ginter, & Primavera, 1982), the role of homeroom teachers was augmented to include classroom modifications designed to maintain student peer networks and buttress social support. Students involved in the intervention evidenced greater academic success and adjustment as well as lower levels of self-reported psychological dysfunction when compared to a peer control group. Four years later, a follow-up study found that 43% of the control group students had dropped out of school compared to 21% of the experimental group of students (Felner & Adam, 1988).

**Insecure Teacher/Student Relationship Quality**

Described as negative interactions and cognitions embedded within discordant relationships, conflictual teacher-student relationships represent an area of significant concern (Mantzicopoulos, 2005) especially within larger challenges currently faced in schools. Teacher-student relationships marked by conflict have consistently been linked with negative school outcomes (e.g., Birch & Ladd, 1997; Howes et al., 1994; Ladd, Birch, & Buhs, 1999; Pianta, 1994; Pianta et al., 1997; Stuhlman & Pianta, 2001), school trajectories (Hamre & Pianta, 2001),
school adaptation including cognitive competence (e.g., Pianta et al., 1995) and externalizing behaviors (e.g., Birch & Ladd, 1998; Howes, Phillipsen, & Peisner-Feinberg, 2000; Pianta, 1994; Pianta et al., 1995).

**Insecure Classroom Management Strategies**

While positive teacher-student relationships may offer buffers to known risk factors for youth, research indicates that relational negativity within student-teacher relationships may not be evenly distributed across school populations but exists at higher levels among identified groups of at-risk students. Children with early behavior problems and early (kindergarten) teacher-reported relational conflict seem to run a higher risk for long-term behavioral maladjustment and reduced levels of both classroom participation and overall adjustment to school (Hamre & Pianta, 2001). Research examining teacher-reported conflict has consistently linked higher reports of teacher-child conflict to children with higher scores on behavioral hyperactivity indices (Birch & Ladd, 1997, 1998; Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Pianta et al., 1995).

**Negative affective climate.** In a qualitative study exploring the classroom environment in urban schools, Fines (1987) observed “The intellectual, social, and emotional substance the constitutes minority students’ lives was routinely treated as irrelevant to be displaced and silenced... at the level of curricula, texts, conversations in classes, school talk, and knowledge were radically severed from the daily realities of adolescents’ lives and more systematically allied with the lives of their teachers (p. 163-164). Irvine’s (2003) research concluded that preservice teachers’ negative beliefs and low expectations of non White students led to teaching practices that ignored students’ ethnic identities and their unique cultural beliefs, perceptions, values, and worldviews (p. xvii).
The affective climate generated in many low-track curriculum and low status classes in urban schools was characterized in relational studies (Goodlad, 1984; Oakes, 1986) by a lack of intellectual energy and positive support and the presence of “abrasiveness, ... punitive teacher behavior, and high interpersonal tension (Goodlad, 1983, p. 112). In low-curriculum classes noted for their overrepresentation of students of color; classroom atmospheres are consistently described as emotionally flat and intellectually dull, teachers’ classroom management strategies as low-interactive and dominant in nature, and rote learning that focuses upon the learning of isolated discrete skills (Good & Brophy, 1994).

**Insecure Conflict Management Strategies**

Teacher strategies for addressing conflict that have been linked to increases in both conflict and violence seem to have no clear expectations, do not have consistent application and most consequences are punitive instead of providing opportunities for students to learn about positive behaviors. Larger schools have been linked with higher rates of conflictual behaviors (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993) while increased discipline problems were predicted by conflict-reducing strategies that rely upon ambiguous sanctions and punitive teacher attitudes, and are characterized by poor cooperation between teachers and administrations (Mayer, Butterworth, Nafpaktitis, & Sulzer-Azaroff, 1983). Preschool program approaches that relied upon teacher control and direct instruction over the promotion of children’s self-control were associated with lower income levels and higher drop-out rates in high school, confirming other researcher’s suggestions (Barber, 2002) that “heavily unilateral” atmospheres may be linked to the underdevelopment of children’s sociomoral thinking and behaviors (Schweinhart & Weikart, 1997, p. 12).
Insecure Learning Environments (exploratory system)

Adolescence has generally been described as a period marked by heightened academic concerns and self-consciousness (McGuire et al., 1987). Researchers have suggested that students’ daily exposure to the personal, social, and academic realities associated with contemporary achievement gaps among students’ varying sociocultural identities (e.g. gender, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or relative learning, linguistic or behavioral abilities) may be mediated by students’ “own espousal of relative ability goals” and may, therefore, serve to increase feelings of “self-consciousness at a time when this could be most detrimental to youths’ self-image” (Eccles & Midgley, 1989 cited in Roeser et al., 1996, p. 218). Aspects of the classroom environment (comprised of teacher-student-peer interactions, instructional practices, management of classroom management, and school policies, etc.) associated with less than optimal conditions for learning and positive development (Covington, 1992; Elias, 1989) have been linked to settings where students’ experience anxiety surrounding differences between their own abilities and others and “the need to negotiate perceived threats to self-worth” (Roeser et al., 1996; p. 418). In classrooms where differences in academic ability vary considerably, teachers’ styles of classroom management, for example, that emphasizes “competition to be the best”... [may result in a setting wherein] too few children have access to this valued role and the resulting pressures... contribute to a sense of failure and alienation” (Elias, 1989; p.394).

Teachers performance-oriented approach to learning. Learning environments that are based upon teachers performance-oriented approaches to education maintain competitive classroom atmosphere where students are reinforced for out-performing peers. Evaluation methods utilize interpersonal norms to rank students’ relative levels of achievement in the classroom. Performance-based approaches to learning have been linked to student tendencies
towards avoidance of learning, reliance upon external rewards to generate motivation, and shallow-level cognitive (e.g. rote memorization) instructional strategies (Elliot, 1997). Teacher management styles that appear to undermine the students’ approach-orientations towards learning appear to be linked to teacher preoccupation with adherence to strict rules and routines (Patrick et al., 2001) and tendency to emphasize the importance of the correctness of an answer as opposed to understanding underlying learning processes, call attention to differences in students’ abilities, offer special recognition to high achievers, and use normative curve (Maehr & Midgley, 1996). Researchers have established relationships between performance-based, as opposed to mastery-oriented, approaches to learning and reductions in perceived self-efficacy as students meeting with “consistent failure in performing a particular task, …will have little confidence in their ability to succeed” in future learning attempts (Omrod, 1995, p. 151). For low-performing students, “each new failure confirms what they already ‘know’ about the task-they can’t do” p. 152, emphasis in original). Maeher and Midgley describe avoidantly-oriented learners as less likely to seek help when needed and more likely to engage in self-defeating behaviors that create barriers to academic success, give up when challenged or facing possible failure, and report negative attitudes towards school (2001). The accumulation of failure experiences leads to secondary consequences that further compromise students’ academic potential for achievement including school attendance, personal well-being, the benefit of dropout prevention efforts, and the avoidance of problems with conflict and discipline (Gay, 2000).

**Insecure Home-School Connections**

Parents are able to play key roles in promoting positive outcomes for students when teachers maintain collaborative relationships and open lines of communication between home
and school (Hendersona & Mapps, 2002 skiba). Particularly when families’ races, ethnicities, and languages differ from those of children’s teachers, a ‘disconnect’ may occur leading to parents’ mistrusting the school and teachers’ perceiving parents as problematic (Bryk & Schneider, 2002) or as (Hulsebosch & Logan, 1998). According to Mantzicopoulos’ (2005), children are more likely to report higher levels of relational conflict when teachers reported less positive parent–community relationships within their school.

**Insecure Peer Cultures (affiliative system)**

Student-teacher relationships characterized as insecure, distant, distrusting, conflictual, overly dependent (Birch & Ladd, 1998) or imbued with little positive affect and warmth have been linked in studies with lower levels of student social competence and higher levels of problematic peer relationships and teacher-student behavioral conflict (Howes, Matheson, & Hamilton, 1994; Pianta, 1994, Pianta & Steinberg, 1992). Exposure to high levels of caregivers’ negative affect (Cummings, Iannotti, & Zahn-Waxler, 1985) and conflict (Katz & Gottman, 1994) has been associated with children’s difficulty in managing negative affect and problematic behavior with peers. Reciprocal exchanges of negative affect have been linked to children with conduct problems (Patterson & Dishion, 1988) suggesting that exposure to reciprocal negative interactions may heighten children’s negative affective arousal with potentially long-term detrimental effects (Carson & Parke, 1996). Children at age 4 who experienced relationships with day care providers and teachers characterized by warmth and mutual cooperation, demonstrated less physical and verbal aggression towards their peers than students whose relationships with teachers were characterized as distant and conflictual (Howes, Hamilton, & Matheson, 1994). Hanish et al. (2004) suggest “the kinds of relationships that children have with their teachers, as well as the behaviors of teachers in the context of peer-to-peer interactions, are
associated with the development of aggression. Research suggests associations not only associations between students’ lack of social skills and increased involvement in bullying and/or victimization interactions, but hint that “bullying and victimized youngsters tend to have poor relationships with their teachers” (Hanish, et al., 2004, p. 152). Children exhibiting early signs of bullying behavior may benefit from the presence of warm relationships with supportive teachers who offer positive relational context for guiding students in the development of more appropriate behavioral repertoires. The quality of relationships held by victimized students and their teachers offer less definitive results, according to Hanish et al. (2004). While Birch and Ladd’s (2001) study examining associations between 1st through 3rd graders self-reports of victimization by peers and teachers’ ratings of conflict reported no significant correlations, Hanish et al.’s study (2002) found positive correlations between kindergartner through 3rd graders reports of peer victimization and descriptions of harassment by their teachers.

Quality of social support and classroom intervention. Teachers may vary in the degree to which they perceive, accurately interpret and respond to underlying emotional needs of a child’s exhibiting negative behaviors with peers (Bierman, 2004). The availability and quality of supportive social interventions in the classroom vary across teachers’ competency and self-efficacy levels, contextual variables unique to each classroom, and teachers’ attitudes towards which individual students and/or kinds of situations warrant teacher assistance (Bierman, 2004). For example, the degree to which students’ negative behavior is likely to lead to social difficulties with peers is influenced by classroom norms held by teachers and students surrounding aggressive and rejecting peer behaviors. In classroom peer groups where aggressive behavior tends to be normative, aggressive behavior would be less likely to lead to peer disliking than it would be in settings where aggression is not as typical (Boivin, Dodge & Coie, 1995;
Stormshak et. al., 1999). Prosocial behavior, on the other hand, appears to “contribute to peer-liking across a variety of different peer groups” (Stormshak et al.,) in the same way that disruptive/hyperactive behaviors elicit peer dislike even in peer groups where such behavior is common (Stormshak et al., 1999). Bierman (2004) suggests that teachers may be influenced, just as peers, by complex and interacting factors embedded within the social dynamics of classroom climate. Low teacher understanding and empathy for students’ social distress as well as awareness surrounding complex dynamics that may influence their choices to offer-or withhold support from a particular student may result in students perceived as chronically aggressive or ‘annoying’ receiving less support from teachers than peers demonstrating more prosocial behavior.

When particular children routinely engage in negative behaviors, both peers and teachers come to expect problematic social interactions from these students. According to Bierman (2004), expectations from both peers and adults can lead to focusing primarily, and at times unfairly, on the negative behavior of aggressive and/or rejected children in ways that create self-fulfilling prophecies and reduce opportunities for positive change. “It is critical for adults to guard against their own negatively biased expectations. In work with aggressive-rejected children, it is easy to fall into the trap of expecting and responding selectively to deviant behavior” (Bierman, 2004 p. 43). Data suggest that teachers may vary in the degree to which they accurately attribute students’ negative behaviors to parental modeling of conflictual behavior in the home or to the ongoing behavior and social influence of peers actively occurring within the social dynamics of the classroom (Bierman, 2004. Studies indicate that teacher attributions of students’ negative social behaviors to parenting practices rather than to classroom influences may be inaccurate and that the frequencies and tendencies towards misattributions
may vary among different teachers (Achenbach, McConaughty, & Howell, 1987; Dishion, Duncan, & Eddy, Fagot, and Fetrow. 1994). Evidence suggest that African American and Hispanic children may be at heightened risk for behavioral and academic maladjustment and are disproportionately represented in statistics on poor school adjustment (Burchinal et al., 2002: Pigott & Cohen, 2000). In this context, perceptions of students’ negative behavior may be a function of the distinctive interpersonal norms and expectations for student behaviors held by each classroom teachers. “The need for teachers to assess students who may hold different norms and expectations regarding acceptable behavior poses myriad problems” (Hudley, 1993, p. 383) as teachers bear the primary responsibility in identifying problem behaviors, referring students for interventions, and initiating formal disciplinary processes.

Research Questions

The research questions posed for this study were -

Research Question 1 (Integrating Conflict Styles)

To what extent do variances in (a) demographic variables including racial/ethnic identification, (b) school location (rural, suburban, urban) and relative levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, circle of friends) characterizing individuals’ own PreK-12 educational experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful); and universality-diversity (diverse contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) orientation- predict preservice teachers’ integrating styles

Research Question 2 (Compromising Conflict Styles)

To what extent do variances in (a) demographic variables including racial/ethnic identification, (b) school location (rural, suburban, urban) and relative levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, circle of friends) characterizing individuals’ own PreK-12 educational
experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful); and universality-diversity (diverse contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) orientation- predict preservice teachers’ compromising conflict styles?

Research Question 3 (Obliging Conflict Styles)-

To what extent do variances in (a) demographic variables including racial/ethnic identification, (b) school location (rural, suburban, urban) and relative levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, circle of friends) characterizing individuals’ own PreK-12 educational experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful); and universality-diversity (diverse contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) orientation- predict preservice teachers’ obliging conflict styles?

Research Question 4 (Avoiding Conflict Styles)-

To what extent do variances in (a) demographic variables including racial/ethnic identification, (b) school location (rural, suburban, urban) and relative levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, circle of friends) characterizing individuals’ own PreK-12 educational experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful); and universality-diversity (diverse contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) orientation- predict preservice teachers’ avoiding conflict styles?

Research Question 5 (Dominating Conflict Styles)-

To what extent do variances in (a) demographic variables including racial/ethnic identification, (b) school location (rural, suburban, urban) and relative levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, circle of friends) characterizing individuals’ own PreK-12 educational experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied,
dismissive, and fearful); and universality-diversity (diverse contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) orientation—predict preservice teachers’ dominating conflict styles?
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The methodology for the study is discussed in this chapter. The study was descriptive research that used self-report survey methods to investigate the degrees to which associations among (a) demographic (location and levels of diversity in participants’ own schooling experiences) and (b) attachment (anxiety and avoidant attachment dimension, attachment styles) variables and scores for (c) universality-diversity orientations (diversity of contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) predicted preservice teachers’ attachment styles (integrating, compromising, obliging, avoiding, and dominating). These variables have been linked in previous research to dimensions of professional dispositions held by effective educators who demonstrate success in the constructive management of classroom conflict, a factor that has been shown to promote academic and social learning for youth of all races, ethnicities, disabilities/exceptionalities; and contribute to the formation of positive teacher/student relationships. This chapter includes a description of study participants, participants, instruments, procedure for data collection, and tests of statistical analyses.

Participants

Seventy-three students participated in this study. Undergraduate students (N = 73) out of a potential pool of 680) attending both the main and several (four) satellite campuses at a major university in the mid-Atlantic United States were recruited for participation in this study. Permission was solicited from university professors teaching core (required) courses for education majors to recruit students in their sections (see Appendix B). Students were recruited for participation in brief face-to-face presentations for courses located on the university’s main campus and by email for the four satellite campuses (see Appendix C). Both groups (main
campus and satellite) of potential participants received notice (written or email) of the study’
purpose and voluntary nature with a URL to access the study on-line. Follow-up reminders were
sent through the instructors to alert students two weeks before the study’s end (see Appendix E).

Students were eligible to take part in the study (a) one time only, if they were taking
more than one course, (b) if they were enrolled as an education major, and (c) or, if they were not
education majors, if their course of study was directed towards employment in which they would
work with students in a school setting. Students who were not majoring in education- and who
intended to work in other settings (youth development, hospital, recreation) were not eligible for
study participation.

Participants ranged in ages with 84.9 % between the ages of 18-24. Of these participants,
84.9 % (n= 62) were female and 15.1% (n=11) were male. 64 participants or 87.7% of the
sample described their racial/ethnic identity as White and with 9 participants representing 12.3%
of preservice teachers describing their racial /ethnic identity as Hispanic. The university standing
among participants was distributed as follows: 5.5% (n=4) freshman, 21.9% (n=16) sophomore,
56.2% (n=41) junior, 12.3% (n=9) senior with 1 and 2 other individuals classifying themselves
as enrolled in certification and ‘other’ programs, respectively.

Sampling Plan

Demographics of the participants were examined to determine the extent to which
findings derived from this sample may be used to generalize to a broader population. With a
potential pool of over 680 students, the projected sample size was 350, however, the actual
number of participants was 79. Researchers have offered guidelines for determining the number
of participants required for simple linear regression (Green, 1991; Hair, Anderson, Tatham, &
Black, 1998; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Hair et al, (1998) suggested that, at a minimum, the
ratio between the number of observations and predictor variables should be no less than 5 to 1 with the desired level being “15 to 20 observations for each independent variable” (p. 166). The thirteen predictor variables for this study included demographic variables describing participants’ own educational experiences including 1) school location and levels of diversity characterizing 2) overall student populations, 3) teachers, and 4) close circle of friends; 5) anxiety and 6) avoidance attachment dimensions; 7) secure, 8) preoccupied, 9) dismissing, and 10) fearful attachment styles; and dimensions of individuals’ universality-diversity orientations comprised of 11) diversity of contact, 12) relativistic appreciation, and 13) comfort with differences. For this study, the n= 73 was sufficient to meet the minimum number of participants considered to represent an appropriate sample size.

Procedure

During the face-to-face (main campus) and/or email recruitment (satellite campuses) presentations, participants were informed of the study’s (a) purpose and (b) voluntary and (c) confidential nature. Students at on-site recruitment received a take-home notice (e.g. same content as emails that were sent to participants at satellite locations) with reviews of the study purpose, contact information and instructions for accessing the study’s URL (see Appendix C). Instructors read the same recruitment notice in their classes and then forwarded the notice via email to students. As part of the recruitment process, students at main and satellite locations were notified that they would have an opportunity to enter a raffle for winning one of four $25 gift certificates from a major credit card company by clicking on an independent link at the completion of the study’s surveys. Students were informed that choices to click on the “continue” button after reviewing the introduction/eligibility page represented indications of their implied consent for study participation.
Students who participated in the study were roughly divided equally among the branch/satellite locations. Approximately 50% of the participants in each of these groups elected to enter the raffle. Both main- and satellite campus instructors sent emails reminding students two weeks before the study’s end-date (see Appendix E).

**Instruments**

**Demographic survey** (Author developed, 2007; see Appendix F). Demographic data were collected for descriptive purposes in establishing students’ identity and educational history. Descriptive data were obtained regarding participants’ (a) gender, (b) age, (c) race/ethnicity identification, (d) sexual orientation, (e) academic standing (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, certification, and/or other). Participants were asked to (f) rank their preferences for seeking future employment in rural, suburban, and/or urban school settings and (g) describe their own early educational experiences in terms of geographical location (rural, suburban, urban) and levels of diversity characterizing student populations, teachers, and circles of friends.

**Experiences in Close Relationships.** (ECR, Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; see Appendix G). The attachment questionnaires administered throughout the study were based on items from the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (ECR; Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). The ECR is a 36-item questionnaire examines patterns underlying individuals’ self-reported attachment-related anxiety and avoidance within the context of close relationships. Attachment-related anxiety (i.e., the degree to which one is sensitive to signs of rejection and attachment-related concerns) and attachment-related avoidance (i.e., the degree to which one uses proximity-seeking strategies to regulate attachment-related feelings) are conceptualized within the tenets of attachment theory to reside at the core of fundamental variances underlying patterns that differentiate cognitive, emotional, motivational, and behavioral functioning characteristic of
Individuals high in anxiety often worry about abandonment and feel neglected in their relationships, whereas those low in anxiety do not usually suffer from such concerns. The 18-item anxiety subscale measures the extent to which individuals are concerned about being rejected, abandoned, and unloved by others (e.g., “I worry about being abandoned”). Highly avoidant people tend to withdraw from emotional closeness, while individuals who are low in avoidance do not hesitate to rely on others for support and comfort (Fraley & Shaver, 2000). The 18-item avoidance subscale assesses the degree of individuals’ comfort/discomfort with closeness, intimacy, depending on others, and certainty/uncertainty that others can be relied upon when needed (e.g. “I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down”).

Individual differences in these two dimensions are thought to reflect variation in the working models and mental representations that individuals hold of self, others, and emotional experiences in close relationships. Individuals who score low on both dimensions are assumed to have secure working models. In the current study, the term attachment security was used to refer to both the low ends of the anxiety and avoidance dimensions- as well as individual differences in the organization of overall attachment orientations.

Participants are asked to rate degrees of attachment-related anxiety or avoidance on each item of the ECR questionnaire using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) disagree strongly to (7) agree strongly. The reliability of all ECR measures have been demonstrated to be adequate ranging from .85 to .89, as indicated by Cronbach’s alphas. Summary scores, reflecting adolescents’ attachment-related anxiety, are obtained by summing items along the anxiety dimension; possible scores ranged from 18 to 126. Summary scores reflecting individuals’
attachment-related avoidance are obtained by summing items along the avoidance dimension; possible scores ranged from 18 to 126.

Psychometric properties. The ECR has been widely used in attachment research among college populations for examining variances in attachment security as related to parent, peer friendship, dating, and romantic relationships and has evidenced strong psychometric properties with internal consistency, short-term test-retest reliability, and long-term test-retest reliability noted across numerous studies (Brennan et al., 1998; Crowell et al., 1999; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002). The dimensions of attachment-related anxiety and avoidance have been demonstrated to possess good construct validity (Brennan et al., 1998) and substantial predictive validity with respect to multiple social and emotional indices linked theoretically to attachment security (e.g. empathy (Mikulincer et al., 2001) caregiving (Feeney & Collins, 2001) and emotion regulation (Gross & John, 2003).

Four prototypic attachment styles. Attachment researchers also recognize four prototypes derived from the underlying dimensions of attachment avoidance and anxiety. Much like children's working models direct their attachment behavior in parent-child interactions, working models in adulthood should shape the way that adults express and regulate their attachment needs. Although the need for felt security is believed to be universal, people differ systematically in the way they cope with distress and regulate feelings of security (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). These differences in "attachment style" are thought to reflect underlying differences in internal working models of oneself (as worthy or unworthy of love and support) and others (as responsive or unresponsive), which are thought to develop, at least in part, from interactions with important attachment figures (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1973; Bretherton, 1985; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985).
These expectations are parts of relatively stable working models: mental representations of self and others in the context of close relationships. Consistent with the major tenets of attachment theory, adult attachment researchers have argued that these different styles of attachment can be understood in terms of rules that guide individuals' responses to emotionally distressing situations (Fraley and Shaver 2000), which have evolved, at least in part, in the context of parental responsiveness to signals of distress (Kobak and Sceery 1988). In fact, Kobak and Sceery (1988) suggested that the different attachment styles can be understood in terms of rules that guide responses to emotionally distressing situations (see also Bartholomew, Cobb, & Poole, 1997) and conceptualized within four distinct attachment styles: secure, preoccupied, dismissing avoidant, and fearful avoidant.

Individuals who are securely attached score low in both attachment related anxiety and avoidance and are governed by rules that allow acknowledgment of distress and turning to others for support. (Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Mikulincer, Florian, & Weller, 1993; Ognibene & Collins, 1998). Secure individuals are (a) confident that they are loved and valued by others, (b) comfortable with intimacy, and (c) willing to rely on others for support. Preoccupied (anxious-ambivalent) adults are high in anxiety and low in avoidance and their behaviors are organized around assumptions that others are unreliable and unlikely to remain consistently available for responding to their needs. Individuals who score high on anxiety maintain ongoing and exaggerated desires for closeness and dependence coupled with heightened concern about imminent rejection by others. Individuals classified as preoccupied maintain consistent hypervigilance by continually monitoring their social relationships for signs of potential rejection, thereby, inhibiting the energy and attention that have to devote towards self-confidence, autonomy, and meeting others’ needs (Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Mikulincer,
Dismissing avoidant adults are low in attachment-related anxiety but high in avoidance. Derived from experiences with caregivers who remained nonresponsive to their needs, individuals classified as dismissing avoidant (a) value independence and self-reliance, (b) view attachment relationships as unimportant in their lives, and (c) prefer to distance themselves from close experiences with others. Avoidantly-attached individuals’ lives are governed by rules that restrict acknowledgment of (a) emotions and emotional experiences, (b) relationships as viable sources of protection, comfort, and enjoyment, and (c) benefits derived from seeking- and/or providing- comfort and support from and/or to- others (Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Mikulincer, Florian, & Weller, 1993; Ognibene & Collins, 1998).

Finally, fearful avoidant individuals score high on both attachment anxiety and avoidance. Individuals who are classified as fearfully avoidant both desire the approval of- and close relationships with- others at the same time that they avoid intimacy due to their fears of being rejected. Close relationships of individuals who are fearfully avoidant are governed by intense desires for closeness and ambivalence surrounding their fears of becoming involved and therefore vulnerable to risks of being abandoned or rejected by others.

**Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale** (M-GUDS-S; Fuertes et al., 2000; see Appendix H) The M-GUDS-S is a 15-item questionnaire designed to assess cognitive, affective, and behavioral characteristics of universal-diverse orientation (Fuertes et al., 2000). Universal-diverse orientation (UDO) is defined by Miville et al. (1999) as an attitude that simultaneously incorporates the recognition and acceptance of both similarities and differences in self and others. The M-GUDS-S conceptualizes orientations towards universality/diversity as a compilation of three subscales formulated to assess (a) cognitive: Relativistic Appreciation of
oneself and others involves a simultaneous recognition and acceptance of the similarities and differences that exist among- and between- people, (b) behavioral: Diversity of Contact involves both previous and future (e.g. intended) behaviors relevant to interpersonal contact with people of different demographic backgrounds from one’s own; and (c) affective: Sense of Connection involves ones’ recognitions of the existence of shared experiences among all human beings- dimensions of individuals’ orientations towards diversity in interpersonal relationships (Fuertes et al., 2000). M-GUDS request participants to rate items on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (6).

**Psychometric properties.** Miville et al. (1999) reported Cronbach’s alpha of the original M-GUDS total score at .92 and test-retest reliability was \( r = .94 \). Cronbach’s alpha for the subscale scores on the M-GUDS-S were as followed: Relativistic alpha = .59, Sense of Connection alpha = .92, and Appreciation of Diversity or Comfort with Differences alpha = .92 . Total M-GUDS-S Alpha = .77. The convergent validity of M-GUDS scores was evidenced by significant correlations in theoretically predicted ways with measures of racial identity (Helms & Carter, 1990), empathy (Davis, 1983), healthy narcissism (Goldman & Gelso, 1997), and dogmatism as described below. For the M-GUDS-S, convergent validity was established through significant correlations in the expected directions, with single items centered on diversity-related issues. Results also indicate no significant effect of race on the M-GUDS-S or its subscales.

The M-GUDS score displayed discriminant validity by failing to correlate with measures in the Scholastic Assessment Test Verbal scores and mixed findings with a measure of social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). The mixed nature of results surrounding social desirability scores has led the author to suggest that future studies incorporating the universality-diversity orientation should control for potential socially desirable responding (Brummett et
Cognitive dimensions. The Dogmatism Scale (Troldahl & Powell, 1965; Rokeach (1960) was selected to assess cognitive dimensions of UDO. The construct of dogmatism is related to prejudice (Rokeach, 1960) and refers to qualities of rigidity and closed mindedness in individuals’ thinking and belief systems and is posited to extend across diverse domains including aesthetics, cognition, perception, and ideology. In a study investigating levels of counselors' relative open-mindedness/closed-mindedness, high scores on dogmatism were associated with counselors' (a) increased tendencies to be judgmental (e.g. evaluative) of clients, and decreased tendencies to (b) exhibit supportive/understanding responses, and/or (c) demonstrate counseling effectiveness (Carlozzi, 1985). Negative correlations (-.27) with the dogmatism measure suggested that individuals who score higher on the MGUDS tend to be characterized by less rigid and dogmatic attitudes that individuals with lower scores.

Social dimensions. Racial identity (defined as identification or nonidentification with one's racial group; Helms, 1984, 1990, 1995) is generally theorized to be qualitatively different for Whites and people of color (Helms, 1995) and assesses the presence and quality of attitudes of conflict over- or acceptance (positive or negative- (a) of one's own racial group membership and (b) towards other social groups and their relevant oppressed and nonoppressed status. The M-GUDS showed a significant association with all subscales in both the White Racial Identity Scale (WRIAS; Helms, 1990) and Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (BRIAS; Helms, 1990) suggesting associations with the internalization of a positive resolution of racial identity for both groups. Contrary to predictions, the M-GUDS was positively related to social desirability, indicating that African American participants expressing UDO tended to express more socially desirable responses.
**Affective dimensions.** M-GUDS investigated emotional reactions to stereotypes including attitudes toward feminism, awareness of sexism, inclinations towards promoting egalitarian relationships between men and women, and refusal to adhere to gender stereotypes (Livingstone & Luxton, 1989). Scores on M-GUDS have been shown to predict college students’ help-seeking behavior, attitudes towards diversity of people and programs in a college setting, and their academic self-confidence. With respect to personality functioning, scores on M-GUDS have been related to self-efficacy, positive thinking, and numerous coping skills such as active coping and planning, seeking social support, and using positive reinterpretation.

The M-GUDS was formulated for providing access to negative attitudes—such as prejudice (e.g. defined as "an attitude toward members of some specific group, leading the persons who hold it to evaluate others in a characteristic—usually negative, fashion solely on the basis of the membership in that group" (Baron & Byrne, 1984, p. 170). Given the clarity and weight of expectations placed upon trainees by NCATE to work successfully with all youth—the incorporation of a scale such as M-GUDS may offer a valuable tool for assessing what is likely to be experienced by candidates as a sensitive issue.

**Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory- ROCI-II** (ROCI-II, Rahim, 2001; see Appendix L) The instrument selected for this study, the Rahim Conflict Inventory Scale II (ROCI-II, Rahim, 2004), conceptualizes variances in individual preferences for handling interpersonal conflict in terms of the degrees to which individuals focus on satisfying their own concerns (high/low) - and/or focus on desires for satisfying the concerns of others (high/low) across five subscales for handling interpersonal conflict (Rahim & Bonoma, 1979) into five conflict styles. Rahim’s work builds upon foundations established in game theory to describe the five conflict styles across self/other dimensions: (a) integrating (win/win), (b) obliging
(lose/win), (c) compromising (mixed: no win/no lose), (d) avoiding lose/lose, and (e) dominating (win/lose) styles, each accompanied by parallel terminologies as presented in game theory (Rahim, 2001).

**Psychometric properties.** Psychometrics have been reported on the ROCI-II for discriminant validity. Pearson's corrected item–total correlations, and median intercorrelations of items of a subscale and their median intercorrelations with the items of other subscales for collegiate samples were conducted. The corrected item–total correlations for the five subscales ranged between .38 and .59 in collegiate samples ($p < .0001$). In collegiate samples, average intercorrelations of the five items for the indices were: integrating (.36), obliging (.33), dominating (.38), avoiding (.38), and compromising (.32) styles among collegiate samples was, and respectively. Each inter-item correlation was positive and significant beyond .001 level. The off-diagonal median intercorrelations of items were much lower than median intercorrelations of items in the diagonal.

A confirmatory factor analysis investigated the construct validity of the five ROCI–II subscales and their factor invariance across groups. Results from the confirmatory factor analysis provided evidence of both the convergent and discriminant validities of the subscales in diverse samples. Evidence of these validities together with the evidence reported in other field and experimental studies (Eshleman, 1982; Lee, 1990; Levy, 1989; Psenicka & Rahim, 1989; Ting-Toomey et al., 1991; Wardlaw, 1988) provide support for the construct validity of the instrument.

Reliability was established on a collegiate sample of 119 students (cite). The five ROCI–II subscales of conflict styles retest reliabilities ranged between .60 and .83 ($p < .0001$) at one-week interval. The internal consistency reliability coefficients, which ranged between .65–.80
collegiate samples were satisfactory. The test–retest and internal consistency reliability coefficients compare quite favorably with those of other existing instruments. The retest correlations for several instruments ranged between .41–.66 for Hall (1969); .33–.63 for Lawrence–Lorsch (1967); and .61–.68 for Thomas–Kilmann (1974) instruments. The Cronbach $\alpha$ for Hall, Lawrence–Lorsch, and Thomas–Kilmann instruments ranged between .39–.73, .37–.59, and .43–.71 respectively (Thomas & Kilmann, 1978, p. 1141). The Thomas–Kilmann and Hall instruments showed somewhat higher reliabilities than the other two instruments.

To ensure that the five subscales of conflict styles were free from social desirability or response distortion bias, Pearson correlations between the five subscales of the ROCI–II and impression management, social desirability, and lie scales were computed with data a collegiate sample (cite). Of the 60 correlations, only 7 were statistically significant. Although these correlations were significant, they were marginal, which ranged between (+) – .09 and (+) – .20. The correlations indicate that the five subscales of conflict styles are free from social desirability or response distortion bias.

The results from a number of field studies investigating the relationship between gender and styles of handling interpersonal conflict have been inconclusive. Rahim (1983a) indicated that there may be differences in the ways men and women handle their interpersonal conflict. Rahim’s study with 50 female and 50 male managers suggested that female managers tended to use more integrating, avoiding, and compromising and less obliging conflict styles than male managers. Rahim notes that the results of data analysis indicate that the male/female perspectives surrounding conflict may differ in other subtle ways (e.g. ranking the conflict styles in the same order and interpreting items on the ROCI-II similarly) and suggests future factor analysis on female and male subsamples for gaining greater understanding of this problem. Other studies
comparing conflict-handling modes of men and women in organizations have used other instruments (Renwick, 1977; Shockley-Zalabak, 1981) suggest no statistically significant differences in conflict-handling modes between men and women.

**Integrating conflict style.** The integrating conflict style is representative of approaches that convey, across all of its dimensions, the expression of an inclusive and collaborative stance. The integrating style is grounded in (a) concerns surrounding the needs, interest, and goals of all (e.g., self and others) parties, (b) beliefs that optimal resolutions of conflict represent outcomes that are mutually acceptable to all parties, (c) assumptions that the most satisfying, enduring, and creative resolutions emerge not from the use of power, influence, or expertise but from (d) collaborative processes characterized by (d) open exploration of all participants’ perspectives and feelings and (e) the exchange of accurate information that leads to a (f) thorough and shared understanding of salient issues and goals from which (g) input derived from ideas expressed by all participants is synthesized to become a joint solution and conflict is resolved in “best possible way”.

Integrating conflict styles are most closely aligned with a referent power base from which student compliance is more likely to emerge due to identification with admiration for and/or liking of their teacher. Integrative dimensions in conflict styles are characterized as diagnosis of-and intervention in conflict events “so that issues are effectively dealt with” (Rahim, 2001, p. 10). Follett describes “the first rule for obtaining integration is to put your cards on the table, face the real issue, uncover the conflict, bring the whole thing out into the open” (1940, p. 38). The open examination and processing of differences is required in addition to shared mutual concerns in order to generate creative solutions that are acceptable to all parties. Gray (1980)
describes this collaborative orientation as “a process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their limited vision of what is possible” (p. 5).

The uniqueness of the solutions that are generated by groups and the degrees of satisfaction that are experienced by group members have been linked to relative levels of concern for all parties. Optimal outcomes, however, are associated with elevated levels of concern for self and other (high/high) wherein lesser levels of concern (low/low) are associated with solutions that address the issues less effectively- and are experienced with less satisfaction by group members, “as a result of their failure to confront and solve their problems” (Rahim, 2004, p. 11). Prein suggests that integrating styles incorporate two distinctive dimensions: (a) confrontation: involves open communication, clearing up misunderstanding, and analyzing the underlying causes of conflict; and (b) problem-solving: generations of optimally-effective solutions require foundations built upon accurate identification and understanding of the “real” (Rahim, 2001, p. 29) problems that comprise the conflict.

An integrating conflict style shares common characteristics with an authoritative parenting style that is involved, offers developmentally appropriate expectations and encourages and permits youth to develop their own opinions and beliefs (Steinberg, 2000bernard). Studies investigating adolescents’ conflict styles within parental conflict established that secure teenagers remain more engaged, exhibited less evidence of avoidance during debates, and were less likely to display dysfunctional anger (Kobak, Cole, Ferenz-Gillies, Fleming, & Ganble, 1993). Adolescents and parents who were described as securely attached tended to express and communicate with one another more freely surrounding their emotions (Bretherton, 1987) suggesting an association between internal working models of relationships and expectations that
one will be responded to openly as well as sensitively (Cassidy, 1994).

The current study suggests that integrating styles’ preferences for process-oriented conflict resolution that encourages active participation of all parties represents conceptual alignment with attachment theory’s safe haven and proximity-maintenance as its open reciprocal processes offer context that are likely to enhance (a) perceptions of security associated with teachers’ (b) accessibility, (c) availability), (d) prompt access to co-regulation of affect with teacher, and opportunities for (d) exposure to teacher/peer modeling of positive communication models, (e) participation that builds competence and autonomy in acquiring enhanced emotional and social competence, and (f) problem-solving skills (Chirkov & Ryan, 2001; Ryan & Deci, 2000), and (g) commitment to democratic values (Benard, 2004).

**Compromising conflict style** The compromising conflict style maintains moderate concern for self and other and has been characterized as a ‘mixed motive’, give-and-take, or sharing (Rahim & Shapiro, 2000, p. 12) model in which both parties give up something in order to reach a mutually acceptable resolution. Obliging styles are willing to give up more than compromising while styles while obliging styles are willing to give up more than dominating. A compromising style tends to be more directive than an avoiding style but does not endorse an in-depth exploration of issues and perspectives as the integrating style. Compromising approaches seek practical and expedient middle-ground solutions that request individuals to ‘split the difference.

**Obliging conflict style.** This style involves low concern for self and high concern for the other party involved in conflict. An obliging person attempts to play down the differences and emphasize commonalities to satisfy the concern of the other party. There is an element of self-sacrifice in this style. It may take the form of selfless generosity, charity, or obedience to another
person's wishes. “An obliging person neglects his or her own concerns to satisfy the concerns of the other party” in demonstrating a willingness to ‘accommodate’, ‘allow concessions’, and ‘satisfy [others’] expectations (Rahim & Shapiro, 2000, p. 10). Teachers exhibiting obliging conflict styles may act as a “conflict absorber… a person whose reaction to perceived hostile act on the part of another has low hostility or even positive friendliness” (Boulder, 1962, p. 171).

Avoiding conflict style. This involves low concern for self as well as for the other party involved in conflict. This has been associated with withdrawal, passing-the-buck, sidestepping, or "see no evil, hear no evil, speak on evil" situations. This style is often characterized as an unconcerned attitude toward the issue or parties involved in conflict. It may also take the form of postponing an issue or simply withdrawing from a threatening situation. Avoiding styles appear to prefer to avoid negative interactions even if at a personal cost to self (eliminates possibility of gaining support or resolution of own concerns) especially when interactions may result in potential exposure to interpersonal risk (e.g. negative affect or others’ disapproval).

Dominating conflict style. This style involves high concern for implementing the teacher’s expectation and beliefs and low concern for the needs, desires, and goals that may be at stake for individual youth in a conflict situation. In endorsing a dominant conflict style in the classroom, teachers operate from a coercive power (e.g. associated with the ability to deliver punishment) stance (win-lose) to use their positions of relative authority, influence, and power to pressure students to comply with teacher-directed regulations, norms, and expectations without acknowledging youths’ expectations or perspectives surrounding the particular conditions that may underlie a particular conflict event. Teachers’ dominating styles may orient them to defer to students at times for the purpose of furthering the adult’s own position.
Data Analysis Plan

Hierarchical Regression was used to analyze data. The independent (predictor) variables are preservice teachers’ (a) demographic variables (age, gender, racial/ethnic identification, and sexual identification) including (b) geographical locations (rural, suburban, and urban) and (c) levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, and close circle of friends) characterizing their own PreK-12 educational experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, avoidant, and fearful, and (d) universality-diversity orientation (diverse contact, comfort with differences, and relativistic appreciation). The dependent variable is preservice teachers’ conflict styles with subscales assessing of integrating, obliging, dominating, and avoiding conflict styles.

Random assignment cannot be used, as preservice teacher’s attachment styles and universal-diverse orientations have existed prior to the current study.

After gathering the data, each variable was separately assessed to obtain measures of central tendency, dispersion, and frequency distributions to determine normal if variables were normally distributed. Indicators of skewness (Table 2), the measure of how symmetrical the data are (i.e. the mean and median vary widely and, therefore, do not appear together in the middle of the distribution)- and kurtosis (Table 2), the measure of the characteristics of the distribution’s peak (i.e. either too peaked or too flat), fall within acceptable ranges of extreme values ($> +3$ or $<-3$). The Shapiro-Wilk test, in combination with the instruments’ production of a low number of participants indicated that not all test variables were normally distributed. Therefore, non-parametric tests were used with those variables.

The relationship of each of the independent variables with the dependent variable was assessed one at a time. Correlation coefficients were calculated to create a scatter plot and it
was determined that each of the pairs of variables are linearly related to one another. A correlation coefficient matrix was constructed for examining relationships between all of the independent variables with one another in order to determine their degrees of correlation. Correlation coefficients (Table 2) evidence some overlap among attachment dimensions and styles in ways that are theoretically consistent with these variables as defined by attachment theory. The degrees of correlation indicated by these coefficients, however, fall within the limits of values that would otherwise raise concerns about multicollinearity. Regression equations were calculated from the data and tested for their significance in explaining variances in predicting dependent variables examined in each of the major research questions.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Descriptive statistics on the sample and bivariate correlations on the scales were included in the preliminary analyses. The survey instrument produced a low number of participants, and the Shapiro-Wilk Test coefficient showed that not all the test variables were normally distributed. Therefore, non-parametric tests were used. Spearman correlation and ANOVA were used to explore correlations between attachment (anxiety and avoidance) dimensions and styles (security, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful), and the integrating conflict style. Next, Spearman correlation was used to examine correlates between attachment scores and participants’ universality/diversity orientations (diverse contacts, comfort with differences, and relativistic appreciation. The major questions were answered with Hierarchical Multiple Regression.

Pre-Analysis

Out of a potential pool of approximately 640 candidates enrolled in courses identified for recruitment sites for this research, 112 individuals logged on to the study’s URL. Certain measures within the Experience in Close Relationships (ECR), Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale- S (M-GUDS-S), and the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI-II) had missing data. The valid N listwise was 75.

Demographic information for the 73 preservice teachers who completed all surveys is provided in Table 1.
Table 1. Demographics for Sample (N=73)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lesbian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freshman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophomore</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junior</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certification program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate Analysis

Descriptive and Normality Statistics for All Regression Variables are summarized in Table 2.
Table 2. Descriptive and Normality Statistics for All Regression Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservice Teachers Own Educational Experiences</td>
<td>1.820</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall levels of diversity characterizing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student populations ****</td>
<td>2.410</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>-.780</td>
<td>-.603</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers ****</td>
<td>2.730</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>-1.419</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close circle of friends ****</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>-6.44</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td>2.501</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td>2.260</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>3.382</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>4.330</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.749</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.204</td>
<td>7.955</td>
<td>35.910</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preoccupied</td>
<td>14.200</td>
<td>12.645</td>
<td>53.620</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>-.357</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dismissing</td>
<td>12.895</td>
<td>11.512</td>
<td>55.610</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fearful</td>
<td>13.400</td>
<td>13.967</td>
<td>65.910</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universality-Diversity Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity of contact</td>
<td>19.959</td>
<td>5.240</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>-.357</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relativistic appreciation</td>
<td>23.521</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>-.382</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfort with differences</td>
<td>24.233</td>
<td>4.148</td>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>-.771</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** 1=urban, 2=suburban, 3=urban
**** In the given category sociocultural identities of (student populations, teachers, close circle of friends,) were described by participants as either 1) pretty much the same as mine, 2) mostly like mine, but some different, or 3) just as likely to be different as the same as mine.

Bivariate Analysis

Table 3 shows the Spearman correlation tests conducted on the test variables.
### Table 3. Spearman Correlation Matrix for Predictor and Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>- .423**</td>
<td>- .244**</td>
<td>.190**</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>- .178</td>
<td>- .112</td>
<td>- .087</td>
<td>- .133</td>
<td>- .051</td>
<td>.280*</td>
<td>.256*</td>
<td>.277*</td>
<td>- .083</td>
<td>- .200</td>
<td>- .141</td>
<td>- .346**</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>- .234*</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>- .118</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>- .041</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.250*</td>
<td>- .029</td>
<td>- .071</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>- .169</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.292*</td>
<td>.650**</td>
<td>.752**</td>
<td>.560**</td>
<td>.853**</td>
<td>- .097</td>
<td>- .105</td>
<td>- .181</td>
<td>- .315**</td>
<td>- .085</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.758**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.881**</td>
<td>.804**</td>
<td>.935**</td>
<td>.704**</td>
<td>- .136</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>- .145</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>- .015</td>
<td>.629**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.985**</td>
<td>.988**</td>
<td>.940**</td>
<td>- .123</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>- .160</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.834**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.955**</td>
<td>.981**</td>
<td>- .121</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>- .173</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.870**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.893**</td>
<td>- .132</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>- .148</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.798**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>- .103</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>- .174</td>
<td>- .079</td>
<td>- .005</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.889**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.477**</td>
<td>.657**</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>- .124</td>
<td>- .111</td>
<td>- .547**</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>- .368**</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>- .582**</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>- .016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.254*</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level.  ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level.
Major Research Questions

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how certain measures predicted conflict styles among participants. The predictors in Model 1 were participants’ (a) racial/ethnic identification and characteristics of preservice teachers’ own PreK-12 educational experiences including (b) school location (1= rural, 2= suburban, 3= urban) and levels of relative similarity and/or differences between participants’ own- and others’ sociocultural identities described as 1) “pretty much the same as mine”, 2) “mostly like mine, but some different”, or 3) “just as likely to be different as the same as my own”- across these categories: overall student populations, teachers, and close circles of friends. The predictors in Model 2 were avoidance and anxiety dimensions, attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful), universality-diversity orientations (diversity of contact, relativistic concern, and comfort with differences.

Research Question 1: Predictors for Integrating Conflict Styles

To what extent do variances in (a) demographic variables including racial/ethnic identification, (b) school location (rural, suburban, urban) and relative levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, circle of friends) characterizing individuals’ own PreK-12 educational experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful); and universality-diversity (diverse contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) orientation- predict preservice teachers’ integrating conflict styles?

Results for hierarchical regression examining the degrees to which predictor variables contribute to preservice teachers’ endorsement of an integrating conflict style are displayed in Table 4.
In Model 1, none of the independent variables characterizing aspects of individuals’ own PreK-12 educational experiences including school locations (either rural, suburban, or rural \( \beta = -0.043, \rho = 0.729 \)) or levels of overall diversity among student populations \( \beta = 0.78, \rho = 0.469 \), teachers \( \beta = 0.094, \rho = 0.527 \), or close circle of friends \( \beta = 0.025, \rho = 0.788 \) were found to be statistically significant in predicting preservice teachers’ integrating conflict styles. When the hierarchical regression analyses was expanded with additional variables as defined for Model 2, both positive scores in the anxiety attachment dimension \( \beta = 0.182, \rho = 0.015 \) and relativistic concern \( \beta = 0.057, \rho = 0.003 \) subscale assessing cognitive dimensions of participants’ universality-diversity orientations - and negative scores for a dismissive attachment style \( \beta = -0.094, \rho = 0.010 \) accounted for 33% of the variances in predicting preservice teachers’ preferences for endorsing integrating conflict styles.
Research Question 2: Predictors for Compromising Conflict Styles

To what extent do variances in (a) demographic variables including racial/ethnic identification, (b) school location (rural, suburban, urban) and relative levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, circle of friends) characterizing individuals’ own PreK-12 educational experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful); and universality-diversity (diverse contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) orientation- predict preservice teachers’ compromising conflict styles?

Table 5. Hierarchical Regression Predicting Compromising Conflict Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Compromising Conflict Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice Teachers' Own Education Experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school location</td>
<td>-.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall levels of diversity characterizing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student population</td>
<td>-.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close circle of friends</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preoccupied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dismissive</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fearful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universality-Diversity Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity of contact</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relativistic appreciation</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfort with differences</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² | .072 | .121
Adjusted R² | .018 | -.005

In the full regression model, none of the independent variables were found to be significant in accounting for variances in predicting a compromising conflict style among preservice teachers. Model 1, however, suggested negative associations between participants’ own educational experiences in schools located in rural settings (β = -.77) and the likelihood (ρ = .015) that preservice teachers would endorse compromising conflict styles.
Research Question 3: Predictors for Obliging Conflict Styles

To what extent do variances in (a) demographic variables including racial/ethnic identification, (b) school location (rural, suburban, urban) and relative levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, circle of friends) characterizing individuals’ own PreK-12 educational experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful); and universality-diversity (diverse contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) orientation predict preservice teachers’ obliging conflict styles?

Table 6. Hierarchical Regression Predicting Obliging Conflict Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Obliging Conflict Style</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservice Teachers’ Own Education Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school location</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall levels of diversity characterizing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall student population</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close circle of friends</td>
<td></td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preoccupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dismissive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fearful</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universality-Diversity Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity of contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relativistic appreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.128</td>
<td></td>
<td>.201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.077</td>
<td></td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 suggests that the levels of diversity that characterize individuals’ exposures to others whose sociocultural identities differ from their own play roles in predicting preservice likely orientations towards displaying obliging orientations towards the management of conflict events in prospective classroom situations. The addition of predictor variables in Model 2 suggest that decreases in relative exposures to peers in student populations whose sociocultural identities differ from one’s own (β = -.208, ρ = .032) in combination with increases in exposures to
classroom teachers’ whose sociocultural identities are similar to one’s own ($\beta = 2.68, \rho = .055$) function together to account for 20.1% of the variance in predicting preservice teachers’ preferences for obliging conflict styles.

**Research Question 4: Predictors for Avoiding Conflict Styles**

To what extent do variances in (a) demographic variables including racial/ethnic identification, (b) school location (rural, suburban, urban) and relative levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, circle of friends) characterizing individuals’ own PreK-12 educational experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful); and universality-diversity (diverse contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) orientation - predict preservice teachers’ avoiding conflict styles?

Table 7. will display results from hierarchical regression model for predicting preservice teachers’ avoiding attachment styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Avoiding Conflict Style</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice Teachers’ Own Education Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school location</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Diversity among:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall student population</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close circle of friends</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preoccupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dismissive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fearful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universality-Diversity Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity of contact</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relativistic appreciation</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfort with differences</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the regression model displayed in Table 7, scores associated with participants’ dismissive attachment styles ($\beta = .082, \rho = .000$) accounted for 79.9% of the variance in predicting preservice teachers’ endorsement of an avoiding conflict style. Although non-significant ($\rho = .531$), scores assessing individuals’ anxiety dimension ($\beta = .049$ represented the only other attachment measures remaining after avoiding attachment dimensions and secure, preoccupied, and fearful attachment styles were excluded from Model 2 due to collinearity.

**Research Question 5: Predictors for Dominating Conflict Styles**

To what extent do variances in (a) demographic variables including racial/ethnic identification, (b) school location (rural, suburban, urban) and relative levels of diversity (student populations, teachers, circle of friends) characterizing individuals’ own PreK-12 educational experiences; (c) attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissive, and fearful); and universality-diversity (diverse contact, comfort with differences, relativistic appreciation) orientation- predict preservice teachers’ dominating conflict styles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Dominating Conflict Style</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$  $\rho$</td>
<td>$\beta$  $\rho$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice Teachers’ Education Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school location</td>
<td>-.440  .006</td>
<td>-.210  .132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Diversity among:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall student population</td>
<td>-.138  .318</td>
<td>-.161  .170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>.111  .562</td>
<td>.252  .136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close circle of friends</td>
<td>-.108  .370</td>
<td>.084  .430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.109  .216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preoccupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dismissive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006  .442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fearful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universality-Diversity Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity of contact</td>
<td>-.044  .023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relativistic appreciation</td>
<td>-.016  .468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfort with differences</td>
<td>-.054  .014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.134  .466</td>
<td>.083  .390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.083  .390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the full regression model, negative coefficient scores on behavioral and emotional dimensions of participants’ universality-diversity orientations, diversity of contact ($\beta = -.044, \rho = .023$) and comfort with differences ($\beta = -.054, \rho = .014$), respectively, accounted for 46.6% of the variance in predicting a dominating conflict style.
Chapter 5: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the salience of attachment theory for providing a comprehensive framework for not only defining the components of attitudes, values, beliefs, verbal and nonverbal behaviors that operate within teachers’ professional dispositions to enhance their effectiveness in the classroom, but to understand how they work in conjunction with one another. If the principles of attachment theory do govern the ways in which teachers and student interact, then building upon the over sixty years of research may offer teacher preparation programs a strong foundation for optimizing novice teachers readiness to “survive and thrive” in contemporary classrooms.

Limitations

Sample Size

The study’s low n represents a limitation in the degree to which findings from this research may be generalized for targeting the design of interventions for guiding teacher education programs’ efforts in supporting the development of those dimensions of intra- and inter-personal functioning found in the professional dispositions of educators who demonstrate capacities for the constructive management of conflict in today’s increasingly diverse classrooms. The study’s sampling method was designed to reduce potential sources of bias derived from differences among unspecified patterns of characteristics within participants’ professional disposition that may be related to preservice teachers’ existing goals surrounding their intentions to pursue grade level and content and/or specialty area- by recruiting undergraduate students enrolled in courses that are required for all education majors.

Efforts devoted to highlighting evidence of the consistent presence- and universal nature of attachment theory’s core themes as reflected across broad spectrums of developmental,
resilience, and educational psychology drew upon, by necessity, the frequency with the same themes are characterized as factors of either protection and/or risk- regardless of variances in age, gender, contexts, or foci of interest of the studies in which they are embedded. The degree to which these underlying substrates may contribute towards natural tendencies toward collinearity among the independent and dependent variables is likely to have been further compounded by the low number of participants.

As manifestations of elements comprising teachers’ basic sensitivity and responsiveness are supported by underlying mental representations of self, others, relationships, and the meanings- and effects of the emotion-based communications that occur naturally between youth and caregiver figures are expressed within the contexts of daily exchanges and teacher/student relationships- the nature of their parallel functions and goals may compete with one another within the regression analyses to distort and possible even to diminish statistical evidence of the relationships between them. Future studies with a larger sample may provide more conclusive evidence of the capacities of attachment theory’s explanatory values to capture the effects of the study’s independent variables in predicting teachers’ conflict styles.

**Lack of Sociocultural Diversity in Sample**

Although participants’ demographic profiles (see Table 1, Demographics for Sample N for review) are unevenly distributed within categories of gender (female: n=62, 84.9 %); male: n=11, 15.1 %) and race (White: n=64, 88.7 %); Hispanic: n =9, 12.3%), it is also interesting to note that these distribution patterns are not unlike those characterizing national norms for gender (female: 76%) and race (White: 83%; African American and Hispanic: 7%) among those currently teaching in U.S. public schools (NCES, 2010). The lack of sociocultural diversity in the current study does fail to address longstanding problems characterizing education researchers’
continued failures to adequately explore- and learn how to address the challenges that preservice teachers of color experience in addressing differences between their own sociocultural identities and those held by students in their classrooms.

**Snap-shot Study: Viewing Study Results in Terms of Preservice Teachers’ Daily Management of Classroom Conflict Events**

This dissertation’s findings offer a rudimentary snap-shot of correlates among effects-derived from preservice teachers’ own early socialization histories embedded in the dimensions of attachment anxiety and avoidance and attachment styles that would be expected to govern complex dimensions of intra- and interpersonal functioning underlying the nature and qualities of preservice teachers’ daily interactions with youth. Predictor variables selected for this study’s regression models were designed to explore learning effects derived both from preservice apprenticeships (Lortie, 1975) as learners during their own PreK-12 educational experiences in which individuals’ encountered daily realities of the relative similarities of- or differences between their own sociocultural identities and those of general student populations, teachers, and close peers by gaining understanding of individuals’ prior exposures to daily realities tied to relative differences and sameness of one’s own sociocultural identities with those of teachers, friends, and broader student populations- as well as the effects of deeper socialization processes within the contexts of early relationships with their own primary caregivers.

**Predicting Integrating Conflict Styles**

The 33% of the variance accounted for by (a) higher levels of anxiety attachment dimension ($\beta = .182, \rho = .015$), (b) negative scores for a dismissive attachment style ($\beta = .094, \rho = .010$) and (c) positive scores evidencing the presence of relativistic concern ($\beta = .057, \rho = .003$) in predicting an integrating conflict style is theoretically consistent with attachment
theory’s principles and would be expected to provide explanatory values for understanding novice teachers’ relative effectiveness in managing student behavior during conflict events in the classroom.

**Positive scores: anxiety attachment dimension.** Low, but positive, levels of attachment anxiety would be expected to direct preservice teachers’ field of attention towards monitoring their students’ emotional states and the status of teacher/student relationships. These individuals may be more likely to experience empathic concern and maintain access to a store of emotion-based memories of the relative effectiveness of interpersonal strategies they have employed to resolve conflict in their own personal relationships. Questions remain, however, upon the adaptive functioning of preservice teachers with higher attachment anxiety scores when placed in challenging interpersonal contexts during classroom events when individuals’ attachment systems are activated to trigger individuals’ preoccupation with their own- versus students’ emotional distress. Elevated levels of attachment anxiety are associated with increased tendencies for individuals to distort others’ interpersonal signals, misattribute their intentions, and use less constructive strategies for responding to conflict.

**Positive scores: relativistic appreciation.** Higher scores on universality-diversity orientations cognitive-based subscale, relativistic appreciation, would be expected to be manifested in more highly-differentiated understanding of- and respect for- the ways in which students may simultaneously perceive, attach social meaning, and experience emotional responses in ways that are similar to- as well as different from their teacher and peers during the same conflict event. Communicating understanding and acceptance of these differences and similarities may serve to guide teachers in responding sensitively to youths’ signals, maintain behavioral expectations that are calibrated to youths’ individual capacities for emotion
regulation, and providing contexts that will promote ongoing gains in youths’ emerging social competence in navigating conflict in ways that support—rather than threaten fulfillment of their own- and others’ basic needs. Research suggests that conflict settings that build upon foundations provided by positive socialization experiences are more likely to enhance youths’ natural motivation to endorse—rather than aggress against their classroom community’s social norms.

**Negative scores: dismissive attachment style.** Lower scores suggesting a negative relationship between dismissive attachment styles predictions for an integrating conflict style are theoretically consistent with attachment theory’s principles. Characteristics of dismissive attachment styles are manifested in drives to avoid rather than embrace open styles of bi-directional communications in which students are encouraged to explore opinions and concerns underlying their own- and others’ emotional responses to conflict. The manifestation of dismissive attachment styles in conflict events would lead individuals to be less likely to maintain positive views of students, concerns for their experiences, and expectations that value cooperation among all parties in arriving at mutually acceptable resolutions of conflict. Dismissive approaches would be more likely to be directed towards strategies that would end conflict promptly rather than provide opportunities for students to engage in and assume active ownership of problem-solving and conflict resolution.

*Attachment perspectives for teacher educators.* Lower dismissing scores and higher anxiety suggests, somewhat unexpectedly, that anxiety may play more of a role in supporting positive teacher/student relationships (Trusty, Ng, & Watts, 2005) than originally posited by traditional attachment conceptualizations of caregiving models. In fact, throughout this study’s results, attachment anxiety scores, though often non-significant outplaced secure in scores in
demonstrating relatively more acceptance of sociocultural differences. One of this study’s limitations is certainly the low number of participants, however, the presence of systematic patterns in this exploratory research suggests that further research is warranted.

As Trusty et al. (2005) reported in their article examining relationships between anxiety and avoidance dimensions and levels of empathy among master’s levels counselor trainees that attachment anxiety in terms of sensitivity to others may represent more of a resource than was realized in early attachment research. It is difficult to draw any conclusions from this current study as to how well the integrating style would serve individuals who are anxiously-attached. While the open, bi-directional forms of communication may provide preservice teachers with their outlets for their own emotional expression, their tendency for inappropriate disclosure, over-sensitivity to criticism, need for approval, and becoming overwhelmed with youths’ negative emotions would suggest that this remains an open question.

**Predicting Compromising Conflict Styles**

**Lack of definitive results.** Hierarchical regression employed in the current research offer little additional insight for understanding predictors that are likely to account for variance in predicting preservice endorsement of a compromising conflict styles as none of the independent variables in the full model approached statistical significance. Morris-Rothschild & Brassard (2006) examined linkages between teachers’ attachment- and conflict styles and found compromising approaches to conflict resolution to be somewhat intermixed with orientations towards integrating and to a lesser degree obliging styles. In their study, teachers’ reports of higher levels of self-efficacy were associated with more proactive approaches to classroom management in which teachers demonstrated moderate concern for self and others (Rahim & Bonoma, 1979), commitment to assume some personal responsibility for addressing student
behavior in the classroom (Dembo & Gibson, 1985; Gutkin & Achenbaum, 1984; Hughes, Grossman, & Barker, 1990), and willingness to devote some time and energy in seeking constructive resolution to conflict.

The compromising conflict style reflects individuals’ preferences to adopt a practical approach to resolving conflict in ways that maintain moderate concerns for self and other. Strategies based upon compromising styles’ approaches to conflict are more directive in nature than integrating styles and are less invested in exploring and gaining in-depth understanding of individuals’ perspectives of the issues involved in a conflict situation.

Implications for teacher preparation. Characterized as a ‘mixed motive’ approach, the strategies employed by a compromising conflict style remain oriented towards expedient resolutions that require individuals to adopt a give-and-take stance in which all parties must prepare themselves to “split the difference” in terms of their needs and concerns in order to arrive at a solution (Rahim & Shapiro, 2000, p. 12). Applying attachment perspectives for conceptualizing variances in classroom outcomes associated with individuals’ compromising conflict styles may guide teacher preparation programs to focus on developing preservice teachers’ awareness of the critical importance of fully understanding implications that conflict resolution outcomes have in supporting or detracting from individual students’ (a) broader perceptions of physical, psychological, emotional, and social security, (b) emerging capacities for self-regulation of emotions underlying behavioral displays, (c) access to resources for the fulfillment of basic needs for belonging with peers, membership in the classroom community, and continued growth in acquiring a personal sense of competence and autonomy- as opposed to teachers’ conceptualizations of fairness appraised as the “equal” delivery of standardized consequences to all students involved in a conflict event.
Predicting Obliging Conflict Styles

Differences of sociocultural identity relative to student populations (negative scores) and classroom teachers (positive scores). Model 2 suggest that decreases in relative exposures to peers in student populations whose sociocultural identities differ from one’s own ($\beta = -.208, \rho = .032$) in combination with increases in exposures to classroom teachers’ whose sociocultural identities are similar to one’s own ($\beta = 2.68, \rho = .055$) function together to account for 20.1% of the variance in predicting preservice teachers’ preferences for obliging conflict styles.

Low concern for self- and high concern for others serve as psychological substrates that differentiate underlying goals and processes used to determine conflict outcomes for individuals who endorse obliging styles as opposed to other strategies. Obliging styles’ approaches to conflict center around investment in efforts tend to (a) emphasize commonalities, (b) play down differences in opinions and perspectives, and (c) communicate an ongoing willingness to “accommodate and allow concessions [in order to] satisfy [others’] expectations”. Individuals’ openness to minimizing and/or disregarding their own concerns is often accompanied by an “element of self-sacrifice in this style… that take[s] the form of selfless generosity, charity, or obedience” to others’ wishes (Rahim & Shapiro, 2000, p. 10).

Attachment perspectives for teacher preparation. While obliging styles’ emphasis upon generally trying to “satisfy the needs of my students” may initially appear to represent manifestations of sensitivity to and responsiveness towards signs of youths’ distress and/or need, the consistency of responses limited largely to accommodating, giving in, and making concessions to students’ wishes carry additional consequences for youth and their teachers. According to Tracey and Yuki (1992), obliging behaviors function in ways that parallel those of the social influence tactic ingratiation employed by individuals for inducing others to think
favorable of them. Although teachers may enjoy the positive affect generated by youths’ favorable responses to their teachers’ obliging conflict strategies (Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Ferris, Judge, Rowland, & Fitzgibbons, 1994; Wayne, Liden, Graf, & Ferris, 1997), these short-term benefits may also trigger stressors that function as long-term liabilities to students and teachers.

*Student perceptions of diminished security.* Conflict resolution strategies that are limited to their obliging nature are likely to be experienced by students as limiting their access to teachers who are willing to assert themselves to advocate and/or provide protection when needed. Teachers’ generalized responses- or lack of responses may be experienced by youth as lacking in sensitivity, contingency, completeness, and appropriateness all of which represent hallmarks of security and requirements for the classroom’s potential for serving as the safe havens and secure bases that will sustain protective factors embedded in teacher/student relationships.

*Negative effects of failure to resolve conflict.* Over time, however, Friedman et al. (2000) suggest that accumulations of affective residues left from unresolved issues may drain emotional energies in the classroom for students- and their teachers. While little time and effort may have been lost to frequent resolution of conflict events, (a) teachers have failed to serve as positive role-models for constructive communication and (b) respectful and creative problem-solving; (c) the collective resources of the classroom as a community have not been expanded, (d) few opportunities to process and correct misunderstandings and (e) restore relationships are offered, and (f) underlying problems and the negative emotions that are associated with them remain unaddressed- and unregulated.

*Compounded risk when sociocultural identities of teachers and students differ.* Findings surrounding the predictors of obliging conflict styles may be viewed from an attachment
perspective as compounding the presence of potential risks to security for youth whose teachers’ sociocultural identities may differ from their own. Not only are teachers less likely to take definitive action in responding to any student distress and/or need arising from conflict events, but their lack of exposures to diverse interpersonal contexts through their own behavioral preference (contact with differences) or prior educational experiences would be likely to contribute to further diminishment of their capacities to accurately perceive, interpret, and express understanding of youths’ experiences.

**Predicting Avoiding Conflict Styles**

*Positive scores: dismissive attachment styles.* In the regression model displayed in Table 7, scores associated with participants’ dismissive attachment styles ($\beta = .082$, $\rho = .000$) accounted for 79.9% of the variance in predicting preservice teachers’ endorsement of avoiding conflict styles. Although non-significant ($\rho = .531$), scores assessing individuals’ anxiety dimension ($\beta = .049$) represented the only other attachment measures remaining after avoiding attachment dimensions and secure, preoccupied, and fearful attachment styles were excluded from Model 2 due to collinearity.

The avoiding conflict style is characterized by low concern for self- as well as other parties involved in a conflict situation. Often accompanied by others’ appraisals of individuals’ lack of concern for other parties, individuals who adopt an avoiding stance will display behaviors interpreted as withdrawing, passing-the-buck, sidestepping, or "see[ing] no evil, hear[ing] no evil, or speak[ing] no evil” when encountering conflict situations. Individuals’ choices to postpone engagement in or withdraw from a threatening issue are preferable even when doing so exposes individuals to potential losses or even considerable risks.
Understanding implications of attachment avoidance with avoiding conflict styles- for educators. Preservice teachers who are classified as avoidantly-attached and who also endorse avoiding conflict styles would have developed mental representations of self, others, and relationships that center around self-protection to avoid the pain of their own caregivers’ punishing responses to their childhood signals of need, distress, or bids for attention. Cumulative experiences with early caregivers’ non-responsiveness trigger the organization of strategies that drive individuals to distance themselves from interpersonal contexts that hold potentials for calling their personal sense of self-reliance and invulnerability into question (Cassidy, 1994).

Avoidantly-attached individuals’ prolonged inattention to- and inhibition of- negative affective gradually leads to global states (Kim, 2005; Searle & Meara, 1999) characterized by disregard and eventual exclusion of- and access (Kim, 2005; Searle & Meara, 1999), to stimuli associated with both their own- and other’s emotions (Mikuluncer & Florian, 1998). Regardless of their valence, students’ emotion-based cues would not be experienced as relevant input for gaining access required to active preservice teachers’ cognitive processing mechanisms. Opening up themselves to perceiving and responding to youths’ emotional distress is incongruent with anxiously-attached individuals’ drives to keep their own attachment systems deactivated in order to avoid their own exposures to feelings of overwhelming sadness, shame, guilt, and (Main & Weston, 1982).

Impact upon teacher/student relationship quality. Distancing strategies associated with avoidant attachment are frequently paired with interaction partners’ descriptions of individuals as lacking as estranged and lacking in empathy (Mikulincer & Kobak, 1998). As expressions of empathic concern represent core components of caregiver manifestations of warmth and care and contribute in important ways to generating youths’ perceptions of security and trust, it is likely
that higher scores in attachment avoidance may place the very foundations of strong
teacher/student relationships at risk. When paired with considerations that anxiously-attached
individuals are likely to avoid the activation of positive- as well as negative emotions, it may be
that avoidance orientations prevent youth and teachers alike from accessing the protective
benefits that are provided by the warmth and enjoyment of mutual bonding that occurs within
strong teacher/student relationships (Cassidy, 1994).

Drives to deny the value of relationships for offering protection, comfort, and support
may preclude avoidantly-attached teachers’ willingness to display interest, concern, and
commitment to acknowledging- and responding to students’ emotional distress especially when
youths’ sadness, fear, and/or anger (DeOliveira, Moran, & Pederson, 2005) emerges from desires
to seek closeness and a place of membership in peer circles (Mikulincer & Kobak, 1998).

Avoidantly-attached individuals’ drives to maintain interpersonal distance between self,
others, and relationships by suppressing interpersonal stimuli gradually lead to negative views of
others who are viewed as unreliable (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Negative views of others
harden over time to maintain (a) biased perceptions of others based on one’s own (b)
assumptions of ‘false distinctiveness’ (e.g. unrealistic appraisals of self as unique and different
from others; Mikulincer, Orbach, & Lavnieli, 1998) leading to tendencies to (c) chronically
devalue others while, ironically, projecting ones’ own unwanted faults onto others (Mikulincer,
Orbach, & Lavnieli, 1998).

Researchers attribute lower scores assessing avoidantly-attached individuals’ capacities
for emotional abstraction (i.e. abilities to reflect on emotional themes) and difficulties in
identifying and describing emotions (Hexel, 2003; Mallinckrodt & Wei, 2005; Montebarocci,
Codispoti, Baldaro, & Rossi, 2004; Picardi, Toni, & Caroppo, 2005; Troisi, D’Argenio,
Peracchio, & Petti, 2001; Wearden, Lamberton, Crook, & Walsh, 2005) to underlying cognitive structures characterized by their psycholocial shallowness (Buchheim & Mergenthaler, 2000). Aversions to engaging in open patterns of communication would be likely to contribute to educators’ reluctance to talk to about cultural characteristics, seeing sociocultural groups static, monolithic, and homogeneous structures, and tendencies to strive for color-blindness (Nieto, 1994) in the mistaken belief that it may enhance fairness and impartiality in determining conflict outcomes.

**Predicting Dominating Conflict Styles**

**Negative scores: diversity of contact and comfort with differences.** In the full regression model, negative coefficient scores on behavioral and emotional dimensions of participants’ universality-diversity orientations, diversity of contact ($\beta = -.044$, $\rho = .023$) and comfort with differences ($\beta = -.054$, $\rho = .014$), respectively, accounted for 46.6% of the variance in predicting a dominating conflict style.

A dominating style involves high concern for implementing the teacher’s expectation and beliefs and low concern for the needs, desires, and goals that may be at stake for individual youth in a conflict situation. In endorsing a dominant conflict style in the classroom, teachers operate from a coercive power (e.g. associated with the ability to deliver punishment) stance (win-lose) to use their positions of relative authority, influence, and power to pressure students to comply with teacher-directed regulations, norms, and expectations without acknowledging youths’ expectations or perspectives surrounding the particular conditions that may underlie a particular conflict event.

**Implications for addressing youths’ needs for affect-regulation support.** Support for youths’ emerging capacities for self-regulation are derived from contexts that ensure
opportunities for youths’ voices to be heard and active participation in problem-solving processes. Individuals classified with attachment security would be expected to not only demonstration high levels of empathic concern in responding to youths’ needs, but to support classroom interaction norms that expect youths’ to demonstrate care and respect to one another (Mikulincer et al, 2001; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2001). Dominating conflict styles on the other hand do not lend themselves to modeling of empathy, care, or cooperative strategies required for full resolution of emotional issues underlying conflict events.

While, it may not be necessary for every teacher to be classified as securely-attached, classroom management strategies that support perceptions of security communicate acknowledgment of youths’ drives for need-fulfillment and shifts towards attending to attachment-relevant goals as youth see them. The convergence of dominating conflict styles with negative scores on diversity of contact and comfort with differences appear to position youth whose sociocultural identities differ from their teachers in untenable positions where they are unlikely to be understood- or have opportunities to address misunderstandings with their teachers.

Future Teacher Education Research

Unpacking Universal Substrates for Understanding Cultural Match/Mismatch

Default assumptions made by policy makers and researchers are often grounded in views positing that the recruitment of more educators of color represents would represent an optimal solution to challenges associated with realities that a new majority of youth will continue to be taught by a force of educators who are predominantly (83%) White (NCES, 2003, 2004; NCTAF, 2003). While researchers have documented that shared sociocultural background experiences between youth and their teachers do function in reducing cultural and linguistic
divides, increase the relevance of positive role models for at-risk youth (Valencia, 2002; Villegas & Clewell, 1998) and adapting instruction and behavioral norms to remain more culturally congruent with- and compatible to- youths’ home environments (Au & Kawakami, 1994; Jordan, 1985; Valencia, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002)- studies have also underestimated the degree and nature of “practice shock” that is encountered by novice teachers of color. Research suggests that dramatic- and often traumatic nature of events that characterize early classroom experiences for White teachers- are also encountered by novice teachers of color as both groups face the “collapse of the missionary ideas formed during teacher training by the harsh and rude reality of everyday classroom life” (Veeman, 1984, p. 143).

Research suggests that understanding of the experiences of novice teachers of color, indeed, all teachers in high-diversity urban classrooms may be generated when conducted from a starting point that questions dominant views assuming that optimal outcomes can only occur when one-to-one correspondence exists between the identities of youth and their (Achinstein & Aguirre, 2008). Sharing similar racial, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds has been shown to not only enhance student motivation for learning, expand career aspirations, and mediate effects of negative cultural stereotyping (Basit & McNamara, 2004), however, researchers have also acknowledged that positive outcomes with enhanced academic achievement and securely and orderly classrooms are mediated by youths’ sense of connectedness to their teachers (Su, 1997). Applying understanding of the universal substrates that govern the function of- and outcomes associated with-optimal functioning of relationships between youth and caregivers who are relied upon for protection, care, and development support for learning how to gain mastery of their physical and social worlds may offer a key for unpacking cultural match/mismatch phenomena in ways that offer directions from which to
support positive trajectories of growth for all novice teachers regardless of sociocultural background.

**Offer Expanded Models for Guiding Teacher Preparation**

Making the shift from traditional views of teacher quality would include a shift from cognition-based views of ‘what works’ to looking at:

(a) emotional exchanges as the fundamental substrate of the daily interactions that occur between teachers and youth,

(b) realizing that the reciprocal nature of these changes means that students affect teachers—just as teachers affect youth,

(c) these effects are embodied in the affective bond that is formed between teachers and students. This bond may be positive or negative and is grounded in the nature and quality of the teacher/student relationship, and

(d) outcomes are derived, from an attachment perspective, as the products of youths’ perceptions of their teachers and the degrees to which they serve as someone who is “older and wiser”, someone who cares about them and can be relied upon to remain committed to working with youth to optimize their future. Trust, a construct critical to resilience literature, is not something that can be delivered by novice teachers to their students, rather, it is earned. Viewing youths’ worlds from an attachment perspective may require important shifts in understanding how effectiveness can best be conceptualized and, eventually, assessed.

*Providing targeted strategies to promote teacher resilience.* Trusty, Ng, and Watts (2005) examined a model of effects of adult attachment on emotional empathy of counseling students. Like this study, their research revealed a somewhat unexpected finding surrounding effects of participants’ attachment anxiety that “were significant and accounted for a practically
significant portion of the variability in emotional empathy scores” (p. 74). In the current study, attachment anxiety was consistently paired with dimensions of participants’ universality-diversity orientations and conflict styles that would have been theoretically more consistent with scores associated with attachment security. If preservice teachers scores were suggesting elevated forms of sensitivity to others’ in conflict situations, it may be important to further interrogate the meaning that enhanced sensitivity to others’ distress may hold for individuals who would also be likely to struggle with their own heightened emotional reactivity and needs to be liked and approved of by their students in the midst of managing conflict events in their classrooms. It may be possible that, similar to counselor trainees, the daily realities that are encountered by preservice teachers who may bring elevated levels of empathy to interactions with youth in conflict situations- may also take their “toll” (Trusty, Ng, and Watts, 2005; p. 75) on these individuals and their capacities to manage their own emotional distress.

The authors’ (Trusty, Ng, and Watts, 2005) call to focus on the personal development of counseling students (see Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, 1993) is mirrored in teacher education literature cited earlier in this study. The degrees of match between resilience researcher’ recommendations of targeted area of concern for teacher preparation programs- and those found below for counselors emphasizes the universality of influences exerted by attachment-salient mechanisms for professionals who desire to optimize others’ intra- and interpersonal functioning, whether students or clients, for enhancing capacities for goal fulfillment. The convergence of training concerns shared for counselors and teachers also emphasizes the nature of their shared roles, especially for school counselors, in education settings. Additionally, attachment perspectives may provide school counselors with frameworks
for supporting teachers’ in awareness- and development of security-enhancing strategies in their classrooms.

Future research for including and later assessing effects of incorporating attachment perspectives, as suggested above, into models for teacher preparation might include the following as adapted for this study (from Association for Counselor Education and Supervision 1993; as cited in Trusty, Ng, and Watts, 2005):

1. **Help teachers connect to their own emotional experiences.** “Avoidance of emotions is counterproductive” for all novice teachers. Regardless of individual attachment styles, all preservice teachers are likely to encounter strong emotions in their early days as classroom teachers on their own. Charges to reverse longstanding achievement gaps, manage conflict and discipline, and navigate sociocultural dissimilarities – with- and/or among students will require skills that individuals may have yet to develop. Capacities to “recognize and deal with their challenges and vulnerabilities” (Trusty, Ng, and Watts, 2005; p. 75-76) may provide outlets for processing- and expressing their emotions that provide dual benefits in supporting their own- and students’ emotional regulation while modeling positive regulatory skills for youth.

2. **Help teachers normalize and appropriately channel anxiety.** Like, counseling students, anxiety is likely to be compounded by stressors frequently encountered by novice teachers who are attempting to establish their own approaches to classroom management styles with students whose background experienced may differ widely from their own. “If anxiety is normalized, it is less likely to rise to debilitating levels. The positive products of anxiety could be enhanced self-awareness and sensitivity to [students’] emotions and needs” (Trusty, Ng, and Watts, 2005; p. 75-76).
3. Help teachers develop effective use of the self. “When self-awareness is enhanced, there is increased potential for developing interpersonal awareness” (Trusty, Ng, and Watts, 2005; p. 75-76). Preservice teachers’ capacities to relate their own personal emotional functioning to their students’ emotional functioning may provide knowledge of the reciprocal effects that both have on one another (positive and/or negative). Preservice teachers’ capacities for capturing moments when interactional errors have occurred and are moving towards mis-attuned states may engage in relational repair to restore both their own- and students’ emotional equilibrium to prevent sustained damage to their relationship. Teachers are also, simultaneously, serving as role models for the constructive management of conflict.

4. Help teachers develop their personal coping skills and self-care. “Connecting to vulnerabilities of self and others requires courage”. Teacher preparation programs “focus on attending to trainees’ coping and self-care” will support individuals in building the strategies they will need to navigate the challenges they encounter on a daily basis (Trusty, Ng, and Watts, 2005; p. 75-76).
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IRB Approval Letter

Date: September 14, 2013
From: The Office for Research Protections - FWA#: FWA00001534
Jodi L. Mathieu, Research Compliance Specialist
To: Mary C. Mattise
Re: Determination of Exemption

IRB Protocol ID: 43774
Follow-up Date: September 13, 2018
Title of Protocol: Understanding the Thoughts, Attitudes, and Behaviors that Preservice Teachers Bring to their Classrooms

The Office for Research Protections (ORP) has received and reviewed the above referenced eSubmission application. It has been determined that your research is exempt from IRB initial and ongoing review, as currently described in the application. You may begin your research. The category within the federal regulations under which your research is exempt is:

45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Given that the IRB is not involved in the initial and ongoing review of this research, it is the investigator's responsibility to review IRB Policy III “Exempt Review Process and Determination” which outlines:

• What it means to be exempt and how determinations are made
• What changes to the research protocol are and are not required to be reported to the ORP
• Ongoing actions post-exemption determination including addressing problems and complaints, reporting closed research to the ORP and research audits
• What occurs at the time of follow-up

Please do not hesitate to contact the Office for Research Protections (ORP) if you have any questions or concerns. Thank you for your continued efforts in protecting human participants in research.

This correspondence should be maintained with your research records.
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Request to Instructors: Permission to Recruit Students for Study Participation

From Chris Mattise< mcm308@psu.edu>
To dzm14@psu.edu
Subject Request to Recruit Students for Participation in Doctoral Study from Chris Mattise
Date Sat, Oct 12, 2013 02:20 PM

Dear Dr. Miller,

Hello! My name is Chris Mattise and I am a doctoral candidate in Counselor Education at Penn State. Dr. Katie Hoffman was kind enough to share your name as a resource for exploring the possibility of recruiting students enrolled in SPLED 400 and 403 (A &B)- and CI 280 at the Lehigh Valley Campus- to participate in my dissertation research. I would very much like to schedule a phone conversation with you, if at all possible, at your earliest convenience to outline my recruitment strategy and online survey, and receive your feedback about how they might fit with your students and course schedule.

My interest in this topic- and its underlying phenomena grew throughout experiences in my Teaching Assistantship position (former version of CI 295 with Dr. Dana Stuchul, University Park). Following observations conducted during on-site school visitations, preservice teachers who spent an entire school day “shadowing” individual students brought the same question repeatedly to our group discussion sections. “Why does the same student exhibit cooperative, engaged on-task behaviors in the presence of one teacher- only to display disruptive, disengaged off-task behaviors in other teachers’ classrooms? In an era of unprecedented changes in the demographic makeup of student populations in the nation’s schools, longstanding gaps in academic achievement- and persistently elevated rated of turnover in urban classrooms, especially among novice teachers, many researchers have argued that the need to understand how preservice teachers’ professional dispositions function to enhance- and/or detract from their capacities to work effectively with all youth- have, perhaps, never been greater.

In the meantime, I would like to offer some background information that might prove helpful to you as you kindly consider my request. The Office of Research Protection at Penn State has approved this study. The purpose of my research, “Understanding the Thoughts, Attitudes, and Behaviors that Preservice Teachers Bring to their Classrooms”, is to enhance our understanding of variances in educators’ professional dispositions and how they are likely to contribute to the nature and qualities of daily interactions experienced by students- and their teachers in today’s classrooms.

My online study requests students to complete a brief demographic questionnaire and several well-established instruments that ask them to select responses indicating how much they agree- or disagree with descriptions of attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors commonly experienced in everyday interpersonal exchanges with others across several different contexts. I would be happy to share these instruments and more of the study’s underlying rationale should you wish to do so.

I thank you for your attention in allowing me to describe my research- and to explore the possibility of recruiting your students’ participation in my study. I have attached an example of an email that, should you be willing, I would ask you- and/or other instructors teaching sections of these courses to send to students for obtaining their implied consent for study participation. Please note, for your general
information, that I am offering students the opportunity to choose to enter a raffle for winning 1 of 2 American Express Gift cards for $50. The specific details for entering the lottery are contained in the attached email.

I welcome the opportunity to answer any questions or concerns that you may have. Should you be willing to consider the recruitment of your students for participation in my study, I would be eager to discuss how possible open- and close dates for survey completion could be arranged to minimize interference with this semester’s academic calendar. I will follow-up with you with a phone call in the coming week to see if we may arrange a time for a brief conversation.

Sincerely,

Chris Mattise
Appendix C

Recruitment Scripts to Students

UP: Face-to-Face Presentation and Written Hand-out (given to all students)
Satellite Campuses: Recruitment Email (forwarded by professors to students)

My name is Chris Mattise and I am a doctoral student at Penn State University. I am recruiting you to participate in my research study entitled, “Understanding the Thoughts, Attitudes, and Behaviors that Preservice Teachers Bring to their Classrooms”.

Frequently Asked Questions

WHY might I want to participate in this study? As future teachers, you are well aware of the challenges you are likely to encounter in classrooms amidst the rapidly changing student populations in the nation’s public schools. Demands are also rising for increasing all educators’ effectiveness in reaching and teaching youth whose academic and social needs may be the greatest. Outcomes tied to your relative success as a teacher carry implications for preparing youth to function not only as individuals but as responsible and productive members of the nation’s future citizenry. The purpose of this study is to gain understanding about who you are as individuals, how you are likely to interact with your students, and how both may contribute to the personal satisfaction you experience as an educator in the classroom. Participation in this study is expected to provide you with an opportunity to share in current research underlying critical dialogues taking place about the future of public education and its role in a rapidly changing world.

WHO may participate? In order to participate in this study, you must be (a) at least 18 years of age AND enrolled EITHER as an (b) education major at Penn State OR (c) in another major that focuses upon preparing you to work with youth in school settings.

WHAT will I be asked to do as a study participant? You will log on to a security-encrypted URL designed specifically for this study to complete a demographic questionnaire and survey questions asking you to decide how much you disagree- or agree with statements about topics related to daily living.

HOW, WHERE, and WHEN will this occur? You may use your own or university-owned computer at any convenient time or place.

HOW MUCH TIME will this take? Usually 20 minutes or less.

AM I REQUIRED to participate? No, study participation is voluntary. Should you decide to participate, you may choose not to answer any particular question- or to exit the study at any time. Your instructor will have no knowledge about your choice to- or no to participate.

WILL I BE ASKED TO SHARE PERSONALLY-IDENTIFIABLE (name, student ID) INFORMATION? No, this study will not request this kind of information. (Exception: please see choice to enter raffle BELOW).

WILL I RECEIVE ANY BENEFITS for participating in this study? You will not receive extra-credit or monetary compensation.
*As an incentive, however, you may choose to enter a raffle to win one of 4 American Express gift cards for $25. After you complete the study, you will be asked to choose whether or not you would like to enter the raffle. Should you decide to enter the raffle, you will be directed to click on to an independent (not tied to your survey responses in any way) link where you will be asked for your name, email, course, section, and instructor’s name. I, Chris Mattise, will contact winners via email to make arrangements for delivery (U.S. mail) of your gift certificate.

FURTHER QUESTIONS?

Please direct further questions, or problems with logging into study to Chris Mattise (Principal Investigator) at mcm308@psu.edu or (603) 566-4115- or Dr. JoLynn Carney (advisor) at jvc15@psu.edu

The study is located at the following URL:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PSUPreserviceTeachersResearchCampusStudy
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IRB Clarification re: Instructor Reminder Email to Students

From: Chris Mattise [mailto:mcm308@psu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 11:06 AM
To: Mathieu, Jodi
Subject: Re: IRB# 43774 - "Understanding the Thoughts, Attitudes and Behaviors that Preservice Teachers bring to their Classrooms"

Dear Jodi,

It was very exciting to receive notice of my study's exempt status. Thank you for your review!

I have completed my 5-minute face-to-face recruitment sessions in courses across campus.

I am seeking your feedback, please, on whether or not it is necessary for me to file a modification with the IRB to seek permission to send information that (a) is new (the online study's close date which had not been available at time of recruitment); responds to students' (b) questions re: eligibility (in addition to education majors- the inclusion of non-education majors whose professional goals [e.g. speech & language, occupational therapy]- emphasize working with youth in school settings) and requests (c) although all students were supplied with a written notices with the study's URL at the time of recruitment, I have been approached repeatedly on campus by students requesting extra replacement copies); and reminders of the value of their participation in terms of its' potential contributions to the education profession (teacher preparation and outcomes for students- and teachers).

Is it acceptable, please, to send the above information to (a) each of the courses' instructors to request them to share with students (noting that this information originates from myself, as the principal investigator, and not the instructors)- or to (b) seek students' emails and send directly to them? Does either or both of the above require me to submit a modification request to IRB?

Thank you very much for considering these questions for me.

Sincerely,

Mary Mattise (Mary Christina)

II. IRB's RESPONSE- SPECIFIC TO “REMINDER” INQUIRY

From: "Mathieu, Jodi" <zjc2@psu.edu>
Date: Wed, Oct 2, 2013 11:18 AM
Subject: RE: IRB# 43774 - "Understanding the Thoughts, Attitudes and Behaviors that Preservice Teachers bring to their Classrooms"

To: "Chris Mattise" <mcm308@psu.edu>

Jodi L. Mathieu, Research Compliance Specialist IV
814.865.1775 (Main Line) | 814.865.7954 (Direct Line) | zjc2@psu.edu

Hi Mary

"Thanks for your email. You can have instructors send emails for you to students in their courses. Instructors cannot supply you with a class list of students’ names and email address as this is covered under FERPA and would require signed consent from the students before the list could be provided to you”. Regarding a modification to the study, there are only a few changes to an exempt study that require a modification be submitted. Please see the section below in the approval notification that I have now highlighted in pink for more information – specifically, please see the IRB Policy on the exempt review process and determination [link to the policy is provided below].

Thanks. Jodi
Appendix E

Student Reminder Notice Sent by Instructor

Study Recruitment Update

Before sharing these updates, I would like to thank each of your instructors for welcoming me into their classes over the past weeks- AND to express my appreciation to those students who have already participated in the completion of this online study. For those of you who are still interested in participating, please be advised that the study (and raffle entry for the gift cards) will remain open until:

MIDNIGHT on FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2013

REMINDER: This study welcomes the participation of ALL students, regardless of major, whose professional goals include working with youth in school settings. Question 1 has been adjusted to admit students who may have been previously disqualified.

Preparing youth to meet the challenges they will face in today’s changing world- may lie in understanding the unique qualities that you, as new teachers, will bring to tomorrow’s classrooms.

This study allows you to participate in research that is critical to ongoing dialogues dedicated to enhancing teacher effectiveness in the nation’s public schools.

You CAN begin to make a difference …. today!

The study’s link is:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PSU_PRESERVICE_TEACHERS_ResearchStudy_Fall2013

Thank you, Chris Mattise
Appendix F

Demographic Form

1. What is your age?
   ○ 18-24
   ○ 25-34
   ○ 35-44
   ○ 45-54
   ○ 55-64
   ○ 65-74
   ○ 75 or older

2. What is your gender?
   ○ male
   ○ female

3. What is your sexual identification?
   ○ straight
   ○ gay
   ○ lesbian
   ○ transgender
   ○ other (please specify) _________________________

4. What is your racial/ethnic orientation?
   ○ White
   ○ Hispanic
   ○ Black
   ○ Asian/Pacific Islander
   ○ American Indian- Alaska Native
   ○ Multiracial
   ○ other: ______________________________________

5. In addition to English, how many other languages do you speak fluently?
   ○ I speak English only.
   ○ In addition to English, I am fluent in ONE additional language.
   ○ In addition to English, I am fluent in TWO or MORE additional languages.

6. What is your university status?
   ○ freshman
   ○ sophomore
   ○ junior
   ○ senior
   ○ certification program
   ○ other
7. Have you completed EARLY field experiences (CI 295)? Please check any that apply to you:
   ○ No, I have not completed any of the EARLY field experiences described below.
   ○ Yes, I completed 2 hours/week tutoring experiences; 2 bus trips for observing in local
     schools (K12 certification & world language majors)
   ○ Yes, I completed 6 hours/week for 10 weeks, observing/working with
     individuals/small groups of children in early childhood settings (Pre-K-4 majors)
   ○ I completed 6 hours/week for 10 weeks; observing/working with individuals/small
     groups in classroom settings (Grades 4-8 certification in English or Social
     Studies)
   ○ Yes, I completed the optional Urban Education Seminar (summer semester) a two-
     week experience that included working with students/teachers in urban
     classrooms and participation in learning reflection forums, community cultural
     events, and service activities.

8. Have you completed MIDDLE LEVEL Field Experiences? If YES, please check below:
   ○ All CI 495 (A,B,C)
   ○ WLED 495C (Education and World Languages)

9. Have you COMPLETED your STUDENT TEACHING (fulltime, 15-week teaching
   experience supported by mentor teacher and university supervisor)? If YES, please describe the
   setting of your student teaching school site:
   ○ urban school setting
   ○ suburban school setting
   ○ rural school setting

10. At what level do you expect to apply for your first teaching position?
    ○ PreK
    ○ Elementary
    ○ Middle/Junior High
    ○ High School

11. Your Professional Teaching Goals: Please check any that apply to your professional goals.
    ○ classroom teacher
    ○ language arts
    ○ math
    ○ science
    ○ history
    ○ social studies
    ○ foreign language
    ○ ELL
    ○ vocational/home science
    ○ art
    ○ music
    ○ health and/or physical education
    ○ computer
    ○ library
    ○ environmental / outdoor education
Other (please specify): ________________________________

12. Please RANK in order the kind(s) of school settings that you would consider working in for your FIRST TEACHING POSITION.
1= your FIRST choice, 2= your SECOND choice, 3= your THIRD choice.

NOTE: If you would NOT CONSIDER APPLYING to a particular setting(s), please enter 0 for that setting.

rural
suburban
urban

Please select the answer that best describes YOUR OWN K-12 educational experiences.
1. Overall, across my own K-12 education experiences, I would describe the level of racial/ethnic diversity among TEACHERS in the schools I attended as …
   ○ Very diverse
   ○ Somewhat diverse
   ○ Little or no diversity

2. Overall, across my own K-12 education experiences, I would describe the level of racial/ethnic diversity across the general STUDENT POPULATIONS in the schools I attended as …
   ○ Very diverse
   ○ Somewhat diverse
   ○ Little or no diversity

3. Overall, across my own K-12 education experiences, I would describe the racial/ethnic backgrounds of my CLOSE CIRCLE OF FRIENDS in the schools I attended as …
   ○ “just as likely to be different from- as they are to be the same as- my own (background)”.
   ○ “mostly like my own, but some of my friends’ backgrounds were different from mine”.
   ○ “pretty much the same as my own (background)”.


Appendix G

Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR)

Instructions: The following statements concern how you feel in romantic relationships. We are interested in how you generally experience relationships, not just in what is happening in a current relationship. Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it. Write the number in the space provided, using the following rating scale:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Disagree   Neutral/   Agree
Strongly   Mixed   Strongly

___  1. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.
___  2. I worry about being abandoned.
___  3. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.
___  4. I worry a lot about my relationships.
___  5. Just when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away.
___  6. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.
___  7. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.
___  8. I worry a fair amount about losing my partner.
___  9. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.
___ 10. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him/her.
___ 11. I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back.
___ 12. I often want to merge completely with romantic partners, and this sometimes scares them away.
___ 13. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.
15. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.

16. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.

17. I try to avoid getting too close to my partner.

18. I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner.

19. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.

20. Sometimes I feel that I force my partners to show more feeling, more commitment.

21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.

22. I do not often worry about being abandoned.

23. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.

24. If I can't get my partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry.

25. I tell my partner just about everything.

26. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.

27. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.

28. When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure.

29. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.

30. I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like.

31. I don't mind asking romantic partners for comfort, advice, or help.

32. I get frustrated if romantic partners are not available when I need them.

33. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.

34. When romantic partners disapprove of me, I feel really bad about myself.

35. I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance.

36. I resent it when my partner spends time away from me.
Scoring: Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR)

Scoring Notes- Items and Psychometric Information for the ECR (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998)
Attachment Scales and Scoring Instructions Two Higher-Order Attachment Dimensions (Avoidance and Anxiety)

Avoidance (alpha = .94)

Item #: Item-Total Correlation; Item; (R) = reverse keyed

1. .73 I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.
2. .71 I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners. (R)
3. .70 Just when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away.
4. .70 I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.
5. .69 I don’t feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.
6. .68 I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back.
7. .68 I am nervous when partners get too close to me.
8. .68 I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner. (R)
9. .68 I try to avoid getting too close to my partner.
10. .67 I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner. (R)
11. .67 I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.
12. .65 I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.
13. .64 I tell my partner just about everything. (R)
14. .64 I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner. (R)
15. .64 I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners. (R)
16. .63 I don’t mind asking romantic partners for comfort, advice, or help. (R)
17. .62 It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need. (R)
18. .60 I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance. (R)

Anxiety (alpha = .91)
2. .67 I worry about being abandoned.

4. .65 I worry a lot about my relationships.

6. .65 I worry that romantic partners won’t care about me as much as I care about them.

8. .63 I worry a fair amount about losing my partner.

10. .62 I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him/her.

12. .60 I often want to merge completely with romantic partners, and this sometimes scares them away.

14. .60 I worry about being alone.

16. .57 My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.

18. .56 I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner.

20. .55 Sometimes I feel that I force my partners to show more feeling, more commitment.

22. .54 I do not often worry about being abandoned. (R)

24. .52 If I can't get my partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry.

26. .52 I find that my partner(s) don’t want to get as close as I would like.

28. .51 When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure.

30. .51 I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like.

32. .51 I get frustrated if romantic partners are not available when I need them.

34. .50 When romantic partners disapprove of me, I feel really bad about myself.

36. .50 I resent it when my partner spends time away from me.
Self-report measurement of adult attachment styles - Scoring Instructions

STEP 1: Recode the reversed variables, such that 1 = 7, 2 = 6, and so on. You may want to create temporary variables, which can be reversed without potentially incorrectly transforming the original data (We computed “temp3” for items number 3, etc., for use in scoring below (p. 72).

Compute temp 3 = A3.
Compute temp15 = A15.
Compute temp19 = A19.
Compute temp25 = A25.
Compute temp27 = A27.
Compute temp29 = A29.
Compute temp31 = A31.
Compute temp33 = A33.
Compute temp35 = A35.
Compute temp22 = A22.
Recode temp3 to temp22 (1 = 7) (2 = 6) (3 = 5) (5 = 3) (6 = 2) (7 = 1).

STEP 2: Compute scores for the two dimensions, avoidance and anxiety.

Compute AVOIDANC =
Compute ANXIETY =
STEP 3: Compute attachment-style categories from the classification coefficients (Fisher’s linear discriminant functions) based on our sample of $n = 1,082$.

Compute $\text{SEC2} = \text{avoidance} \times 3.2893296 + \text{anxiety} \times 5.4725318 - 11.5307833$.

Compute $\text{FEAR2} = \text{avoidance} \times 7.2371075 + \text{anxiety} \times 8.1776446 - 32.3553266$.

Compute $\text{PRE2} = \text{avoidance} \times 3.9246754 + \text{anxiety} \times 9.7102446 - 28.4573220$.

Compute $\text{DIS2} = \text{avoidance} \times 7.3654621 + \text{anxiety} \times 4.9392039 - 22.2281088$.

Variable labels

- $\text{sec2} \text{ “coeff secure dimension”}$
- $\text{fear2} \text{ “coeff fearful dimension”}$
- $\text{pre2} \text{ “coeff preoccupied dimension”}$
- $\text{dis2} \text{ “coeff dismissing dimension”}$

If ($\text{sec2} > \max(\text{fear2,pre2,dis2})$) $\text{ATT2} = 1$.

If ($\text{fear2} > \max(\text{sec2,pre2,dis2})$) $\text{ATT2} = 2$.

If ($\text{pre2} > \max(\text{sec2,fear2,dis2})$) $\text{ATT2} = 3$.

If ($\text{dis2} > \max(\text{sec2,fear2,pre2})$) $\text{ATT2} = 4$.

Variable labels

- $\text{ATT2} \text{ “coefficient-based attachment category.”}$

Value labels

- $\text{ATT2 1 “secure” 2 “fearful 3 “preoccc” 4 “dismiss”}$
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Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Orientation Scale-Short form  
(M-GUDS-S)

The following items are statements using several terms that are defined below for you. Please refer to these definitions throughout the rest of the questionnaire.

Culture refers to the beliefs, values, traditions, ways of behaving, and language of any social group. A social group may be racial, ethnic, religious, etc.
Race or racial background refers to a sub-group of people possessing common physical or genetic characteristics. Examples include White, Black, American Indian, etc.
Ethnicity or ethnic group refers to a specific social group sharing a unique cultural heritage (e.g., customs, beliefs, language, etc.). Two people can be of the same race (i.e., White), but from different ethnic groups (e.g., Irish-American, Italian-American, etc.).
Country refers to groups that have been politically defined; people from these groups belong to the same government (e.g., France, Ethiopia, United States). People of different races (White, Black, Asian) or ethnicities (Italian, Japanese) can be from the same country (United States).

Instructions: Please indicate how descriptive each statement is of you by circling the number corresponding to your response. This is not a test, so there are neither right nor wrong, good nor bad answers. All responses are anonymous and confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicate how descriptive each statement is of you by circling the number corresponding to your response.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree a Little Bit</th>
<th>Agree a Little Bit</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would like to join an organization that emphasizes getting to know people from different countries.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Persons with disabilities can teach me things I could not learn elsewhere.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Getting to know someone of another race is generally an uncomfortable experience for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would like to go to dances that feature music from other countries.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can best understand someone after I get to know how he/she is both similar to and different from me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am only at ease with people of my race.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I often listen to music of other cultures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Knowing how a person differs from me greatly enhances our friendship.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It’s really hard for me to feel close to a person from another race.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I am interested in learning about the many cultures that have existed in this world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>In getting to know someone, I like knowing both how he/she differs from me and is similar to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>It is very important that a friend agrees with me on most issues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I attend events where I might get to know people from different racial backgrounds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Knowing about the different experiences of other people helps me understand my own problems better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I often feel irritated by persons of a different race.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Scoring: M-GUDS-S

Items 3, 6, 9, 12, and 15 above are reverse scored.

Below are the items listed by subscale:

Diversity of Contact – Preservice teachers' interest in participating in diverse social and cultural activities
1. I would like to join an organization that emphasizes getting to know people from different countries.
2. I would like to go to dances that feature music from other countries.
3. I often listen to music from other cultures.
4. I am interested in learning about the many cultures that have existed in this world.
5. I attend events where I might get to know people from different racial backgrounds.

Relativistic Appreciation – the extent to which preservice teachers value the impact of diversity on self-understanding and personal growth
1. Persons with disabilities can teach me things I could not learn elsewhere.
2. I can best understand someone after I get to know how he/she is both similar to and different from me.
3. Knowing how a person differs from me greatly enhances our friendship.
4. In getting to know someone, I like knowing both how he/she differs from me and is similar to me.
5. Knowing about the different experiences of other people helps me understand my own problems better.

Comfort With Differences – Preservice teachers’ degree of comfort with diverse individuals (all of these items are reverse scored)
1. Getting to know someone of another race is generally an uncomfortable experience for me.
2. I am only at ease with people of my race.
3. It’s really hard for me to feel close to a person of another race.
4. It is very important that a friend agrees with me on most issues.
5. I often feel irritated with persons of a different race.

Appendix K

Permission for Use: M-GUDS-S

From: Miville, Marie <miville@exchange.tc.columbia.edu>
To: hurtfreeschool <hurtfreeschool@aol.com>
Subject: Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale
Date: Fri, Aug 9, 2013 1:12 pm
Attachments: M-GUDS.doc (26K), UDS--reverse_scored_items.doc (4K), MGUDS-S_Key.doc (8K), MGUDS-S.doc (19K)

Thank you for your interest in the M-GUDS! I've attached a copy of both the Long and Short Forms of the scale as well as a list of reverse scored items for the long form and a scoring key for the short form.

You may use the M-GUDS (Long and Short Forms) for clinical/educational and research purposes. I request a copy of the data once your project is completed. As well, I would appreciate hearing feedback from you if you use the scale in clinical/consulting settings. Please note that the M-GUDS is a copyrighted scale and may not be modified or revised without my written permission. Also, you may not forward this email or the M-GUDS to another party without my written permission. Finally, you may not publish the M-GUDS in any other format, such as a paper or dissertation.

Again, thank you for your interest in the scale. If there are any further questions regarding the M-GUDS, please do not hesitate to contact me (212-678-3343 or mlm2106@tc.columbia.edu).

Marie L. Miville, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology and Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
Box 102
525 West 120th St.
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-3343
mlm2106@tc.columbia.edu
Appendix L

Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI-II)

Adaptation of ROCI-II for Educators (Morris-Rothschild & Brassard, 2006)

Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II, Form A: Used with permission from the © Center for Advanced Studies in Management. Further use or reproduction of the instrument without written permission is prohibited.

Author requirements limit item descriptions to one per each subscale as follows:

Integrating: “I try to investigate an issue with my students to try to find a solution that is acceptable to us”.

Compromising: “I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse”.

Obliging: “I often go along with the suggestions of my students”.

Dominating: “I am generally firm in pursing my side of an issue.

Avoiding: “I attempt to avoid being "put on the spot" and try to keep my conflict with my students to myself.”
Appendix M

Scoring Instructions for ROCI-II

The five styles of handling conflict are measured by 7, 6, 5, 6, and 4 statements, respectively, selected on the basis of repeated factor and item analyses. An organizational member responds to each statement on a 5–point Likert scale. A higher score represents greater use of a conflict style.

1. Integrating (IN)-involves high concern for self as well as the other party involved in the conflict. Concerned with collaboration between parties to reach a solution. (7 items)

2. Obliging (OB)-low concern for self and high concern for the other party involved in the conflict. Attempts to play down the differences and emphasize the commonalities to satisfy the concerns of the other party. (6 items)

3. Dominating (DO)-high concern for self and low concern for the other party. It is a win-lose orientation and forces behavior to win one’s position. (5 items)

4. Avoiding (AV)-low concern for self as well as the other party. Associated with withdrawal, passing-the-buck, sidestepping, or “see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil.” (6 items)

5. Compromising (CO)- (4 items)

Brief summary of instructions:

The five styles of handling conflict are measured by 7, 6, 5, 6, and 4 statements, respectively, selected on the basis of repeated factor and item analyses. An organizational member responds to each statement on a 5–point Likert scale. A higher score represents greater use of a conflict style. The ROCI–II is brief which can be administered in 8 minutes, yet the subscales have adequate reliability and validity. The ROCI–II is self-administering. The directions for filling them out are given on the questionnaire.
Appendix N

Permission for Use: ROCI-II

From: Afzal Rahim <1990icam@gmail.com>
To: hurtfreeschool <hurtfreeschool@aol.com>
Subject: Order of 400 copies of the ROCI-II
Date: Wed, Sep 18, 2013 10:50 pm

Attachments: Rahim_Organizational_Conflict_Inventory-II-A.doc (47K), ROCI-Bibliography-2013.doc (274K)

Dear Ms. Mattise,

Thank you very much for your order for which we received $506.25 (first 300 + 100, $525 + 150 = 675 - 15% 168.75 = 506.25) from your credit card. Attached please find our camera-ready ROCI-II, Form A. You are authorized to make 400 copies of the ROCI-II for your doctoral dissertation research. You are required to mention the following as a footnote when you refer to the use of this instrument first time.

*Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II, Form A*: Used with permission from the © Center for Advanced Studies in Management. Further use or reproduction of the instrument without written permission is prohibited.

We would like to receive a copy of your report when it is ready. Attached please find our ROCI Bibliography which should help in your research.

Good luck with your research.

Thanks.

Mir S. Haque, Manager
Center for Advanced Studies in Management
1574 Mallory Court
Bowling Green, KY 42103, USA
Phone/Fax: 270-393-4393
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