

The Attachment Paradox:

How Can So Many of Us (the Insecure Ones) Have No Adaptive Advantages?

Tsachi Ein-Dor Mario Mikulincer Guy Doron

The New School of Psychology, Interdisciplinary Center, Herzliya

Phillip R. Shaver

Department of Psychology, University of California, Davis

Running head: THE ATTACHMENT PARADOX

Word count:

Tsachi Ein-Dor and Mario Mikulincer are also at the Department of Psychology, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel. Please address all correspondence to: Tsachi Ein-Dor, The New School of Psychology, Interdisciplinary Center, P.O.Box 167, Herzliya, 46150, Israel. Email: teindor@idc.ac.il

Abstract

Bowlby's (1982) attachment theory has generated an enormous body of research and conceptual elaborations. Although attachment theory and research propose that attachment security provides a person with many adaptive advantages, during all phases of the life cycle, numerous studies indicate that almost half of the human species can be classified as insecurely attached or insecure with respect to attachment. It seems odd that evolution left humans in this vulnerable position, unless there are some advantages to individuals or groups, under at least some conditions, of anxious and avoidant attachment styles. We argue that a social group containing members with different attachment patterns may be more conducive to survival than a homogeneous group of securely attached individuals. In making this argument, we extend the scope of attachment theory and research by considering a broader range of adaptive functions of insecure attachment strategies. We also present preliminary data to support our argument.

Bowlby's (1973, 1980, 1982) attachment theory postulates an inborn behavioral system that emerged as an adaptation over the course of mammalian evolution. Because human infants are born immature and require a long period of care and protection, they are equipped with a repertoire of behaviors that increase the likelihood that they will remain proximal to supportive others. That is, the attachment behavioral system presumably evolved because it increased the likelihood of survival and eventual reproduction on the part of members of a species born with inadequate capacities for defense, locomotion, and feeding.

An enormous amount of research has been conducted since Ainsworth and her students (e.g., Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978) first identified individual differences among infants in the use of various attachment strategies (see Cassidy & Shaver, 1999, 2008, and Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007, for reviews). The major insecure attachment patterns, often called "anxious" and "avoidant" for short (e.g., Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), are associated with relatively poor adjustment, and in some cases are associated with psychopathology at various phases of the life span. For example, insecure adults (whether anxious or avoidant) report higher rates of relationship breakup (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Kirkpatrick & Hazan, 1994; Shaver & Brennan, 1992) and more psychological problems (e.g., Mikulincer, Florian, & Weller, 1993; Mickelson, Kessler, & Shaver, 1997) compared to secure adults. Nevertheless, research indicates that almost half of living human beings in every age group are insecure with respect to attachment, and the proportion is higher in more disadvantaged (e.g., poorer, less socially stable) populations (Cassidy & Shaver, 1999, 2008; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

This set of facts raises questions concerning how such a high degree of insecurity could have survived evolutionary winnowing over millions of years (Belsky, 1997, 1999; Chisholm, 1996; Belsky, Steinberg, & Draper, 1991; Simpson, 1999; Simpson & Belsky, 2008). Here, we

argue that groups that include individuals with different attachment strategies may have adaptive advantages over homogenous groups of securely attached individuals. In contrast to Belsky and colleagues, who have attempted to link insecure attachment patterns to particular mating strategies, we suggest that the adaptive advantages of insecure attachment patterns may be that they promote the *survival* of individuals in a group rather than directly promoting reproduction. Of course, there would be no reproduction without survival. Our analysis is not meant to substitute for those of Belsky and his colleagues; it is meant to supplement them. But we do provide reasons for viewing survival benefits of insecure attachment as more important and more likely than direct reproductive benefits.

Attachment-System Functioning

According to Bowlby (1973, 1980, 1982), human beings and many nonhuman primates are born with an innate psychobiological system (the *attachment behavioral system*) that motivates them to seek proximity to significant others (*attachment figures*) in times of need as a way of protecting themselves from threats and alleviating distress. The goal of the system is objective protection or support and the concomitant subjective sense of safety or security (which Sroufe & Waters, 1977, called “felt security”). This double-sided (objective and subjective) goal is made salient when a person encounters actual or symbolic threats and notices that an attachment figure is not sufficiently near, interested, or responsive (Bowlby, 1982). In such cases, the attachment system is activated and the individual is driven to reestablish actual or symbolic proximity to an external or internalized attachment figure until felt security is attained. Bowlby (1969/1982, 1988) assumed that although age and development result in an increased ability to gain comfort from symbolic representations of attachment figures, no one of any age is completely free from reliance on actual others. The attachment system therefore remains active

over the entire life span, as indicated by adults' tendency to seek proximity and support when threatened or distressed (Hazan & Zeifman, 1999).

Many studies have shown that the attachment system is indeed active during adulthood and that it affects many aspects of psychological and social functioning (see relevant chapters in Cassidy & Shaver, 2008; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). For instance, Mikulincer and colleagues (e.g., Mikulincer, Birnbaum, Woddis, & Nachmias, 2000; Mikulincer, Gillath, & Shaver, 2002) showed that perceived threats generally cause adults to activate mental representations of attachment figures as a means of coping and regulating emotions. Study participants reacted to threats with heightened mental accessibility of the names of their supportive attachment figures in both lexical decision tasks and Stroop color-naming tasks. As compared with neutral subliminal priming, subliminal priming with threat words (e.g., failure, death, or illness) led to (a) faster identification of attachment figures' names in a lexical decision task and (b) slower color-naming times for attachment figures' names in a Stroop task. Fast lexical decision times and slow color-naming responses were interpreted as indications of heightened activation of mental representations of attachment figures in threatening contexts.

Bowlby (1982) listed some of the major situations or stimuli that activate the attachment system in early childhood: "Observation of any one child during his second and third years of life, when attachment behavior is most evident, shows that such behavior varies enormously in activation, form, and intensity. At one moment the child is content to explore his surroundings; at the next he is searching for his mother desperately... Every mother knows that a child who is tired, hungry, cold, in ill health or in pain is likely to be especially 'mummyish'" (p. 311). Under normal circumstances, this activation is manifested in the actual seeking of proximity to attachment figures. However, there are cases in which these behaviors may be inhibited by the

absence of attachment figures or by other personal and contextual factors. In such cases, thoughts about proximity to attachment figures may still be mentally active, and representations of these figures may still influence behavior (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003).

In addition to describing the normative activation and operation of the attachment system, Bowlby (1973, 1988) and his research collaborator Ainsworth (e.g., Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978) focused on salient individual differences. Although the attachment system is active in every individual, there are individual differences in the extent to which attachment behaviors are effective in mitigating distress and attaining felt security. When people can attain support and protection when needed, they feel confident about the value of proximity seeking as a coping strategy, are able to trust other people's availability and willingness to provide help and support, and are increasingly able to build resources and skills that allow them to deal autonomously with stress. However, when people fail to attain support and protection from attachment figures, worries and insecurities about proximity seeking and others' goodwill are formed, distress is intensified, and defensive strategies other than confident proximity seeking are developed. Main (1990) labeled these alternatives *secondary attachment strategies*, and later theorists described them as involving either hyperactivation or deactivation of the attachment system (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994; Cassidy & Kobak, 1988; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003, 2007).

This analysis of individual differences in attachment strategies has influenced personality and social psychologists who study attachment in adolescent and adult samples to focus on individual differences in "attachment style" (see review by Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Adolescent and adult attachment styles are generally conceptualized as regions in a two-dimensional space (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; Fraley & Waller, 1998). One dimension,

attachment-related *avoidance*, reflects the extent to which a person distrusts relationship partners' goodwill, strives to maintain independence, and relies on deactivating strategies for dealing with dangers and threats. The second dimension, attachment-related *anxiety*, reflects the extent to which a person worries that a relationship partner will not be available in times of need and hyperactivates the attachment system in an attempt to gain the partner's attention, care, and love (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003). Attachment security is indicated by low scores on measures of both insecurity dimensions. Scores in the other regions of the space indicate attachment insecurity of various kinds, each with its own emotional and behavioral correlates.

Research supports the claim that a person's attachment style is related to his or her ways of coping with threats. For example, people who score low on both attachment anxiety and avoidance (i.e., those who are relatively secure with respect to attachment) are commonly observed to cope with threats by effectively seeking support from others (Mikulincer & Florian, 1995, 1998; Mikulincer et al., 1993), possess a strong sense of self-efficacy (Collins & Read, 1990; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995), generally trust other people (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Collins & Read, 1990), and perceive the world as a relatively safe place (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

People who score high on attachment anxiety and/or avoidance (i.e., those who are relatively insecure with respect to attachment) have developed alternative ways of coping with threats and stress. Avoidant attachment is organized around deactivating strategies of affect regulation, which involve de-emphasizing threats and trying to cope with them alone, without seeking help or support from other people (e.g., Kobak, Cole, Ferenz-Gillies, & Fleming, 1993; Fraley & Shaver, 1997; Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002). Anxious attachment is organized around hyperactivating strategies of affect regulation, which involve

overemphasizing threats and becoming very emotional and intrusive or insistent in attempts to gain protection and support from other people (Cassidy & Kobak, 1988; Feeney & Noller, 1990; Mikulincer, Orbach & Iavnieli, 1998; Mikulincer et al., 2000; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002). Both of the major insecure attachment strategies tend to cause difficulties in relationships and are often the foci of individual and couple psychotherapy (Cassidy & Shaver, 1999, 2008).

How do these individual differences in attachment style arise? According to Bowlby (1973) and Ainsworth et al. (1978), they are shaped by interactions with one's attachment figures across the lifespan, but especially in childhood. Interactions with attachment figures who are available and responsive contribute to a core dispositional sense of *attachment security*. However, when attachment figures are not reliably available and supportive, a sense of security is not attained and secondary strategies of affect regulation come into play. According to Bowlby (1973), interactions with rejecting and unsupportive attachment figures push a child toward one or another attachment strategy, which is characterized by particular mental representations of self and attachment figures called "internal working models" (Bretherton & Munholland, 2008). These working models allow a person to predict future interactions with attachment figures and activate generally reliable strategies for interacting with them that do not require rethinking or initiating a particular set of strategic actions each time they seem relevant to a situation.

Research has shown that these individual differences are transmitted from parents to children in what van IJzendoorn, (1995) called "the intergenerational transmission of attachment." High rates of concordance (between 60% and 85%) have been found, for example, between a mother's "state of mind with respect to attachment" (as measured by the Adult Attachment Interview; Hesse, 2008) and her child's degree of security or insecurity in her

presence in a laboratory assessment procedure called the Strange Situation (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Benoit & Parker, 1994; Fonagy, Steele, & Steele, 1991; Hesse, 2008). According to Main, Kaplan, and Cassidy (1985), the quality of parent-children interactions mediates this intergenerational transmission of attachment. That is, parents' attachment working models shape their caregiving behavior and affect their ability and willingness to provide a safe haven and secure base for their child, which in turn contributes to the child's attachment security. However, van IJzendoorn's (1995) meta-analysis of 10 studies revealed what he called a "transmission gap." Although there was a sizeable mean effect size linking a secure parental "state of mind with respect to attachment" and sensitive responsiveness to children's needs and signals during parent-child interactions, much of the association between parent's and child's attachment status seemed to occur through processes other than the quality of parental-child interactions, at least as this has been measured to date.

The "transmission gap" opened the door to possible genetic explanations of intergenerational transmission of attachment patterns, which challenged Bowlby's (1982) almost exclusive emphasis on the importance of early social experiences. And of course, genetic transmission could have played a role even if there had been no transmission gap, because the similarity between a parent's and his or her child's attachment security could have been based partly on shared genes. Behavioral genetic studies that have assessed concordance of attachment patterns in monozygotic and dizygotic twins have indicated that genetic factors can explain between 14% and 40% of the variance of attachment patterns at various phases of the lifespan (e.g., Brussoni, Jang, Livesley, & Macbeth, 2000; Crawford et al., 2007; Finkel & Matheny, 2000; O'Connor & Croft, 2001). Studies exploring possible molecular genetic markers associated with attachment patterns have shown that different attachment patterns are somewhat

related to particular genetic alleles (e.g., Donnellan, Burt, Levendosky, & Klump, 2008; Gillath, Shaver, Baek, & Chun, in press). However, other studies have failed to find a strong, direct genetic contribution to attachment patterns (e.g., Bakermans-Kranenburg & van IJzendoorn, 2004), and have instead found evidence for an interaction between genetic and parenting influences.

The Attachment Theory Paradox

One of the most frequently replicated findings in attachment research concerns the distribution of attachment orientations in infancy, childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. Around 50% of infants, children, adolescents, and adults exhibit insecure attachment patterns. For instance, using the infant Strange Situation testing procedure, numerous researchers in the United States (see reviews in Grossmann, Grossmann, & Waters, 2005), Germany (e.g., Beller & Pohl, 1986; Grossmann, Grossmann, Huber, & Wartner, 1981), Japan (e.g., Miyake, Chen, & Campos, 1985), Sweden (e.g., Lamb, Hwang, Frodi, & Frodi, 1982), the Netherlands (e.g., van IJzendoorn, Goossens, Kroonenberg, & Tavecchio, 1985), Indonesia (e.g., Zevalkink, Riksen-Walraven, & Van-Lieshout, 1999), and Israel (e.g., Sagi, et al., 1985) have found that, on average, the distribution of infants is roughly 50% secure, 30% avoidant, and 20% anxious. In a meta-analysis of almost 2000 Strange Situation classifications from 32 samples in 8 countries, van IJzendoorn and Kroonenberg (1988) showed that cross-cultural differences in attachment distributions were relatively small. Studies conducted with adolescents and adults have found similar distributions of attachment patterns using both self-reports scales (e.g., Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Mikulincer, Florian, & Tolmacz, 1990) and the Adult Attachment Interview (see Hesse, 2008, for a review).

Although almost 3 billion people worldwide apparently have an insecure attachment style, theoretical proposals regarding possible adaptive functions of such patterns are scarce (e.g., Belsky, Steinberg, & Draper, 1991; Belsky, 1997, 1999; Simpson & Belsky, 2008). By far most of the research has focused on disadvantages rather than advantages of secondary attachment strategies. For example, research examining individual differences in attachment orientations has linked avoidant attachment with fear of intimacy and a tendency to maintain distance in close relationships, pessimistic beliefs about relationships, proneness to sexual infidelity in relationships (Brennan, Shaver, & Tobey, 1991), and a high rate of relationship dissolution (see Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007, for a review). Avoidant individuals disapprove of and avoid self-disclosure (e.g., Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991), are susceptible to sudden and erratic religious conversions (e.g., Kirkpatrick & Shaver, 1990), and are judged by their peers to be unusually hostile (e.g., Kobak & Sceery, 1988). They prefer to work alone and use work as an excuse for avoiding close relationships (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1990). They are more likely than less avoidant individuals to report that they have or had poor relations with their parents while attending college (e.g., Rothbard & Shaver, 1994; Shaver & Clark, 1994). They attempt to cope with stress by ignoring or denying it (e.g., Dozier & Kobak, 1992), or by using alcohol and other substances to reduce tension (e.g., Brennan et al., 1991). Following stressful periods they are more likely than nonavoidant individuals to exhibit psychosomatic symptoms (e.g., Mikulincer et al., 1993). They are somewhat pessimistic and cynical about long-term relationships (e.g., Carnelley & Janoff-Bulman, 1992) and are less compassionate and altruistic than their less avoidant peers (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005).

Anxious attachment is also associated with many problems and disadvantages: being obsessively preoccupied with romantic partners' interest, loyalty, and responsiveness; jealous;

subject to fear, anxiety, and loneliness (even when involved in a relationship); plagued with low and unstable self-esteem (e.g., Collins & Read, 1990; Feeney & Noller, 1990); and burdened by a higher than usual rate of relationship dissolution (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Such individuals are excited about leaving home and going to college but become socially dissatisfied and lonely after the first semester (e.g., Hazan & Hutt, 1993); prefer to work with others but feel unappreciated and misunderstood at work and tend to daydream about success and slack off after receiving praise (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1990). They become very emotional under stress and are forced to use ineffective emotion-focused coping strategies (e.g., Mikulincer et al., 1993). They report more physical and psychological symptoms (e.g., Fiala, 1991; Hazan & Shaver, 1990). They worry about rejection during interactions (Tidwell, Reis, & Shaver, 1996) and indiscriminately self-disclose too much, too soon (e.g., Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991). They tend to be argumentative, intrusive, and overly controlling (e.g., Kunce & Shaver, 1994).

Both kinds of insecure attachment have been associated with various forms of psychopathology, such as depression (e.g., Carnelley, Pietromonaco, & Jaffe, 1994), anxiety (e.g., Bartholomew, 1990; Riskind et al., 2004; Safford, Alloy, Crossfield, Morocco, & wang, 2004; Williams & Riskind, 2004), obsessive-compulsive disorder (e.g., Doron & Kyrios, 2005), and eating disorders (e.g., Friedberg & Lyddon, 1996). Conversely, a secure attachment style seems to buffer a person against various risk factors (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Thompson, 2008). Self-reports of attachment security are associated with increased perceptions of self efficacy, positive affect, and reliance on problem-solving coping strategies for dealing with personal and interpersonal stressors (e.g., Birnbaum, Orr, Mikulincer, & Florian, 1997; Collins & Read, 1990; Lussier, Sabourin, & Turgeon, 1997; Mikulincer, 1998; Mikulincer & Florian, 1998).

Although a great deal of research has documented the disadvantages of insecure attachment, a closer examination of the insecure patterns suggests possible adaptive advantages under special conditions. Indeed, evolutionary theory suggests that anything as pervasive in the population as insecure attachment is likely to have an adaptive function. It therefore seems worthwhile to consider the possible advantages of anxiety and avoidance.

Belsky's Evolutionary Analysis of Attachment Insecurity

Belsky and colleagues (Belsky, Steinberg, & Draper, 1991; Belsky, 1997, 1999; see also Chisholm, 1996; Simpson & Belsky, 2008) were the first to address the possibility that there are potential adaptive benefits, under particular environmental conditions, of insecure attachment styles. They argued, for example, that “attachment behavior would not have evolved if it had only functioned to protect the child and thereby to promote survival, because survival per se is clearly not the goal of natural selection... Thus variations in attachment security that Bowlby's theory so clearly anticipated evolved to serve reproductive fitness goals in an ecologically sensitive manner” (Belsky, 1999, p. 142). In other words, Belsky and associates proposed that *the potential to develop different attachment patterns* evolved because, under certain ecological conditions, they promote reproductive fitness. Whereas classical attachment theory emphasized the *survival* function of the attachment system, Belsky (1999) argued that modern evolutionary thinking focuses on reproductive fitness, and under certain conditions insecure attachment strategies may be reproductively advantageous.

This argument is based on Symons's (1987) suggestion that the adaptive functions of all morphological, physiological, and psychological attributes are ultimately in the service of genetic reproduction. However, Symons did not argue that all of these attributes evolved because they *directly* promoted reproduction. Although the final goal is reproduction, many

morphological, physiological, and psychological attributes evolved because they solved a specific problem of survival. They promote reproduction by enabling an organism to reach a life stage where successful reproduction and rearing of offspring is possible.

Belsky argued that humans evolved in a way that allows them to modify their reproductive behavior (i.e., mating strategies) in the service of fitness and in accord with ecological conditions. For instance, when resources are limited and unpredictable, parents may unintentionally provide insensitive and unreliable care to their children. In such cases, children may develop avoidant attachment strategies. When they become adolescents or adults, they may pursue a reproductive strategy that emphasizes mating (and procreation) over parenting. That is, by encouraging quantity over quality of offspring, avoidant attachment may indirectly promote reproductive fitness in an unstable, insecurity-arousing environment. In Belsky's (1999) words, "Since the risks to progeny's eventual reproductive success were great and uncontrollable [when the flow of resources was chronically low or unpredictable], the way to ensure that some [children] would survive to reproduce would involve the production of many offspring, even if they were not going to be well cared for" (p. 154). The adaptive advantage of avoidant people is that they pursue disproportionately self-serving, opportunistic sexual matings, and therefore are likely to have multiple mates and many children – some of whom, even if poorly cared for, may go on to reproduce in turn.

With regard to attachment anxiety, Belsky argued that because "whining dependency" (1999, p. 156) is costly to parents, this pattern could have evolved only if it offered a biological payoff for the parents as well as the child. He reasoned that

the capacity for developing resistant [i.e., anxious] attachments evolved as a means of fostering indirectly reproductive 'helper-at-the-nest' behavior. That is, by inducing

helpless dependency in a child, inconsistently responsive parenting evolved to promote a reproductive strategy designed to facilitate the direct reproductive success of kin (especially parents), and thereby the indirect reproductive success of the resistant [anxious] individual. (p. 156)

The adaptive advantage of anxious individuals, according to this argument, is that rather than leave the family home to reproduce, they may stay and help other family members give birth and raise children, thereby increasing the likely survival and successful reproduction of kin with whom they share genes.

Although Belsky took an important first step in attempting to provide an adaptationist analysis of insecure attachment, there are reasons to challenge his basic assumptions. First, recent theoretical analyses and empirical studies in evolutionary psychology suggest that psychological mechanisms exist in their current form because they helped to resolve specific problems of individual *survival or reproduction*, not just reproduction (Buss, 1995; Tooby & Cosmides, 1990). Not all physiological or psychological systems evolved to serve reproductive goals directly. The fear system, for example, including the “fight or flight response,” is an unambiguous example of a psychobiological system that evolved because it helped resolve a specific problem threatening individual survival. Fighting or fleeing from a predator probably did not, and still does not, serve immediate reproductive goals, but it may make reproduction possible by increasing the chances of survival to reproductive age.

According to Bowlby’s (1982) theory, the attachment system is closely related to the fear system; it is activated by threats, and the behavioral output of the system is generally adaptive because it increases the likelihood of survival. If human infants were not interested in and able to signal urgent needs and desires for help and protection, they would die long before

sexual reproduction became a primary interest. Consider, for purposes of comparison, the disposition to fear snakes (Marks, 1987). It presumably exists in humans and nonhuman primates because it contributed to the solution of a specific problem of survival in primates' ancestral environments. The fear of snakes is triggered only by a narrow range of inputs, such as long, sliding, organisms perceived to be within striking range. Once a snake is perceived to be dangerous and within striking distance, this information causes an increase in autonomic arousal, which is part of a flight response that would have protected early humans from deadly snake bites.

The attachment system is also triggered by a fairly narrow range of inputs (which Bowlby, 1973, p. 138. called "natural clues of danger"), which produce a limited set of behavioral outputs (proximity maintenance, signaling a desire to be picked up, hugging and clinging). Thus, survival rather than immediate reproduction seems to be the major reason for the evolution of an attachment behavioral system.

Also relevant to evaluating Belsky's and related theories are studies of sex differences. According to evolutionary psychology, differences between males and females are expected in domains in which they have recurrently faced different adaptive challenges. Conversely, in domains in which the sexes have faced the same adaptive problems, no sex differences are expected (Buss, 1995). In the course of evolution, men and women have faced different problems pertaining to mating (Buss, 1999). Therefore, we would expect there to be sex differences in mating strategies *and* in attachment strategies if attachment behaviors evolved because they directly promoted sexual reproduction. In fact, however, although there are sex differences in mate preferences (Buss, 1989), courting strategies (Buss, 1988a, 1988b; Tooke & Camire, 1991), jealousy (Buss, Larsen, Westen, & Semmelroth, 1992), and mate-guarding

tactics (Buss, 1988b; Flinn, 1988), there are not reliable, general sex differences in attachment strategies.

With regard to jealousy, for example, evolutionary psychologists predicted that the sexes would differ in the kinds of events that activate this intense emotion (Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982; Symons, 1979). Because of concealed ovulation and the fact that fertilization and gestation occur internally in women, men have faced an adaptive problem not faced by women – having less than 100% certainty of biological parenthood. The reproductive threat for men comes from the possibility of sexual infidelity on the part of a female mate. In species such as ours, in which a man sometimes invests heavily in a woman and her children, the woman's certainty of genetic parenthood is not compromised if her mate has sex with other women. However, the woman may risk the loss of her mate's time, attention, commitment, involvement, protection, and resources – resources that can be diverted from her and her children to another woman. For these reasons, evolutionary psychologists predicted and have generally found that the triggers of jealousy in men would be related to the sex act per se, whereas for women the main issue would be loss of a man's commitment and investment (but see Harris, 2003, for a critical evaluation of this literature).

The general absence of consistent sex differences in attachment patterns (see Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007, for a review) does not fit with the thrust of Belsky and colleagues' arguments, because differences between males and females would be expected if attachment styles (or the potential for insecure attachment styles under certain ecological conditions) evolved directly, or mainly, to promote reproduction. Instead, the general lack of consistent sex differences in attachment style are consistent with Bowlby's (1982) idea that all human beings, male and

female alike, have faced the adaptive problem of being born immature and needing care and protection from attachment figures.

It is important to note, however, that some studies have found an association between avoidant attachment and short-term rather than long-term mating strategies (Schmitt, 2005). Likewise, some studies have found that anxiously attached people continue to perceive their parents as their primary attachment figures later in life as compared with secure and avoidant people (Feeney, 2004). This finding might seem to support Belsky's (1999) suggestion that anxious adults are more likely to be helpers-in-the-nest. In his words, "It is usually only where there is some biological 'payoff' for the parent as well as for the child that we should expect a parentally influenced and costly pattern of child functioning to evolve" (p. 156). However, other studies (Carpenter, 2001; Cicirelli, 1993; Crispi, Schiaffino, & Berman, 1997; Eberly & Montemayor, 1998, 1999; Townsend & Franks, 1995) indicate that anxiously attached people are less concerned with the well-being of their parents and show lower willingness to care for them. In other words, anxiously attached people may be in the 'nest' longer, but not necessarily because they are inclined to be helpers-in-the-nest.

Looking for Other Adaptive Advantages of Secondary Attachment Strategies

Hundreds of individual-difference studies have not found adaptive advantages of insecure attachment styles (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), except possibly for the ones that Belsky and his colleagues focused on. The reason for failing to see adaptive benefits of insecurity may stem from searching at the wrong level of analysis. Here, we consider the possibility that some of the advantages reside at the group level and concern survival rather than at the individual reproductive level. As Bowlby (1982) said, "From a new viewpoint a familiar landscape can sometimes look very different" (p. 1).

We base our argument partly on Hamilton's (1964) kin selection theory and on Sober and Wilson's (1998) multilevel selection theory. Hamilton tried to overcome one of the biggest stumbling blocks for Darwin's theory of evolution: In the evolutionary struggle for reproductive fitness, why do some organisms forgo reproduction while assisting the reproductive efforts of kin? Hamilton proposed that the individual's total (inclusive) fitness depends on his or her own reproductive output plus the total reproductive output of kin who share the individual's genes. Moreover, in 1975, Hamilton realized that many social traits (e.g., altruism) may be selectively disadvantageous at the individual level (i.e., the level of within-group selection) but might have evolved because groups containing these social traits contribute more to the total gene pool than other groups. In other words, between-group selection may favor social traits, even though they are disadvantageous at the individual level (Sober & Wilson, 1998; Wilson, Vugt, & O'Gorman, 2008; Wilson & Wilson, 2007). Following this line of reasoning, we suggest that some of the adaptive advantages of attachment insecurity may be found above the individual level of analysis.

In the course of evolution, humans lived in small, highly interactive groups of kin, and humans are unique among mammals in the duration and complexity of the social relationships they form. Because social solutions to adaptive challenges were so crucial for human survival, many of our psychological mechanisms undoubtedly evolved to support this aspect of human existence (Buss, 1995). Brewer and Caporael (1990), as well as other scholars (e.g., Alexander, 1987; Axelrod, 1984; Cosmides, 1989; Gazzaniga, 2008), have argued that living in cooperative groups was the primary survival strategy for humans. This raises the possibility that different attachment orientations, or the facultative potential to develop such orientations under particular environmental conditions (Belsky, 1999; Chisholm, 1996; West-Eberhard, 2003), promote

fitness beyond the individual level because they are advantageous for members of a group. All of the major attachment patterns – secure, anxious, and avoidant – may promote between-group fitness in their own ways. As we explain more fully below, the secure pattern may be associated with balanced, sensible, somewhat altruistic coordination and leadership of group responses to challenges and threats. The avoidant pattern may be associated with quick, independent responses to threat, which may at times increase the survival chances of group members by solving the survival problem or demonstrating ways to escape it. The anxious pattern may be associated with sensitivity and quick detection of dangers and threats, which alert other group members to danger and the need for protection or escape.

Our analysis is based on the following three proposals:

1. Secure and insecure attachment styles may have both unique adaptive advantages (which increase inclusive fitness) and disadvantages (which decrease inclusive fitness) (see Hamilton, 1964, for other examples of such mixtures).
2. Different attachment patterns, by virtue of their associated internal working models and action tendencies or behavioral scripts, may have different benefits for group members under threatening conditions. Specifically, individuals with an anxious attachment orientation may possess what we will call *sentinel reactions and scripts*, and avoidant individuals may possess what we will call *rapid fight-flight reactions and scripts*.
3. A group or society that is heterogeneous with respect to attachment styles, like groups that are heterogeneous in other respects, may be more effective in dealing with threats and survival problems than a homogenous group or society (Sober & Wilson, 1998; Wilson & Wilson, 2007).

These three propositions, when fleshed out in the next section, constitute what we call Social Defense Theory (SDT).

Social Defense Theory

SDT postulates that each attachment orientation – secure, anxious, or avoidant – has both unique adaptive advantages for increasing the inclusive fitness of individuals in a group and unique disadvantages that decrease inclusive fitness. According to the theory, each attachment orientation includes a working model, or script, that is especially available under threatening conditions. This script renders an individual likely to act in a manner consistent with his or her attachment style.

According to Markus (1977), every individual perceives the world in ways that are organized by self-schemas, which include mental representations of the person's special abilities, achievements, and preferences. Individuals with self-schemas in a particular domain use them to make quick and confident judgments in that domain, adapt flexibly to different information-processing goals related to the domain, and accurately retrieve information relevant to the domain (e.g., Carpenter, 1988; Kanagawa, Cross, & Markus, 2001; Markus, 1977, 1980). People are chronically sensitive to schema-relevant stimuli and pay close attention to information pertinent to the schema's domain (Markus & Sentis, 1982). As a result, they are more ready than aschematic individuals to apply relevant abilities and skills when the schema is activated (see Markus, 1983; Markus, Cross, & Wurf, 1990; Markus & Wurf, 1987, for reviews).

Moreover, people who possess a self-schema in a particular domain are better able to predict their future behavior in that domain (Markus, Crane, Bernstein, & Siladi, 1982). Markus and Nurius (1986) called these future-oriented self-conceptions "possible selves." Possible

selves are the elements of a self-system that allow an individual to simulate the necessary steps and strategies for accomplishing a certain goal (see Markus et al., 1990; Markus & Ruvolo, 1989, for reviews). Possible selves enable a person to focus attention on specific, task-relevant thoughts and feelings and to organize action (Inglehart, Markus, & Brown, 1989), building a bridge between the current situation and a future outcome (Oyserman & Markus, 1990). The more vivid and elaborate the possible selves, the better the performance, because many of the routines required for performance are already activated, engaged, and organized by anticipation and simulation (Cross & Markus, 1994).

The same logic applies to attachment orientations, which include self-schemas as parts of internal working models (Bretherton & Munholland, 2008; Waters, Rodrigues, & Ridgeway, 1998; Waters & Waters, 2006). Although the existing literature on attachment tends to emphasize adaptive aspects of secure working models, or scripts, and maladaptive aspects of anxious or avoidant working models, we are especially interested here in cases in which a secure attachment style has *disadvantages* for members of a group or community and cases in which insecure attachment styles contribute to group members' survival.

Adaptive Disadvantages of Secure Attachment

Research on adult attachment has shown that secure individuals provide many advantages to the groups in which they participate. For example, they are generally better than insecure individuals at leading and coordinating group activities (Davidovitz, Mikulincer, Shaver, Ijzak, & Popper, 2007; Rom & Mikulincer, 2003). Also, they spend more time than their insecure counterparts in groups, engage in more group activities, and work more effectively with other group members when solving problems and resolving interpersonal conflicts (Rom & Mikulincer, 2003; Smith, Murphy, & Coats, 1999). According to Mikulincer

and Shaver's (2003, 2007) literature reviews, these advantages stem from a sense of security rooted in past supportive experiences with attachment figures. This sense of security is closely associated with core beliefs, such as the belief that the world is a safe place, especially when significant others are present. These optimistic, comforting mental representations promote self-soothing reappraisals of threats, which help secure individuals perform better than insecure ones in many challenging situations.

However, feelings of security do not always reflect actual physical security. In most everyday situations, a sense of security is beneficial because it reduces anxiety and allows a person to focus fully on the task at hand. This is probably one reason why secure individuals perform better than insecure ones at work (Hazan & Shaver, 1990). In times of actual danger, however, the sense of security may be maladaptive if it causes a person to postpone recognizing the emerging threat. Focusing on an ongoing project irrespective of mounting danger may interfere with taking effective action in an emergency. A quick fight-or-flight response is sometimes necessary to avert disaster, and in such cases being good at self-soothing and generating optimistic appraisals may be counterproductive – for both the individual and the group.

Indeed, Bowlby (1973) observed that attachment behavior frequently takes precedence over escape in many species. Later, Mawson (1978, 1980, 2005) showed that the typical human response to danger is to seek the proximity of familiar people and places, even if this means remaining in or even approaching a dangerous situation (see also Baker & Chapman, 1962; Henderson, 1977; Kinston & Rosser, 1974). Secure individuals may activate schemas and scripts that promote seeking proximity to others (e.g., Mikulincer et al., 2002; Waters & Waters, 2006), even though this is sometimes not the safest strategy. Such proximity-seeking in cases of

actual danger may have two disadvantages: (a) slower identification of early signs of danger and (b) slower activation of defensive behavior.

Sime (1983, 1985) examined these disadvantages in a retrospective study of reactions to a fire in a large coastal resort on the Isle of Man, Great Britain, in 1973. Shortly after a fire in which 50 of 3000 vacationers perished, accounts of 500 survivors were collected through interviews. The interviews provide a vivid account of the vacationers' responses from the moment of being alerted that something was wrong to the time when they reached safety. Each account included detailed information about the identity of other group members and their proximity at the time of the alert and the time of safe exit. These accounts suggest that proximity to other group members was associated with a delay in becoming aware of the serious threat of fire. In particular, people who were physically closer to significant others (e.g., family members) were less likely to react to ambiguous cues of danger, such as noises and shouts, which occurred during the early stages of the fire. They reacted only later, when unambiguous cues of danger, such as smoke, flames, and people running while holding fire extinguishers, occurred. Subsequent studies of survivors' behavior during disasters also suggest that people who were together with other family members were slow to react to danger (Aguirre, Wenger, & Vigo, 1998; Fitzpatrick & Mileti, 1991; Perry, 1994; Proulx, 2002, 2003). In the presence of significant others, many people seem to react slower to cues of imminent danger.

Research examining reactions to real or imagined dangers also provides indirect support for the hypothesis that securely attached people react in nonoptimal way to signs of danger. For example, in October of 1938 Orson Welles broadcast a section from the science fiction book *The War of the Worlds* (Wells, 1898) as if it were genuine news. He dramatically depicted the advance of the Martians as a judgment day for humanity. Cantril, Gaudet, and Herzog (1940)

studied the famous broadcast and its outcomes. It appears that many of the people who listened to the broadcast believed what they heard and were frightened, but the vast majority did not flee. Instead they contacted relatives and friends in the city. Most of those who fled did so only after other family members had been brought together.

In another study of responses to a radio broadcast of a fictitious disaster (a radioactive leak from a nuclear power plant), a telephone survey of a representative sample of the population, as well as unstructured interviews with the police and other authorities, indicated that people's responses "as a rule consisted of contacting family members, relatives or neighbors, over the telephone or face-to-face..." (Rosengren, Arvidson, & Sturesson, 1975, p. 307). In the devastating Southeast Michigan Flint-Beecher tornado of June, 1953, people also tended to turn to and protect loved ones rather than flee from the threat (Form & Nosow, 1958). These findings are not surprising because the attachment system's main tendency and function is to seek proximity as a way of attaining safety (Bowlby, 1982). But proximity seeking in cases of imminent disaster may not be adaptive for individuals or their close relatives.

Bowlby (1973, p. 91) noted that during and after disasters, "no member of a family is content, or indeed able to do anything else, until all members of the family are gathered together." Studies of behavior during fires also show that people tend to converge and cluster (Bryan, 1985, 2002; Sime, 1983, 1985). Governments and trained professionals have great difficulty getting people to evacuate before and during disasters, because "traditional family ties often keep individual members in the danger zone until it is too late" (Hill & Hansen, 1962, p. 217). Both in England and in Germany during World War II, evacuation programs were seriously hampered because parents preferred to keep their children with them, at home in the

cities, rather than sending them away to the safety of the countryside (Titmuss, 1950, U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, 1946).

Studies indicate that most people tend to remain in a disaster area (Cantril et al., 1940; Quarantelli & Dynes, 1977), and when they are forced to evacuate, they tend to do so as a group (e.g., Cantril et al., 1940; Freeman & Cooper, 1940) or in family units (Quarantelli & Dynes, 1977), thereby maintaining proximity and contact with familiars. Bettelheim (1960) described how many Jewish families in Holland went into hiding as groups despite the fact that everyone knew they would have a better chance of surviving as individuals. In addition, remaining close to companions during combat often seems more important to soldiers than avoiding enemy fire (Marshall, 1947).

In his study of the resort fire, Sime (1983, 1985) examined the role of proximity-seeking behavior in causing deaths and injuries. Thirteen of the 50 people who died were in their groups when alerted about the fire, and the groups “evidently delayed their departure. In trying to escape in groups by whatever route they chose, these people were caught by the encroaching smoke and flames” (Sime, 1983, p. 38). In fact, proximity-seeking behavior seemed to increase the danger to family groups because they were slower to escape and therefore increased the risk of injury and death. Other disaster studies also show that people in groups of familiars are slow to leave disaster areas and instead wait to be evacuated as a group (Aguirre et al., 1998; Fitzpatrick & Mileti 1991; Perry, 1994; Proulx, 2002, 2003).

Taken together, the evidence suggests that although securely attached individuals are better at leading and coordinating group activities, these advantages are partially offset by their slower identification of actual and imminent dangers and their sometimes nonoptimal reactions to danger due to a wish to stay close to other people. In other words, securely attached

individuals' action scripts, focused on seeking proximity to others in times of threat, may sometimes hamper their survival and the survival of their group. This suggests that the survival chances of groups composed only of securely attached people might in some important cases actually be lower than the survival chances of insecurely attached people.

Insecure Attachment

Adult attachment research (e.g., Rom & Mikulincer, 2003) has shown that, as compared with securely attached persons, the anxiously and avoidantly attached often perform less optimally in group activities. They may take the work less seriously, make fewer or poorer-quality contributions to a team, and have lower expectations of contributing to the team effort. Nevertheless, in some dangerous situations anxious and avoidant individuals may have advantages in escaping or in helping their group members escape to safety.

The adaptive advantages of attachment anxiety: Mental schemas related to serving as a sentinel. Anxiously attached people adopt hyperactivating strategies of affect regulation in times of threat or stress, which heightens the monitoring of threat-related cues and results in exaggerated threat appraisal, almost regardless of the actual threat (Cassidy & Kobak, 1988; Mikulincer et al., 2000; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002). Moreover, they react to threats by minimizing distance from others, signaling danger and clinging (Feeney & Noller, 1990; Mikulincer, Orbach & Iavnieli, 1998). In this way, anxiously attached individuals may offset some of the deficiencies of securely attached group members by reacting quickly and strongly to early, perhaps ambiguous cues of actual imminent danger. For instance, in case of fire, anxiously attached individuals may alert other group members to the first signs of danger (e.g., ambiguous cues such as unusual noises, shuffling feet, or shouts). They may possess schemas and action tendencies that make them good "sentinels." That is, whenever they become sensitive

to a threat, they may call it to other group members' attention sooner than they would attend to it on their own.

Many species of animals benefit from having *sentinels* in their midst. For instance, birds (e.g., Miller, 2005; Platzen & Magrath, 2005), rodents (e.g., Brudzynski, 2005; Sherman, 1980, 1981), various mammals (e.g., Fichtel, 2004), and primates (e.g., Coss, Ramakrishnan, & Schank, 2005; Riede, Bronson, Hatzikirou, & Zuberbuhler, 2005) produce shrill alarm signals when they detect a potential threat. Moreover, since classic studies by Dunford (1977) and Sherman (1977) demonstrated nepotistic benefits to ground squirrels from issue alarm signals, other studies have found that animals obtain both direct and indirect fitness benefits by risking their own safety (e.g., by calling a predator's attention to them) while signaling their associates of danger (e.g., Blumstein, Steinmetz, Armitage, & Daniel, 1997; Hoogland, 1995, 1996; Schwagmeyer, 1980). In other words, the existence of *sentinels* in a group often enhances the survival chances of group members.

In similar ways, human group members can benefit from anxiously attached individuals' hyperactivating strategies. In the course of evolution, humans lived in relatively small groups or tribes of kin, so anxiously attached individuals might have increased their own inclusive fitness by being sentinels while also enhancing their group's overall contributions to the gene pool. That is, heterogeneous groups that included some members who were anxiously attached might have been beneficial in terms of both survival and reproduction than groups composed entirely of secure individuals.

The existence of this pattern could be due either to genes that contribute to its formation, or to genes that allow it to be developed in response to environmental conditions. Since the developmental research literature on attachment shows that anxious attachment develops when

primary attachment figures are themselves anxious and unreliable (perhaps by being sensitive to threats and oriented toward their own self-protection), it should be more common, as Belsky (1999) argued (although for different reasons), when the social or physical environment is conducive to parents being anxious and unreliable. This environment is likely to include conditions in which threats (whether from weather, predators, or human conflicts and wars) are prevalent but unpredictable.

In sum, anxious attachment and its relation to sentinel behavior may have been adaptive at the group level, given that (a) sentinels in other species contribute to the survival of their groups; (b) the early human environment was most probably well supplied with circumstances and predators that threatened humans; (c) in such an environment the benefits of sentinels would have been great; and (d) anxiously attached group members' quick and intense reactions to threats were probably useful to the majority of group members who were more secure and therefore less excitable. Their anxious schemas and action tendencies, while possibly being troublesome at times, would have nevertheless been beneficial at other times to group members' survival and eventual reproduction.

The adaptive advantages of avoidant attachment. Avoidant individuals are accustomed to looking out for their own interests and taking care of themselves, even if this sometimes occurs at others' expense (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). This means that they are likely to rely on self-protective fight-or-flight reactions in times of danger. This defensive pattern has both disadvantages and advantages. In the face of danger, avoidant individuals may be primarily motivated to save themselves, but this tendency may allow them to quickly discover a way to do so. Meanwhile, anxiously and securely attached individuals may remain close to their associates without quickly figuring out how to escape.

Imagine an avoidant person in the presence of a dangerous fire (of the kind we mentioned earlier). While taking quick protective action, the person may find an escape route or take effective action to put out the fire or seal a door to keep the fire outside. This resembles the behavior of the fictional character “Jack Bauer,” played by the actor Kiefer Sutherland in the television series “24.” Jack is generally fearless, effective, and even ruthless if the situation calls for it; he does not show emotion when drastic action is required. Although there are obvious moral dangers in behaving this way, there is little doubt that it can increase an avoidant person’s survival chances while sometimes saving other people’s lives, including the lives of group members about whom the avoidant individual may not care very deeply. Saving lives is likely to contribute to the avoidant person’s inclusive fitness (keeping in mind that humans for most of their existence have lived in groups of kin) and to the group’s overall fitness.

Evidence for the influence of a few group members’ early decisions to flee a dangerous situation can be found in the research literatures on military situations and natural disasters. One of the most alarming sights for human beings is other people running from danger (e.g., Mawson, 1980). As Marshall (1947) eloquently stated in writing about military behavior during World War II: “It can be laid down as a general rule that nothing is more likely to collapse a line of infantry than the sight of a few of its number in full and unexplained flight to the rear . . . One or two or more men made a sudden run to the rear which others in the vicinity did not understand . . . In every case the testimony of all witnesses clearly [indicated] that those who started the run . . . had a legitimate or at least a reasonable excuse for the action” (pp. 145-146). It is also known that in dangerous situations people tend to follow the route they see others taking (Mawson, 1980).

Individuals who flee first (those, we suggest, who are likely to be disproportionately avoidant) often clear a way by opening emergency doors, breaking a window, or finding a safer place to hide. When their escape route is identified and cleared, others can follow and take advantage of the escape route. Thus, avoidant individuals may increase their own and their group members' chances of survival under emergency conditions. As in the case of anxiously attached individuals acting as sentinels, a group that contained at least some avoidant members might benefit from their presence even if the same individuals at other times caused difficulties (e.g., engaging in mate poaching or being irresponsible as parents; Schachner & Shaver, 2004).

Also as in the case of anxious attachment, the existence of the avoidant attachment pattern could be due either to genes that contribute directly to its formation, or to genes that allow it to develop under certain environmental conditions. Since the developmental research literature on attachment shows that avoidant attachment develops when primary attachment figures are themselves emotionally restricted, highly independent, and somewhat selfish, it should be more common, as Belsky (1999) argued, when the social or physical environment makes selfishness and independence useful for survival. This environment is likely to include conditions in which altruism, including generous parental behavior, and interdependence interfere with survival. In a cross-cultural study of 55 countries, Schmitt et al. (2004) found that avoidant adult attachment is most common in Africa, where mortality due to disease, famine, and war is exceptionally high, sometimes making warm, secure relations with other people less rather than more conducive to survival.

In sum, diversity of attachment patterns in human groups, tribes, and societies may have been adaptively advantageous over the span of human evolution. Although securely attached individuals may provide better care for their children and may be generally more effective than

anxious or avoidant individuals at leading and coordinating groups (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Rom & Mikulincer, 2003), they may also be slower than anxious individuals to notice signs of impending danger and slower than avoidant individuals to show group members how to escape danger.

An implication of this analysis is that groups that are heterogeneous with respect to attachment styles should be better, on average, in dealing with threats and survival problems compared with homogenous groups. Heterogeneous groups should have the ability to detect potential problems and threats (with anxious group members acting as sentinels), the ability to act quickly without much deliberation, negotiation, and compromise (with avoidant people acting as models of quick self-protection), and the ability to manage complex social tasks (with securely attached people acting as stable leaders and coordinators of the group). Interestingly, in an unpublished and generally overlooked dissertation study of real-world work teams, Kimmel (2003) found that teams containing only securely attached individuals were less effective in accomplishing group tasks than work teams containing only 75% or 50% securely attached individuals, with the remaining team members having insecure attachment styles.

Preliminary Evidence Concerning Insecure People's Threat-Related Scripts

SDT proposes that anxiously and avoidantly attached people possess certain kinds of schemas or scripts related to acting in the face of danger, and they will behave in dangerous situations in a manner consistent with those scripts. Anxiously attached people should have ready cognitive access to scripts that sensitize them to threat-related cues and make them likely to capture others' attention and alert them to emerging threats. Avoidant people should have ready access to scripts that cause them, independently, to seek and find ways out of dangerous situations, mainly with the goal of saving themselves.

Two of us (Ein-Dor & Mikulincer, 2006) have examined these hypotheses in two preliminary studies. We reasoned that anxious and avoidant persons would tend to respond more quickly and to produce more false memories of information that was congruent with their schemas. Markus and others (e.g., Markus & Kunda, 1986; Markus, Smith, & Moreland, 1985) had already shown that heightened mental availability of such schemas produces faster responses and more false memories to schema-congruent information. In our first study, we examined the association between attachment anxiety and the accessibility of sentinel-related schemas; in our second study, we examined the association between avoidant attachment and the accessibility of schemas related to rapid fight-or-flight responses.

In the first study, 69 Israeli undergraduates were shown a video clip of a young woman (a confederate) answering 12 open-ended questions. Half of the questions dealt with neutral issues (e.g., “When you go to the beach, you ...”) and the remaining questions dealt with threat-related issues (e.g., “You walk with your friends, and you hear a loud roar behind you, and you ...”). Participants were then randomly assigned to two experimental conditions. In the sentinel-schema condition, the confederate’s answers to the threat-related questions implied that she was highly sensitive to danger and habitually tended to warn others about potential threats (e.g., “I would be very scared. I would scream with fear, turn around, and yell to warn the others”). In the control condition, the confederate’s answers to the threat-related questions implied that she generally remains calm during threatening situations and does not usually engage in sentinel behavior (e.g., “I would turn around and look where the roar was coming from. I am usually in these situations. I act according to what I see”).

All participants then completed a distracter task followed by a computerized recognition test containing segments of the confederate’s answers. In the latter task, participants were asked

to decide as quickly as possible whether or not each of 36 target sentences had appeared in the video clip. Twelve of the target sentences were “old” (i.e., had appeared in the clip) and 24 were “new.” Twelve of the new sentences differed from, but resembled, the original confederate’s answers and were used to test for “false memory.” In each of the sentence categories (old, new, false-memory), half of the sentences dealt with neutral issues and half dealt with threat-related issues. All sentences were matched for length and number of words.

Self-reported attachment anxiety, but not avoidance, was significantly associated with schema-biased memory for threat-related sentences and faster reaction times to the confederate’s statements denoting *sentinel behavior*. This recognition pattern was evident only when the threat-related sentences fit a sentinel-related mental schema (sentinel condition). When sentences deviated from this schema (in the control condition), attachment anxiety was negatively associated with schema-biased memory. In other words, the higher a participant’s attachment anxiety, the less schema-biased memory he or she showed.

In the second study, 57 Israeli undergraduates went through a similar procedure, but the video clip was designed to activate schemas related to fight-or-flight behaviors. Specifically, participants were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions. In the rapid fight-flight condition, the confederate’s answers to the threat-related questions implied that she habitually tended to act alone and with no hesitation in times of danger (e.g., “I would deal with the threat by myself. I would not trust others to do the job”). In the control condition, the confederate’s answers to the threat-related questions implied that she tended to collaborate with others in times of threat and to wait and see what others did (e.g., “I would see what others had done and act accordingly”). Following the distracter task, all participants completed the recognition test used in Study 1.

In this study, avoidant but not anxious attachment was significantly associated with schema-biased memory for threat-related sentences and faster reaction times when the threat-related sentences fit a fight-flight schema. However, when sentences deviated from this schema (in the control condition), avoidance was negatively associated with schema-biased memory. In other words, the higher a participant's avoidance score, the less schema-biased memory he or she showed.

The findings of both studies support our predictions. Whereas anxious participants had readier cognitive access to sentinel-related schemas, avoidant participants had readier access to schemas compatible with fight-or-flight behaviors.

Concluding Comments

Over the past 20 years, numerous studies have demonstrated the relevance of attachment theory to many psychological and social processes in adult life. One consistent finding has been that securely attached individuals are happier and better adapted in virtually every area of daily life. This made us wonder why approximately half of the human population is insecure with respect to attachment. It seemed to be an evolutionary paradox. Social defense theory was devised to explain this paradox. It is based on the possibility that attachment patterns that seem troublesome and dysfunctional at an individual or dyadic level make sense when considered at the level of groups, tribes, and societies. At that higher level of analysis, it seems possible that attachment-style heterogeneity is conducive to survival when a group encounters life-threatening dangers. Social defense theory makes empirically testable predictions, and we have already found in two preliminary studies briefly summarized here that two of the predictions are supported by experimental data. It therefore seems worthwhile to test the theory further.

If SDT continues to receive empirical support, it will be important to determine the best explanation from an evolutionary viewpoint. If a mixture of attachment patterns is useful at the group level, this suggests one or both of two alternative evolutionary accounts. (1) It might imply that different attachment patterns are related to different genetic alleles (as already indicated, e.g., by Crawford et al., 2007; Donnellan et al., 2008; and Gillath et al., in press), in which case inclusive fitness or group-level selection processes might have determined the relative frequencies of the different attachment patterns in the human population. To date, however, there is little evidence for strong, direct genetic determination of attachment patterns and some evidence against it (see Vaughn, Bost, & van IJzendoorn, 2008, for a review of genetic studies of infant attachment patterns). (2) The second possibility is that evolution generated a capacity for facultative development of attachment patterns in response to environmental pressures. This is the kind of explanation offered by Belsky (1999), although he based his version of the explanation on mating processes rather than survival.

In either case, it will be important to discern why the relative frequencies of the major attachment patterns seem to be similar around the world. If there really is such a general similarity, it suggests either similarities in the average kinds and levels of threats to groups or frequency-based selection (West-Eberhard, 2003). An argument against this proportional constancy is that insecure attachment is more common in lower socio-economic groups (Steele & Steele, 2008) and, as already mentioned, in environmentally challenging parts of Africa (Schmitt et al., 2004). These considerations suggest that if Social Defense Theory is supported in future studies, it needs to be developed more fully with respect to alternative biological and evolutionary explanations.

References

- Aguirre, B. E., Wenger, D., & Vigo, G. (1998). A test of the emergent norm theory of collective behavior. *Sociological Forum*, *13*, 301–311.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: Assessed in the Strange Situation and at home*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Alexander, R. D. (1987). *The biology of moral systems*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Baker, G. W., & Chapman, D. W. (1962). *Man and society in disaster*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2004). No association of the dopamine D4 receptor (DRD4) and -521 C/T promoter polymorphisms with infant attachment disorganization. *Attachment and Human Development*, *6*, 211-218.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *7*, 147-178.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*, 226-244.
- Beller, E. K., & Pohl, A. (1986, April). *The strange situation revisited*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Infant Studies, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Belsky, J. (1997). Theory testing, effect-size evaluation, and differential susceptibility to rearing influence: The case of mothering and attachment. *Child Development*, *68*, 598-600.
- Belsky, J. (1999). Modern evolutionary theory and patterns of attachment. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 141-161). New York: Guilford Press.

- Belsky, J., Steinberg, L., & Draper, P. (1991). Childhood experience, interpersonal development, and reproductive strategy: An evolutionary theory of socialization. *Child Development, 62*, 647-670.
- Benoit, D., & Parker, K. C. H. (1994). Stability and transmission of attachment across three generations. *Child Development, 65*, 1444-1456.
- Bettelheim, B. (1960). *The informed heart: Autonomy in a mass age*. New York: Free Press.
- Birnbaum, G. E., Orr, I., Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1997). When marriage breaks up: Does attachment style contribute to coping and mental health? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 14*, 643-654.
- Blumstein, D. T., Steinmetz, J., Armitage, K. B., & Daniel, J. C. (1997). Alarm calling in yellow-bellied marmots: II. The importance of direct fitness. *Animal Behavior, 53*, 173-184.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation: Anxiety and anger*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 3. Sadness and depression*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books. (Original ed. 1969)
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Clinical applications of attachment theory*. London: Routledge.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult romantic attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford Press.

- Brennan, K. A., Shaver, P. R., & Tobey, A. E. (1991). Attachment styles, gender, and parental problem drinking. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 451-466.
- Brewer, M. B., & Caporael, L. R. (1990). Selfish genes vs. selfish people: Sociobiology as origin myth. *Motivation Emotion*, 14, 237-243.
- Bretherton, I., & Munholland, K. A. (2008). Internal working models in attachment relationships: Elaborating a central construct in attachment theory. In J. Cassidy and P. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical application* (2nd rev. ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Brudzynski, S. M. (2005). Principles of rat communication: Quantitative parameters of ultrasonic calls in rats. *Behavior Genetics*, 35, 85-92.
- Brussoni, M. J., Jang, K. L., Livesley, W., & MacBeth, T. M. (2000). Genetic and environmental influences on adult attachment styles. *Personal Relationships*, 7, 283-289.
- Bryan, J.L. (1985). Convergence clusters: A phenomenon of human behavior seen in selected high-rise building fires. *Fire Journal*, 79(6), 27-30.
- Bryan, J. L. (2002). A selected historical review of human behavior in fire. *Fire Protection Journal*, 16, 4-10.
- Buss, D. M. (1988a). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 9, 291-317.
- Buss, D. M. (1988b). The evolution of human intrasexual competition: Tactics of mate attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 616- 628.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 1-49.

- Buss, D. M. (1995). Evolutionary psychology: A new paradigm for psychological science. *Psychological Inquiry*, 6, 1-30.
- Buss, D. M. (1999). *Evolutionary psychology: The new science of the mind*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science*, 3, 251-255.
- Cantril, H., Gaudet, H., & Herzog, H. (1940). *The invasion from Mars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Carnelley, K. B., & Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). Optimism about love relationships: General vs. specific lessons from one's personal experiences. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9, 5-20.
- Carnelley, K. B., Pietromonaco, P. R., & Jaffe, K. (1994). Depression, working models of others, and relationship functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 127-140.
- Carpenter, B. D. (2001). Attachment bonds between adult daughters and their older mothers: Associations with contemporary caregiving. *Journals of Gerontology: Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 56B, 257-266.
- Carpenter, S. L. (1988). Self-relevant and goal-directed processing in the recall and weighting of information about others. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 24, 310-332.
- Cassidy, J., & Berlin, L. J. (1994). The insecure/ambivalent pattern of attachment: Theory and research. *Child Development*, 65, 971-991.

- Cassidy, J., & Kobak, R. R. (1988). Avoidance and its relationship with other defensive processes. In J. Belsky & T. Nezworski (Eds.), *Clinical implications of attachment* (pp. 300-323). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (Eds.). (1999). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Chisholm, J. S. (1996). The evolutionary ecology of attachment organization. *Human Nature*, 7, 1-38.
- Cicirelli, V. G. (1993). Attachment and obligation as daughters' motives for caregiving behavior and subsequent effect on subjective burden. *Psychology and Aging*, 8, 144-155.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 644-663.
- Cosmides, L. (1989). The logic of social exchange: Has natural selection shaped how humans reason? Studies with the Wason selection task. *Cognition*, 31, 187-276.
- Coss, R. G., Ramakrishnan, U., & Schank, J. (2005). Recognition of partially concealed leopards by wild bonnet macaques (*Macaca radiata*) the role of the spotted coat. *Behavioural Processes*, 68, 145-163.
- Crawford, T. N., Livesley, W. J., Jang, K. L., Shaver, P. R., Cohen, P., & Ganiban, J. (2007). Insecure attachment and personality disorder: A twin study of adults. *European Journal of Personality*, 21, 191-208.
- Crispi, E. L., Schiaffino, K., & Berman, W. H. (1997). The contribution of attachment to burden in adult children of institutionalized parents with dementia. *Gerontologist*, 37, 52-60.

- Cross, S. E., & Markus, H. R. (1994). Self-schemas, possible selves, and competent performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*, 423-438.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M. I., & Weghorst, S. J. (1982) Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 3*, 11-27.
- Davidovitz, R., Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R., Ijzak, R., & Popper, M. (2007). Leaders as attachment figures: Their attachment orientations predict leadership-related mental representations and followers' performance and mental health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 632-650.
- Donnellan, M. B., Burt, S. A., Levendosky, A. A., Klump, K. L. (2008). Genes, personality, and attachment in adults: A multivariate behavioral genetic analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 3-16.
- Doron, G., & Kyrios, M. (2005) Obsessive compulsive disorder: A review of possible specific internal representations within a broader cognitive theory. *Clinical Psychology Review, 25*, 415-432.
- Dozier, M., & Kobak, R. (1992). Psychophysiology in attachment interviews: Converging evidence for deactivating strategies. *Child Development, 63*, 1473-1480.
- Dunford, C. (1977). Kin selection for ground squirrel alarm calls. *American Naturalist, 58*, 782-785.
- Eberly, M. B., & Montemayor, R. (1998). Doing good deeds: An examination of adolescent prosocial behavior in the context of parent-adolescent relationships. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 13*, 403-432.
- Eberly, M. B., & Montemayor, R. (1999). Adolescent affection and helpfulness toward parents: A 2-year follow-up. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*, 226-248.

- Ein-Dor, T., & Mikulincer, M. (2006, January). *The attachment theory paradox: How can so many of us have nothing but disadvantages?* Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Palm Springs, CA.
- Feeney, J. A. (2004). Transfer of attachment from parents to romantic partners: Effects of individual and relationship variables. *Journal of Family Studies, 10*, 220-238.
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 281-291.
- Fiala, K. B. (1991). *Attachment and psychosocial functioning of depressed, remitted depressed, and nondepressed women and their partners*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Fichtel, C. (2004). Reciprocal recognition in sifaka (*Propithecus verreauxi verreauxi*) and redfronted lemur (*Eulemur fulvus rufus*) alarm calls. *Animal Cognition, 7*, 45-52.
- Finkel, D., & Matheny, A. P. (2000). Genetic and environmental influences on a measure of infant attachment security. *Twin Research, 3*, 242-250.
- Fitzpatrick, C., & Mileti, D. S. (1991). Motivating public evacuation. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters, 9*, 137-152.
- Flinn, M. V. (1988). Step- and genetic parent/offspring relationships in a Caribbean village. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 9*, 335-369.
- Fonagy, P., Steele, H., & Steele, M. (1991). Maternal representations of attachment during pregnancy predict the organization of infant-mother attachment at one year of age. *Child Development, 62*, 891-905.
- Form, W. H., & Nosow, S. (1958). *Community in disaster*. New York: Harper.

- Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (1997). Adult attachment and the suppression of unwanted thoughts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1080-1091.
- Fraley, R. C., & Waller, N. G. (1998). Adult attachment patterns: A test of the typological model. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 77-114). New York: Guilford Press.
- Freeman, C. D., & Cooper, D. (1940). *The road to Bordeaux*. New York: Cresset Press.
- Friedberg, N. L., & Lyddon, W. J. (1996). Self-other working models and eating disorders. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 10, 193-203.
- Gazzaniga, M. S. (2008). *Human: The science behind what makes us unique*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Gillath, O., Shaver, P. R., Baek, J.-M., & Chun, D. S. (in press). Genetic correlates of adult attachment style. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Grossmann, K. E., Grossmann, K., Huber, F., & Wartner, U. (1981). German children's behavior toward their mothers at 12 months and their fathers at 18 months in Ainsworth's Strange Situation. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 7, 157-181.
- Grossmann, K.E., Grossmann, K., & Waters, E. (Eds.) (2005). *Attachment from Infancy to Adulthood*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Hamilton, W. D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behaviour: I, II. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 7, 1-52.
- Hamilton, W. D. (1975). Innate social aptitudes in man: An approach from evolutionary genetics. In R. Fox (Ed.), *Biosocial anthropology* (pp. 133-155). London, UK: Malaby Press.

- Hazan, C., & Hutt, M. (1993). *Patterns of adaptations: Attachment differences in psychosocial functioning during the first year of college*. Unpublished manuscript, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 511-524.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1990). Love and work: An attachment-theoretical perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 270-280.
- Hazan, C., & Zeifman, D. (1999). Pair-bonds as attachments: Evaluating the evidence. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 336-354). New York: Guilford.
- Henderson, S. (1977). The social network, support and neurosis: The function of attachment in adult life. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *131*, 185-191.
- Hesse, E. (2008). The Adult Attachment Interview: Historical and current perspectives. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications (2nd Edition)*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Hill, R., & Hansen, D. A. (1962). In G. W. Baker & D. W. Chapman (Eds.), *Man and society in disaster*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hoogland, J. (1995). *The black-tailed prairie dog: Social life of a burrowing mammal*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hoogland, J. (1996). Why do Gunnison's prairie dogs give anti-predator calls? *Animal Behavior*, *51*, 871-880.

- Inglehart, M. R., Markus, H., Brown, D. R. (1989). The effects of possible selves on academic achievement: A panel study. In J. P. Forgas & J. M. Innes (Eds.), *Recent advances in social psychology: An international perspective* (pp. 469-477). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers B. V. (North-Holland).
- Kanagawa, C., Cross, S. E., & Markus, H. R. (2001). "Who am I?" The cultural psychology of the conceptual self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 90-103.
- Kimmel, M. (2003). *Attachment patterns and social support processes in work teams*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa.
- Kinston, W., & Rosser, R. (1974). Disasters: Effects on mental and physical health. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 18, 437-456.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Hazan, C. (1994). Attachment styles and close relationships: A four-year prospective study. *Personal Relationships*, 1, 123-142.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1990). Attachment theory and religion: Childhood attachments, religious beliefs, and conversion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 315-334.
- Kobak, R., Cole, H., Ferenz-Gillies, R., & Fleming, W. (1993). Attachment and emotional regulation during mother-teen problem solving: A control theory analysis. *Child Development*, 64, 231-245.
- Kobak, R., & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect regulation, and representations of self and others. *Child Development*, 59, 135-146.

- Kunce, L. J., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). An attachment-theoretical approach to caregiving in romantic relationships. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Attachment processes in adulthood (Advances in personal relationships, Vol. 5, pp. 205-237)*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Lamb, M. E., Hwang, C. P., Frodi, M., & Frodi, M. (1982). Security of mother- and father-infant attachment and its relation to sociability with strangers in traditional and non-traditional Swedish families. *Infant Behavior and Development, 5*, 355-367.
- Lussier, Y., Sabourin, S., & Turgeon, C. (1997). Coping strategies as moderators of the relationship between attachment and marital adjustment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 14*, 777-791.
- Main, M. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of attachment organization: Recent studies, changing methodologies, and the concept of conditional strategies. *Human Development, 33*, 48-61.
- Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50*, 66-104.
- Marks, I. M. (1987). *Fears, phobias, and rituals*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 63-78.
- Markus, H. (1980). The self in thought and memory. In D. M. Wegner & R. R. Vallacher (Eds.), *The self in social psychology* (pp. 102–130). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Markus, H. (1983). Self-knowledge: An expanded view. *Journal of Personality, 51*, 543-565.

- Markus, H., Crane, M., Bernstein, S., & Siladi, M. (1982). Self-schemas and gender. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *42*, 38-50.
- Markus, H., & Cross, S. (1990). The interpersonal self. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 576-608). New York: Guilford Press.
- Markus, H., Cross, S., & Wurf, E. (1990). The role of the self-system in competence. In R. J. Sternberg & J. Kolligian, Jr. (Eds.), *Competence considered* (pp. 205-225). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Markus, H., & Kunda, Z. (1986). Stability and malleability in the self-concept in the perception of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 858-866.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, *41*, 954-969.
- Markus, H., & Ruvolo, A. (1989). Possible selves: Personalized representations of goals. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Goal concepts in personality and social psychology* (pp. 211-241). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Markus, H.R., & Sentis, K.P. (1982). The self in social information processing. In: J. Suls, (Ed.,) *Psychological Perspectives on the Self Vol. 1* (pp. 41–70), Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Markus, H., Smith, J., & Moreland, R. L. (1985). The role of the self-concept in the perception of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*, 1494-1512.
- Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. In M. R. Rosenweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Annual Review of Psychology*, *38*, 299-337.
- Marshall, S.L.A. (1947). *Men against fire*. New York: Morrow.
- Mawson, A.R. (1978, August). *Panic behavior: A review and a new hypothesis*. Paper presented at the 9th World York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. Congress of Sociology. Uppsala, Sweden.

- Mawson, A.R. (1980). Is the concept of panic for study purposes? In B. Levin (ed.). *Behavior in fires*. National bureau of standards, special publication, proceedings of the second international seminar on behavior in fire emergencies.
- Mawson, A.R. (2005). Understanding mass panic and other collective responses to threat and disaster. *Psychiatry: Interpersonal & Biological Processes*, 68(2), 95-113.
- Mickelson, K. D., Kessler, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (1997). Adult attachment in a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1092-1106.
- Mikulincer, M. (1998). Adult attachment style and affect regulation: Strategic variations in self-appraisals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 420-435.
- Mikulincer, M., Birnbaum, G., Woddis, D., & Nachmias, O. (2000). Stress and accessibility of proximity-related thoughts: Exploring the normative and intraindividual components of attachment theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 509-523.
- Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1995). Appraisal of and coping with a real-life stressful situation: The contribution of attachment styles. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 406-414.
- Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1998). The relationship between adult attachment styles and emotional and cognitive reactions to stressful events. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 143-165). New York: Guilford Press.
- Mikulincer, M., Florian, V., & Tolmacz, R. (1990). Attachment styles and fear of personal death: A case study of affect regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 273-280.

- Mikulincer, M., Florian, V., & Weller, A. (1993). Attachment styles, coping strategies, and posttraumatic psychological distress: The impact of the Gulf War in Israel. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 817-826.
- Mikulincer, M., Gillath, O., & Shaver, P. R. (2002). Activation of the attachment system in adulthood: Threat-related primes increase the accessibility of mental representations of attachment figures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 881-895.
- Mikulincer, M., & Nachshon, O. (1991). Attachment styles and patterns of self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 321-331.
- Mikulincer, M., & Orbach, I. (1995). Attachment styles and repressive defensiveness: The accessibility and architecture of affective memories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 917-925.
- Mikulincer, M., Orbach, I., & Iavnieli, D. (1998). Adult attachment style and affect regulation: Strategic variations in subjective self-other similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 436-448.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2003). The attachment behavioral system in adulthood: Activation, psychodynamics, and interpersonal processes. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 53-152). New York: Academic Press.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2005). Attachment security, compassion, and altruism. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*, 34-38.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Miller, G. (2005). Behavior: Bird alarm calls size up predators. *Science, 308*, 1853 – 1855.

- Miyake, K., Chen, S. J. & Campos, J. J. (1985). Infant temperament, mother's mode of interaction, and attachment in Japan: An interim report. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points in attachment theory and research: Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50, (1—2, serial no. 209) 276-297.
- O'Connor, T. G., & Croft, C. M. (2001). A twin study of attachment in preschool children. *Child Development*, 72, 1501-1511.
- Oyserman, D., & Markus, H. (1990). Possible selves and delinquency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 112-125.
- Perry, R. W. (1994). A model of evacuation compliance behavior. In R. R. Dynes & K. J. Tierney (eds.), *Disasters, collective behavior, and social organization* (pp. 85–98). Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press.
- Platzen, D. & Magrath, R. D. (2005). Adaptive differences in response to two types of parental alarm calls in altricial nestlings. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, B* 272, 1101-1106.
- Proulx, G. (2002, April 15–16). *Understanding human behavior in stressful situations*. Presented in workshop to identify innovative research needs to foster improved fire safety in the United States, National Academy of Sciences, Delegate Binder Section 7, Washington, DC.
- Proulx, G. (2003). Researchers learn from World Trade Center survivors' accounts. *Construction Innovation*, 8(1), 1–3.
- Quarantelli, E. L., & Dynes, R. (1977). Response to social crisis and disaster. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 3, 23–49.

- Riede, T., Bronson, E., Hatzikirou, B., & Zuberbühler, K. (2005). The production mechanisms of Diana monkey alarm calls: Morphological data and a model. *Journal of Human Evolution, 48*, 85–96.
- Riskind, J. H., Williams, N. L., Altman, M. D., Black, D. O., Balaban, M. S., & Gessner, T. L. (2004). Developmental antecedents of the looming maladaptive style: Parental bonding and parental attachment insecurity. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy, 18*, 1, 43-52.
- Rom, E., & Mikulincer, M. (2003). Attachment theory and group processes: The association between attachment style and group-related representations, goals, memories, and functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 1220-1235.
- Rosengren, K. K., Arvidson, P., & Sturesson, D. (1975). The Barseback “panic”: A radio program as a negative summary event. *Acta Sociologica, 18*, 303–321.
- Rothbard, J. J., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Continuity of attachment across the life span. In M. B. Sperling & W. H. Berman (Eds.), *Attachment in adults* (pp. 31-71). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Safford, S. M., Alloy, L. B., Crossfield, A.G., Morocco, A. M., & Wang, J. C. (2004). The relationship of cognitive style and attachment style to depression and anxiety in young adults. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy, 18*, 25–41.
- Sagi, A., Lamb, M. E., Lewkowicz, K. S., Shoham, R., Dvir, R. and Estes, D. (1985). 'Security of infant-mother, -father, and -metapelet attachments among kibbutz-reared Israeli children'. In: I. Bretherton and E. Waters (eds.), *Growing points in attachment theory and research* (pp. 257-575). Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development.

- Schachner, D. A., & Shaver, P. R. (2004). Attachment dimensions and sexual motives. *Personal Relationships, 11*, 179-195.
- Schwagmeyer, P. L. (1980). Alarm calling behavior of the thirteen-lined ground squirrel, *Spermophilus tridecemlineatus*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology, 7*, 195–200.
- Schmitt, D. P. (2005). Is short-term mating the maladaptive result of insecure attachment? A test of competing evolutionary perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 747-768.
- Schmitt, D. P., Alcalay, L., Allensworth, M., Allik, J., Ault, L., Austers, I., et al. (2004). Patterns and universals of adult romantic attachment across 62 cultural regions: Are models of self and of other pancultural constructs? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35*, 367-402.
- Shaver, P. R., & Brennan, K. A. (1992). Attachment styles and the “big five” personality traits: Their connections with each other and with romantic relationship outcomes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 536-545.
- Shaver, P. R., & Clark, C. L. (1994). The psychodynamics of adult romantic attachment. In J.M. Masling & R.F. Bornstein (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on object relations theories* (pp. 105-156). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2002). Attachment-related psychodynamics. *Attachment and Human Development, 4*, 133-161.
- Sherman, P. W. (1977). Nepotism and the evolution of alarm calls. *Science, 197*, 1246-1253.
- Sherman, P. W. (1980). The meaning of nepotism. *American Naturalist, 116*, 604-606.
- Sherman, P. W. (1981). Kinship, demography, and Belding's ground squirrel nepotism. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology, 8*, 251-259.

- Sime, J. D. (1983). Affiliative behavior during escape to building exits. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 3*, 21–41.
- Sime, J. D. (1985). Movement toward the familiar: Person and place affiliation in a fire entrapment setting. *Environment and Behavior, 17*, 697–724.
- Simpson, J. A. (1999). Attachment theory in modern evolutionary perspective. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 115–140). New York: Guilford Press.
- Simpson, J. A., & Belsky, J. (in press). Attachment theory in modern evolutionary perspective. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Smith, E. R., Murphy, J., & Coats, S. (1999). Attachment to groups: Theory and management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 94–110.
- Sober, E., & Wilson, D.S. (1998). *Unto others: The evolution and psychology of unselfish behavior*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Sroufe, L. A., & Waters, E. (1977). Attachment as an organizational construct. *Child Development, 48*, 1184-1199.
- Steele, H., & Steele, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Clinical applications of the Adult Attachment Interview*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Symons, D. (1987). If we're all Darwinians, what's the fuss about? In C. Crawford, D. Krebs, & M. Smith (Eds.), *Sociobiology and psychology* (pp. 121-145). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Thompson, R. A. (2008). Early attachment and later development. In: J. Cassidy and P. R. Shaver, (eds.), *Handbook of attachment: theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd Edition). New York: Guilford Press.
- Tidwell, M. O., Reis, H. T., & Shaver, P. R. (1996). Attachment, attractiveness, and social interaction: A diary study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*, 729-745.
- Titmuss, R. M. (1950). *Problems of social policy*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (1990). On the universality of human nature and the uniqueness of the individual: The role of genetics and adaptation. *Journal of Personality*, *58*, 17-67.
- Tooke, W., & Camire, L. (1991). Pattern of deception in intrasexual and intersexual mating strategies. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *12*, 345-364.
- Townsend, A. L., & Franks, M. M. (1995). Binding ties: Closeness and conflict in adult children's caregiving relationships. *Psychology and Aging*, *10*, 343-351.
- U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, Reports, Pacific War: No. 3. (1946). *The effects of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- van IJzendoorn, M. (1995). Adult attachment representations, parental responsiveness, and infant attachment: A meta-analysis on the predictive validity of the Adult Attachment Interview. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 387-403.
- van IJzendoorn, M. H., Goossens, F. A., Kroonenberg, P. M. & Tavecchio, L. W. C. (1985). Dependent attachment: B4—children in the Strange Situation. *Psychological Reports*, *57*, 439-451.
- van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Kroonenberg, P. M. (1988). Cross-cultural patterns of attachment: A meta-analysis of the Strange Situation. *Child Development*, *59*, 147-156.

- Vaughn, B. E., Bost, K. K., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2008). Attachment and temperament: Additive and interactive influences on behavior, affect, and cognition during infancy and childhood. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Waters, H. S., Rodrigues, L. M., & Ridgeway, D. (1998). Cognitive underpinnings of narrative attachment assessment. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *71*, 211-234.
- Waters, H. S., & Waters, E. (2006). The attachment working models concept: Among other things, we build *script*-like representations of secure base experiences. *Attachment and Human Development*, *8*, 185-197.
- Wells, H. G. (1898). *The war of the worlds*. London: Heinemann.
- West-Eberhard, M. J. (2003). *Developmental plasticity and evolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, N. L., & Riskind, J. H. (2004). Adult romantic attachment and cognitive vulnerabilities to anxiety and depression: Examining the interpersonal basis of vulnerability models. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly*, *18*, 2-24.
- Wilson, D. S., Van Vugt, M., & O'Gorman, R. (2008). Multilevel selection theory and major evolutionary transitions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *17*, 6-9.
- Wilson, D.S., & Wilson, E.D. (2007). Rethinking the theoretical founding of sociobiology. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, *82*, 327-348.
- Zevalkink, J., Riksen-Walraven, J. M. A., & Van-Lieshout, C. F. M. (1999). Attachment in the Indonesian caregiving context. *Social Development*, *8*, 21-40.

