Hostile Attribution Bias and Its Relationship to Attachment Methods

Etab Sabri Jalal Hamad
Supervisor:
Sanaa Issa AD-daghistani
Department of Psychology, College of Arts, University of Baghdad
sanaa.rasheed@coart.uobaghdad.edu.iq
Etab.Sabri1204a@coart.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Abstract

The current research aims to identify Hostile Attribution Bias among adolescents and the differences between it and the four attachment patterns (Secure, Avoidant, Anxious, Contradictory) among adolescents depending on gender and age in addition to the relationship between Hostile Attribution Bias and the four attachment patterns among adolescents. 400) adolescents from the (second, third) intermediate and (fourth, fifth) preparatory grades of both sexes. The number of male students was (200) and the number of female students (200) were chosen randomly from (16) sixteen schools. The researcher relied on the Social Information Processing Model in Hostile Attribution Bias, and Mary Answorth's theory (M. Answorth, 1978) in Attachment methods. For the Hostile Attribution Bias scale in the retest method (0.80), while the stability coefficient of the Cronbach's Alpha method for the same scale was (0.71), while the stability coefficient of the Four Attachment Methods scale reached, Secure Attachment using the retest method (0.89), the alpha Cronbach method (0.82), the Avoidant Attachment method, the retest method (0.83), the alpha Cronbach method (0.80), the Anxious Attachment method, the retest method (0.84), the alpha Cronbach method (0.82), and the Contradictory Attachment using the retest method (0.79) Thus, by Cronbach's alpha method (0.77), the results showed:

1. That adolescents have low aggressive attribution.

2. There is a statistically significant difference in Hostile Attribution Bias according to the gender variable and in favor of males, as the calculated t value reached (24.79) which is higher than the tabular t value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396). While there is no statistically significant difference in Hostile Attribution Bias according to the variable of age. In addition, there is no interaction in Hostile Attribution Bias between the two variables (gender and age).

3. Teens have Secure Attachment and Avoidant at a high level, and Anxious Attachment and Contradictory at a low level.

4. There are no statistically significant differences between males and females according to attachment patterns (Secure, Avoidant, Anxious) except for the Contradictory pattern. There is a statistically significant difference in Secure Attachment according to the variable of age and in favor of age (14-15), as the calculated t-value reached (7.24) which is higher than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396). In addition to the existence of a statistically significant difference in Avoidant Attachment according to the variable of age and in favor of age (16-17), as the calculated t-value reached (4.386), which is higher than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1- 396). While there are no statistically significant differences according to the age variable in the patterns (Anxious, Contradictory) or a significant interaction in the attachment patterns between the two variables (sex and age). Finally, there is a statistically significant inverse relationship between Hostile Attribution Bias and the Secure pattern, while there is a positive relationship between Hostile Attribution Bias and Attachment patterns (Anxious, and Contradictory).

Through the results, the researchers presented a number of recommendations and suggestions.

The First Topic

Research Problem

People tend towards certain interpretations or opinions about ambiguous situations based on their own intellectual background. These interpretations and trends affect their decision-making abilities. These mental processes, such as Bias, can be one of the important and main factors that would lead to several interpretations that are commensurate with their abilities and capabilities. Bias) is a prejudgment on a particular or general topic or issue by adopting a point of view that fits with the individual's beliefs, tendencies and preconceived ideas, in which the individual is closed to his thought. Such Bias the individual to prefer distorted interpretations of reality. (Steinbock, 1978, p.247). Hostile Attribution Bias is also a type of bias that influences decisions and judgments; It affects the field of human behavior and social life, which leads to the emergence of bad decisions that result in major problems, because it is a phenomenon in which people distort their opinions and beliefs. Research conducted by Roger, Kniper & Roger, which showed that the effect of subjective information is in people's ability to recall information better if they think about how the information affects them during the encoding process (the recording of memories in the brain), Greenwald sees Greenwald argues that the effect of subjective information causes people to exaggerate their roles in different situations, as well as that information is better encoded. This Bias explains how people tend to interpret information in order to enhance a self-image regardless of whether this image is justified, as people tend to give negative features more than positive features in the process of formulating and forming impressions and interpreting Attitudes about others is one of the problems facing individuals in the process of forming negative impressions, and this tendency is the direction of the angry attitude, and this may seem a contradiction, because People are often biased towards a positive perception of others, so we find that any person with negative traits takes a large place in formulating a negative and aggressive impression. Here, aggression is the main problem. Aggression is a behavioral phenomenon as old as man on this earth, and it is hostile actions and feelings carried by the individual. against others and that people act in a harmful way to others when they are highly emotional, especially if they feel angry towards others. We also find that some people feel pleasure in engaging in hostile behavior that hurts others and some people are more aggressive than others, and there is evidence that Hostile people's attention and awareness social stimuli are weaker than non-Hostiles, and they tend to perceive the behavior of others as aggression against them. For example, Hostile children often misinterpret or understand the behavior of other children. For example, he says, "They want to take my toys," "That child does not like me" (Stefanek 1987, p.98). et al., al), and this is what de Castro (2004) indicated in his study of the feelings of others with regard to encoding and representing the feelings of others, and it seems that boys who They suffer from behavioral problems and are unable to recognize the feelings of other children through images of expressions and feelings (94De Castro, 2004,). Therefore, in Hostile Attribution Bias, there is a tendency to assume the presence of aggressive intentions underlying the actions that are not visible to others, which is a key characteristic of encouraging aggression. There are gender differences in aggression and in the way of perception between males and females. Males in different cultures tend to behave in an aggressive and violent manner more than females, and this was confirmed by the results of the study of Richard and Lazarus (Richard & Loziros, 1990) that aggression is linked to sex hormones; Because males are apparently more aggressive than females (Lazarus, 1990, p. 168). As pointed out by Kenneth's study (2006), which proposed a model for the development of hostile behavior through basic sciences such as ethology, neuroscience, social psychology, personality psychology, and developmental psychology, which assumes that hostile behavior and antagonistic traits are universal human characteristics. Socialization leads to the development of these traits and has the ability to alter individual differences in accounting for the hostile's antisocial behavior pattern (Kenneth, 2006, p1).

As for adolescents with Anxious Attachment pattern, which is associated with obsessive

thoughts, preoccupation with emotional responses, jealousy, psychological isolation, and low levels of self-esteem, they also have difficulty establishing friendships in new social contexts (208.Feeny, 1990,p), conducted by (Lyons) (Lyons) -Ruth, 1996) A study on the relationship of Attachment in children with hostile behavior problems, and concluded that the disorders and problems of Attachment among these children were positively and statistically associated with parental violence and family disasters, and the events of the period of bad breastfeeding in children were positively and statistically related to their level of aggression. In the future, Bowlby sees that the environment of deprivation from the mother is one of the causes of disorders that appear in adolescence and adulthood, as the individual suffers from difficulty in abstract thinking due to self-control and conscience over reality, and the negative parental pattern and negative environment and the mother who frequently reprimands, which does not give Love makes these children troubled characters in the future (Lisa al et., 2001, p32). From the foregoing, it is possible to present the research problem with questions: Does the research sample of adolescent students have Hostile Attribution Bias? What are the predominant attachment styles in teens? Is there a relationship between Hostile Attribution Bias and the Four Attachment Styles (Secure, Avoidant, Anxious, Contradictory)?

Research Importance

Adolescence is one of the age stages in human life that lies between late childhood and adulthood, and it is a critical stage of development that includes mental, physical and psychological changes in which the adolescent tries to learn more about the world in which he lives, and tries hard to be independent from parents, as he considers himself as an adult. He is able to make decisions and engage in sexual issues, destructive aggression and destructive rebellion, and thus becomes a crisis of growth, which may generate an internal conflict for him through which he resorts to seeking information from separate sources, some of which are true and others carry many errors, and this is one of the problems of the adolescence stage (Cripps & Zyromski, 2009, p3), that physical changes play

a clear role in the adolescent's concept of himself and then his behavior, and also have a role on psychological effects; It makes the teenager sensitive, emotionally volatile, angry, excited for the simplest reasons, has a sharp response and focuses his attention on the reaction of others towards him, hence the importance of the family, school and society in immunizing adolescents from the types of hostile behaviors, for example, adolescents who are subjected to harassment Peer at school or parental abuse at home are more likely to develop high levels of hostile behavior leading them to act aggressively at school or at home as well as develop aggression through bias Hostile bias is also a target for intervention and prevention of hostile behaviors (Hurlook, 1964 ,p: 788).

Hostile Attribution Bias is the result of linking an individual's beliefs to things he knows or accepted values, making him more resistant to opinions that try to change his beliefs, and ensuring this resistance Bias has a serious impact on our lives, and may negatively affect our decisions, expectations and judgments (Al-Halabi, 2014, 2014). 38), where it represents the tendency of individuals to rely on their point of view in making judgments and decisions, as their opinions in judgments and decisions exceed the real reality, and they result from the psychological need for self-satisfaction. Studies have shown that experiences, ideas, and beliefs are easier to remember when they are in line with The self of the individual, as it causes a selfish view, and cognitive Bias as a general term includes other phenomena that fall under it and are related to it, and the effects of Bias on the self can vary based on personal characteristics as it pertains to a form of hostile behavior in life, and researchers confirm that aggression is acquired in The environment in which the individual lives as a result of his contact with the group in which he lives, it interprets aggression as an educated activity that is permanently supported in human societies with their current structure, and aggression does not occur in individuals Or it is learned unless the circumstances exist that guarantee its expression without fear of any consequences, but if the circumstances are not present, the

person may withdraw or withdraw (Fiore & Rose, 1979, p.720).

Traditional personality psychologists who have studied "traits" in order to understand how the chronic and stable patterns of hostile personalities are related have taken a view that conflicts with notions that personality characteristics develop change and interact dynamically with the social environment instead, and that their view is that fixed characteristics are driven Biologically present at birth and is the driver of all individual differences in behavior. Such an idea would not allow the hypothesis that hostile relativistic biases develop and direct behaviour. Instead, it rejects these biases; Because it is a secondary phenomenon, it is explained more simply by a primary hostility trait that causes both relative biases and hostile behaviour. Bandura, 1999, which states that personality coherence is directed not by traits but by case-specific social cognition processes, which cause behavior in all situations, and direct behavior patterns for stable cognitive processing in specific situations; Because these cognitive patterns are stable and coherent patterns of behavior that "come from bottom to top instead of top to bottom" (Kenneth, 2006, p14-16), there are many studies indicating that hostile attribution may be related to attachment methods as seen in the first place. The first is within the relationships of children and adolescents, as this phenomenon appears commonly in Hostile children and adolescents, as they tend to interpret ambiguous behavior as aggression (Tam Ly, 2010, p.6). It is the most specific to the way and pattern of his attachment in adolescence to various things that can be a target of attachment in the independent, such as the partner or the social group (Hendricks, 1986, p392), while the study of Hatfield and Rapson (1987 and Hatfield & Rapson) showed that children who have an attachment pattern Maternal anxiety tend to develop more emotional attachments later in adolescence and adulthood than their peers who do not suffer from this Anxious (Hatfield & Rapson, 1987, p. 109). The Tam Ly study (2010) provided an important finding between Hostile Attribution Bias and Attachment Style that Affect the Relationship between Attachment Styles and Aggression Anxious Attachment has a positive

relationship with physical and verbal aggression, Avoidant Attachment is negatively correlated with Verbal aggression, and the interaction between Anxious Attachment and Avoidant style is closely related to any form of aggression (Tam Ly, 2010, p.13), and children may learn to attribute hostile intentions from parents and make them desirable and appropriate behavior for them. The intentions of mothers were significantly related to the characteristics of their children's intentions, and were more related to the emergence of relational aggression. When looking at Hostile Attribution Bias for children and adolescents, one must look at Hostile Attribution for parents; Through interaction with them, the individual learns those negative and repetitive coercive interactions through the fathers' use of provocation, physical violence and harsh disciplinary practices that mediate the relationship between the mothers' hostile intentions and the child's behavioral biases; Some may reinforce those behaviors and interpretations that stand behind hostile attitudes, and over time the negative information schematic is integrated into relational social schemas, which include signals and representations with hostile content, that is, the formation of cognitive structures on this direction (Dodge et al., 2006, p806).

The study of (Kurtz, 2018) aimed to identify the relationship between the influence of non-secure attachment on the level of self-attraction, and also aimed to identify the relationships between Anxious Attachment and Avoidant Attachment and the common attractiveness between new people among adults aged (18-22) years old, male And females, as the participants were asked to talk and share their stories and feelings of attraction towards their new partner, and the results showed that there is no relationship between Anxious Attachment and feelings of attraction, and Avoidant Attachment for these relationships was moderate, as well as a negative relationship between relationship status and Anxious Attachment. Theoretically, it deals with an important segment of society represented by adolescent students who are the future of society and the basis for its progress and prosperity; It is their responsibility to assume the responsibility of developing the future of the educational process in our society. On the practical level, the

research is important at the level of educational guidance and guidance in how programs work on how to influence adolescents and make them far from the hostile influences that affected the world.

Research Objectives

1. Hostile Attribution Bias for Teen Students
2. The differences in Hostile Attribution Bias are as follows:
    1. Gender (male/female).
    2. Age (14-15) (16-17).
    3. Recognizing the methods of attachment in its four forms among adolescent students (Secure, Avoidant, Anxious, Contradictory).
    4. Differences in the methods of attachment in its four forms among adolescent students according to the following variables:
    1. Gender (male/female),
    2. Age (14-15) (16-17),
    5. Recognize the correlations between Hostile Attribution Bias and Attachment Methods in all its forms.

Research Limits

The current research community is determined by a sample of middle and middle school students in grades (second - third - fourth - and fifth) of both sexes (males, females) in the city of Baghdad - from the Karkh Education Directorate (first, second) and Rusafa (first, second) and for the academic year (2021-2022).

Defining Terminologies

First: Hostile Attribution Bias was defined by:

* Dodge (2006) is Bias in social information processing, which is the tendency to interpret the behavior of others as having aggressive intent, especially when the intent is unknown or unclear, and then individuals misinterpret or understand the behavior of others. This is a key characteristic To encourage aggression against others (Dodge, 2006, p791).

* Bailey & Ostrov (2008) The tendency of individuals to attribute ambiguous intentions to others as ambiguous provocation or their tendency to have hostile biases to attribute malicious intentions. (Bailey&Ostrov, 2008, p.37)

Secondly: Attachment methods were defined by:

* (Ainsworth): A strong emotional bond formed by the individual with the primary caregiver

(mother 'father' a substitute for the mother) that becomes the basis for his future relationships that arise in early childhood and extend into adulthood, and affect his close relationships with others. (Ainsworth, 1978, p.67)

* (Hazan) sees it as the first system on the basis of which the child's first real connection with the primary caregiver in early childhood is established, which later becomes a vital source of forming his personality and determining his behavior towards others in the future (Hazan, 1988, p. 106).

* (Eleanor & Kiston) They see that attachment is the consistent tendency of an individual to make more real efforts in the search for Secure and Safety (Eleanor & Kiston, 2006, p110).

The Second Topic

First: Hostile Attribution Bias:

Hostile Attribution Bias, is the tendency to interpret the behavior of others as having hostile intent, even when the behavior is unknown or healthy. For example, when a person who exhibits high levels of hostile attribution bias sees two people laughing, he will interpret this behavior as laughing at him, since the behavior is anonymous and possibly well-intentioned (Dodge, 1986, p162). In addition, hostile attribution bias is assumed to be an important pathway and risk factor such as peer refusal or harsh parenting behavior, all the way to aggression. Also, boys exposed to peer bullying at school or abused at home are more likely to develop high levels of Bias Hostile Attribution, which leads to them behaving violently at school or at home. To interfere with and prevent hostile behaviors (Dodge, 2006, p791).

Dodge (1994) developed the so-called social information processing phenomenon, which is the mechanism that explains the sources of aggression in children and shows the strategies that occur in the brain before taking a direct reaction, so the individual differences in SIP are the basis in the growth and development in general, including Hostile behavior (Combs&Ronto,2008, p 1). This model provided an explanation for social adaptation in children as well as an explanation of the hostile side of socially incompatible situations. It also measures abnormal behaviors as maladaptive behaviors through the child's life and future. This model runs according to a linear pattern within

successive and successive automatic processes that occur cumulatively (Dowling, 2014, p11). During the story of a child who feels angry at his peers, the situation data is preserved, which is that colleagues make fun of him in the first stage. As for the second stage, the interpretation of these data is that he was angry at his colleagues' ridicule, and this means that they intend to harm him. As for the third stage, the child thinks about responding, as if He thinks about expressing his dissatisfaction with them in this situation. As for the fourth stage, he also thinks about response options, such as taking a violent reaction towards them, or he can convince them that this behavior of them is not acceptable. As for the fifth stage, he collects his thinking in a specific response, such as hitting the one who mocked him. The first stage is the most important stage of the model. Any error in it will result in errors in the following stages, and the hostile behavior that he will think about is the result of his understanding that what happened represents an aggression against him (Combs & Ronto, 2008, P 12-13).

Second: Attachment Methods:

The ability to form reciprocal social relationships with others is one of the dominant manifestations of people's strong desire to be close to other individuals who have a particular place. This behavioral pattern is often called "Attachment" (Pary, 2006, p180). Its goal is to adapt the individual through the matching between the search for safety and his needs to explore the world with its risks and pressures, and the word "attachment" in itself refers to the relationship between two people, each of whom is willing to do a set of things to continue this relationship between them (Alexis, Unrau & Morry, 2019) Attachment is defined as a strong emotional bond that leads to a child feeling happy, joyful and secure when he is close to the caregivers, and a feeling of tension and annoyance when he is temporarily separated from him, and this is consistent with what Answorth & Bowlby (1991) said, when they defined Attachment as an emotional bond It is a strong bond that the child forms with the primary caregiver, and later becomes the basis for future love relationships (Al-Hudaibi and Al-Dawash, 2020, p. 433). The attachment does not develop suddenly, but rather consists of a series

of second steps It begins to appear between the month (7-9) of the child's life by forming mental images of those around him and then continues throughout his life in his relationship and his future life. (Be Jamin & Virgink, 2005, p326). Scholars have divided Attachment into two parts according to the nature of the pattern of communication and the extent to which the individual possesses mental health together, which are: (Secure Attachment and Non-Secure Attachment). It helps the individual to achieve adaptation, which enables individuals to establish healthy relationships away from psychological problems. Attachment is a pattern in which the individual may find it difficult to have good relations with others, and with the inability to gain a sense of confidence in oneself and others. These children are likely They are slow to adapt, shy, or irritable during conflicts with their parents and are likely to receive less approval or encouragement from parents, which may make children feel inadequate or guilty. However, the children's mood or other effects can be mitigated if adjusted Parents have their own caring behaviors to better match the child's needs (Al-Bakour, 2021, p. 220).

The Third Topic
Community of the Research

The current research community includes adolescents from grades (second, third (intermediate), fourth, and fifth) preparatory morning studies for the academic year 2021-2022, and their number is (426769) male and female students distributed by branch and gender to (254031) male and female students of middle school At the rate of (130136) male students and (123895) female students, as for the preparatory school, it includes (172738) male and female students (85553) male male and (87185) female student, distributed among (391) secondary and preparatory schools, with (294) secondary and preparatory schools for males, and (335) secondary and preparatory schools for females and (46) mixed secondary and preparatory schools, within the governorate of Baghdad (Karkh / Rusafa) and their ages range from (15, 14) (16, 17) Table 1 illustrates this.

Table 1: Community of the Research

Total	Junior School				Middle School				Governorate	
	5th		4th		3rd		2nd			
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males		
67390	5127	4624	8698	10395	8945	10358	8921	10322	Karkh first	**Baghdad**
106957	8059	5842	15617	15438	16006	16984	14770	14241	Second Karkh	
97121	6961	5552	12937	13587	13702	14613	14970	14799	Rusafa first	
155301	9865	8395	19921	21720	22434	23320	24147	25499	Rusafa second	
426769	20012	24413	57173	61140	61087	65275	62808	64861	Total	

Research Sample [1]

(460) male and female students were chosen, and I chose them using the stratified random method with equal distribution, according to the variable of gender and age. Table 2 illustrates this.

Table 2: Research Sample according to Schools and Directorates

Total	Educational level								School Name	Directorate
	5th		4th		3rd		2nd			
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males		
25		6		6		6		7	Al-Mansour Preparatory School for Boys	**Karkh first**
25	6		6		7		6		Al-Mamoun high school for girls	
25		6		6		7		6	Al-Ghazaliya Preparatory School for Boys	
25	7		6		6		6		Al-Harithiya Preparatory School for Girls	
25		6		7		6		6	Tetouan Preparatory School for Boys	**Second Karkh**
25	6		6		7		6		Al-Amal high school for girls	
25		6		7		6		6	Damascus High School for Boys	
25	6		6		6		7		Republic High School for Girls	
25		6		6		7		6	Al-Ansar Preparatory School for Boys	**Rusafa first**

---

[1] The research community was obtained from the Ministry of Education, Department of Statistics and Planning, Issue No. (8543).

25	6		6		6		7		Al-Rasheed Secondary School for Girls	
25		7		6		6		6	Adhamiya Preparatory School for Boys	
25	7		6		6		6		Adhamiya prep school for girls	
25		6		6		6		7	Okba Bin Nafea Preparatory School for Boys	
25	6		7		6		6		That Al-Sawary Preparatory School for Girls	**Rusafa second**
25		7		6		6		6	Baghdad College Secondary School for Boys	
25	6		7		6		6		Baghdad College High School for Girls	
400	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	**Total**	

Research Tools

For the purpose of achieving the objectives of the current research, the Hostile Attribution Bias scale and the Attachment Methods scale for adolescents were prepared, and the following is a description of each of them:

Tool 1: Hostile Attribution Bias Scale

Item selection and formulation: For the purpose of preparing the Hostile Attribution Bias scale, the researcher went back to the previous literature related to the topic of the research and used it, most of which had adopted Dodge's Social Information Processing Theory (Dogde, 1986), and the researcher also looked at all previous measures that she could not adopt because Its relevance with the reality and culture of our Iraqi society, and for this the researcher decided to rely on some Items of other standards, which are as follows:

1. The Hostile Attribution Bias Scale by Caccoro et al. (Caccoro, 2009) which consists of eight situational stories that measure Hostile Attribution Bias.

2. Tam Ly's Hostile Attribution Bias Scale (Tam Ly, 2010) This scale consists of (9) situational stories that measure Hostile Attribution Bias.

3. Hostile Attribution Bias by Anna Zdravkovic (Ana Zdravkovic, 2012) This scale consists of (5) attitudinal stories.

4. Presentation of the instrument to the arbitrators:

The researcher presented the Hostile Attribution Bias scale items from (15) situations to psychologists, and their number was (16) arbitrators [2]; This is to check the validity of the

---

[2] Names of the referees:

1- Prof. Ibrahim Murtada Al-Araji – University of Baghdad – College of Arts – Department of Psychology.

2- Prof. Ahmed Latif Jassim – University of Baghdad – College of Arts – Department of Psychology.

3- Prof. Inaam Laftah Musa Al-Hindawi – University of Baghdad – College of Arts – Department of Psychology.

4- Prof. Buthaina Mansour Al-Helou – University of Baghdad – College of Arts – Department of Psychology.

5- Prof. Amal Ismail Ayed – Al-Mustansiriya University – College of Arts – Department of Psychology.

6– Prof. Khalil Ibrahim Rasoul – University of Baghdad – College of Arts – Department of Psychology.

7– Prof. Khadija Haider Nouri – Al–Mustansiriya University – College of Arts – Department of Psychology.

8– Prof. Khaled Jamal Jassim – University of Baghdad – College of Education Ibn Al–Rushd – Department of Educational and Psychological Sciences.

9– Prof. Riyad Azzouz Abbas – Al–Mustansiriya University – College of Arts – Department of Psychology.

10– Prof. Saad Abdel–Zahra – Al–Mustansiriya University – College of Arts – General Psychology.

11– Prof. Suhaila Abdel Reda Askar, Al–Mustansiriya University – College of Education – Department of Psychological and Educational Sciences.

12– Prof. Dr. Ali Odeh Al–Halfi – University of Baghdad – Psychological Research Center.

13– Prof. Dr. Soraya Ali Hussein – University of Baghdad – College of Arts – Department of Psychology.

14– Prof. Dr. Sawsan Abd Ali _ University of Baghdad _ College of Arts _ Department of Psychology.

15– Prof. Dr. Saif Muhammad Radif University of Baghdad – Psychological Research Center – General Psychology.

proposed positions; This was done in a form prepared for the scale items on Appendix (2), and after retrieving the forms from the arbitrators, their opinions were analyzed regarding the validity of each item.

In light of the arbitrators' opinions, the instructions of the scale were approved and corrected, and all the positions of the scale (15) were also approved.

Items Analysis

1. Extreme Groups method

Psychological scales require a calculation of discrimination power; The purpose of this procedure is to exclude items that do not discriminate among respondents, and to keep items that distinguish between individuals, and the discriminatory strength of the item is the extent to which it is able to distinguish between individuals who are distinguished in the trait measured by the scale and individuals who are weak in that trait (Al-Zoba'i et al., 1981, p. 89) .

In order to find the discriminatory power of the items of the Hostile Attribution Bias scale, the researcher applied the scale to the analysis sample Table (2) of (400) male and female students.

- Correct each form and determine the total score for the Hostile Attribution Bias Items.

- A percentage (27%) was chosen from the upper group of (108) forms, which are the forms whose members got the highest degree in answering the information avoidance scale, and (27%) were chosen from the lower group of (108 forms) also a form, which are the forms whose members got the lowest score in the answer on the information avoidance scale.

- Thus, the number of members of the upper and lower extremist groups reached (216) respondents

The arithmetic means and standard deviation of the scores for each of the upper and lower groups were calculated on each item of the avoidance scale.

Internal Consistency Method

16– Prof. Dr. Ali Turki Al–Quraishi – University of Baghdad – College of Arts – Department of Psychology.

The Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to extract the correlation between the score of each Item and the total score of the scale. The results showed that all correlation coefficients are statistically significant at the level of significance (0.05).

Psychometric Characteristics of Hostile Attribution Bias:

First: Validity Indicates

Face Validity

The researcher presented the Hostile Attribution Bias scale to a group of arbitrators, as all the referees' professors' comments were taken, with regard to modifying some Items, as was indicated above on p. (69).

Second: Reliability indicators:

The researcher extracted the stability of the scale by these two methods, as follows:

1. Test-Retest Method:

The researcher applied the Hostile Attribution Bias scale to extract stability in this way on a sample of (40) students (male and female), and after two weeks of the first application of the scale, the researcher applied the scale again and on the same sample, and after using the Person Correlation Cofficient. To identify the nature of the relationship between the degrees of the first and second application, the stability value of the scale (0.80) appeared, which is the degree of stability by re-testing, and it is a good stability coefficient that can be relied upon when compared to the value of the stability coefficient of a study, which amounted to (0.86) in the study of Dodge et al. (Dodge et al., 2006, p 8).

2. Alpha-Cronbach's Coefficient

The researcher verified the stability of the Hostile Attribution Bias scale using the Alpha Cronbach method, depending on the sample data for a college, and the reliability coefficient in this way was (0.71).

secondly. Attachment Methods Scale

 Define and collect the items of the scale:

The researcher adopted a measure of the Attachment methods, which in its psychological and social content is based on the theory of (Ainsworth, 1978), and she, in turn, added to Bowlby's theory of the four Attachment methods, as the theory adopted for the methods of Attachment.

1- Secure Attachment style

2- Avoidance attachment style

3- Anxious Attachment style

4- paradoxical attachment style

❖ **Selecting and Drafting of the Items:**

The researcher formulated the Items that were inspired by the adopted theory, and the researcher also developed the answer alternatives for each Item, which are (always, often, sometimes, never), with weights ranging from (4-1) respectively, and accordingly, the scale has become composed of (32) items in its initial form.

❖ Validity of the scale and its clauses - Presentation of the evidence to the arbitrators:

This scale consists of (32) items that measure attachment methods. The items were selected according to the previous sources. The scale was divided according to methods into four sub-measures, which were: (Secure Attachment_ Avoidant Attachment_ Anxious Attachment_ Contradictory Attachment); These methods can be defined according to the adopted theory (Ainsworth, 1978) as follows:

Secure Attachment Secure attachment style: Individuals of this style are distinguished by their ability to get close to others, to get close to others, to trust and to rely on them. And the Items that represent it (8) Items (1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8).

Avoidant Attachment: Avoidant attachment style: This style is characterized by the feeling of its members of a positive model for the self and a negative model for others, and discomfort when they approach others and others approach them, and they feel distrust towards them. And the Items that represent it (8) Items (9-10-11-12-13-14-15-16).

Anxious Attachment Anxious attachment style: Individuals of this style add a negative character to the self and make others a positive role model because of others' refusal to be close to them despite their desire to be close to others. And the Items that represent it (8) Items (17-18-19-20-21-22-23-24).

Paradoxical attachment style: Individuals of this style feel negatively about themselves and toward others. Individuals in this style are characterized by their feelings of inadequacy along with their belief that others are untrustworthy. Individuals of this style are characterized by having doubts about themselves

and others and avoidance for fear of being deceived or causing harm to them.

❖ **Item Analysis:**

1. Extreme Groups method:

To find the discriminatory power of the paragraphs of the Attachment Methods Scale, the researcher applied the scale to the research sample of (400) respondents, and thus the sample size fulfilled the analysis condition.

• Correct each form and determine the total score for it.

• Arrange the (400) forms in descending order from the highest score to the lowest.

• A percentage of (27%) was chosen from the upper group and (27%) from the lower group, and the number of forms was (108), for each of them, and thus the number of members of the upper and lower extremist groups reached (216) respondents.

The arithmetic means and standard deviation of the scores of each of the upper and lower groups were calculated on each item of the Attachment Methods Scale.

2. Internal Consistency Method:

To achieve this, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to extract the correlation between the scores of each item and the total score of the scale. The results showed that all items are significant; This is because its values are higher than the value of the Pearson tabular coefficient of (0.14) at the level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (198).

❖ **Statistical indicators of the Attachment Methods Scale:**

First: Validity Indicates: To verify the indicators of the validity of the Attachment Methods Scale in two ways, as follows:

1. Face Validity: This type of honesty was achieved in the current scale when the researcher presented the paragraphs of the Attachment Methods scale to a group of arbitrators (*) and its alternatives and how to answer it. She took the notes of all the arbitrators professors, as was indicated before.

2. Construct Validity: Indicators of Construct Validity: The researcher verified this type of validity through two indicators: the discriminatory strength of the paragraphs as shown in Table (11), as well as the relationship

of the paragraph with the total score of the scale as in Table (12).

❖ Reliability indicators: After defining the Attachment Methods scale, the researcher extracted the reliability of the scale in two ways, according to the following:

1. Test-Retest Method:

The researcher applied the Attachment Methods Scale to extract stability in this way on a sample of (40) students (males and females), and two weeks after the first application of the list, the researcher re-applied the scale again and on the same sample, and after using the Person Correlation Coefficient. To identify the nature of the relationship between the first and second application degrees, the stability value of the Secure Attachment scale (0.89), the stability value of the Avoidant Attachment method (0.83), the stability value of the Anxious Attachment method (0.84) and the stability value of the Contradictory Attachment method, which is (0.79), the degree of stability by the re-method. The test is a good stability coefficient.

2. Alpha-Cronbach coefficient:

The researcher verified the stability of the Attachment Methods Scale by Alpha Cronbach's method. Based on the data of the total sample, the reliability coefficient was reached in this way

The final application of the two scales: After verifying the validity and reliability of the Hostile Attribution Bias scale and Attachment methods, the two scales were applied to a sample of (400) adolescent male and female students from the (second, third) intermediate and (fourth, and fifth) preparatory classes, at a rate of (200) A female student and (200) students, then the data were analyzed by adopting the appropriate statistical means and in light of the research objectives. (1).

The Fourth Topic
Presentation, discussion and interpretation of results

Objective (1): To measure Hostile Attribution Bias among a sample of adolescents

The Hostile Attribution Bias scale was applied to the children of the research sample of (400) individuals, and the results showed that their average score on the scale amounted to (28.44) degrees, with a standard deviation of (4.80) degrees.) degree, and using the t-test for one

sample, it was found that the difference was statistically significant and in favor of the hypothetical mean, as the calculated t-value was higher than the tabular t-value of (1.96) with a degree of freedom (399) and a level of significance (0.05), which means that There is a statistically significant difference between the arithmetic mean and the hypothetical mean in favor of the hypothetical mean, and it means that the students have a low degree of biased aggressive attribution, Table 3 illustrates this.

Table 3. T-test for the difference between sample mean and hypothetical mean Hostile Attribution Bias

Sample	Arithmetic mean	standard deviation	hypothetical mean	Calculated T-value	Tabular T-value	degree of freedom	Significance
400	28.44	4.80	30	6.50	1.96	399	Significant

The interpretation of this result is according to the approved theory that adolescents are able to infer ambiguous behavior in the tendency to attribute benign intent to hostile intent, which is a function of the hostile or non-hostile schemas stored in memory. Under special circumstances, some adolescents continue to develop an unbiased pattern that includes inclination and lack of blame, and they show aggression and reaction to others, which leads to benign behavioral outcomes for themselves.

The researcher believes that the sample may not be free from the hostile behavior sometimes. Because the behavior is innate in humans and appears early, and children develop the ability to infer hostile intent from ambiguous provocations by others, that is, after a negative event, children take causal cases based on their awareness of the event. Attribution results in judgments that lead to emotion, anger and aggression. Adolescents are the most emotional component of the segments of society. They are constantly exposed to negative events. These events may affect your behavior, which appears in the form of aggressive anti-social behavior.

Objective (2): To identify the differences in Hostile Attribution Bias among the research sample according to the variables of gender and age

To achieve this goal, a two-way analysis of variance was extracted, to identify the significance of the differences in Hostile Attribution Bias among the research sample according to the variables of gender and age, and the table (4, 5) illustrates this:

Table 4. Arithmetic means and standard deviations of Hostile Attribution Bias according to the variables of gender and age

Variables	Number	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
Male 15-14	100	29.02	4.66
Male 17-16	100	30.18	4.72
Male	200	29.60	4.71
Female 15-14	100	27.25	4.58
Female 17-16	100	27.31	4.68
Female	200	27.28	4.62
14-15	200	28.14	4.69
16-17	200	28.75	4.90
Total	400	28.44	4.80

Table 5. Results of the two-way analysis of variance to reveal the significance of differences in Hostile Attribution Bias among the research sample according to the variables of gender and age

Source of Variation	Subtotal of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Means of Squares	F Value	Significance
Sex	538.24	1	538.24	24.79	Significant

Age	37.21	1	37.21	1.71	Unsignificant
Sex X Age	30.25	1	30.25	1.39	Unsignificant
Error	8596.860	396	21.709	----	----
Total	332736	400	----	----	----

It appears from the table that:

1- There is a statistically significant difference in Hostile Attribution Bias according to the gender variable and in favor of males, as the calculated t-value reached (24.79) which is higher than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396).

The above result, whose results showed that there are statistically significant differences among adolescent students according to gender and in favor of males, they are more aggressive than females, due to biological and cultural reasons, as aggression is linked to levels of the male hormone (testosterone); That is, the level of the activity of the sex hormone may help determine the intensity of the hostile behavior, while cultural factors are due to social times and prevailing beliefs that males should be more aggressive than females, as female aggression is an inappropriate response and they feel remorse and anxious, which leads to the inhibition of cognitive processes of hostile behavior The two also differ in estimating the negative consequences of physical and moral aggression as well.

2- There is no statistically significant difference in Hostile Attribution Bias according to the age variable, as the calculated t-value reached (1.71) which is less than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396).

As for age, there are no differences between the sexes, that is, the hostile biased behavior works the same mechanism at all ages, and there are no differences between the ages mentioned.

3- There is no significant interaction between the variables (gender and age); The calculated value reached (1.39), which is less than the tabular value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05), and the degree of freedom (1-396). This means that there are other factors that the current research did not take into account. The cultural level may be the characteristics of the personality and so on.

Objective (3): To measure patterns of attachment among a sample of adolescents

Attachment patterns scales were applied to the children of the research sample of (400) individuals, and by using the t-test for one sample, it was found that the difference is statistically significant and in favor of the arithmetic mean of the children's answers on the (Secure Attachment and Avoidant) scales and in favor of the hypothetical average on the (Anxious) scale Attachment), as the t-values calculated for these comparisons were higher than the tabular t-value of (1.96) with a degree of freedom (399) and a level of significance (0.05), and Table (6) shows this.

Table 6. T-test for the difference between the sample mean and the hypothetical mean. Attachment Pattern Scales

Scale	Arithmetic mean	standard deviation	hypothetical mean	Calculated T-value	Tabular T-value	Degree of Freedom	Sig
Secure Attachment	22.96	4.08	20	14.52	1.96	399	Significant
Avoidant Attachment	22.78	3.69	20	15.07	1.96	399	Significant
Anxious Attachment	19.56	4.20	20	2.10-	1.96	399	Unsignificant
Contradictory Attachment	19.98	4.79	20	0.09-	1.96	399	Unsignificant

The result of Table 6. indicates that the research sample had Secure Attachment and Avoidant at a high level, and Anxious Attachment and Contradictory at a low level. The research sample uses two patterns of Attachment, the avoidant attachment pattern comes in the first place, and the second place is the pattern related to Secure, and that the emergence of the pattern related to Secure in the second place behind Avoidant Attachment is due to the nature of Iraqi and Arab society in particular and the great interest of the family and mother in particular with the child, which continues without Interruption and remain interconnected relations unlike Western society. Bowlby and Mary Unsworth see that secure attachments in adolescence and adulthood are an extension of those attachments that occurred in childhood, and the result also showed that there is a statistical significance of non-secure avoidant attachment among adolescents, and this is consistent with Bowlby and Unsworth theory, which indicated that fear is the main obstacle to normal attachment. With others, if the individual lives in an emotionally depressed environment as a result of pain, turmoil and inconsistency in the environment, they face great difficulties in establishing relationships.

Objective (4): To identify the differences in attachment patterns among the research sample according to the variables of gender and age

A two-way analysis of variance was extracted to identify the significance of the differences in each subscale of the Attachment patterns according to the variables of gender and age and the interaction between them, as follows:

1- Recognizing the differences in Secure Attachment according to the variables of gender and age, and the tables (7, 8) explain this:

Table 8. Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the Secure Attachment Scale according to the variables of sex and age

Variables	Number	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
Male 15-14	100	23.58	3.61
Male 17-16	100	22.65	3.84
Male	200	23.12	3.75
Female 15-14	100	23.43	4.46
Female 17-16	100	22.18	4.24
Female	200	22.81	4.38
14-15	200	23.51	4.05
16-17	200	22.42	4.04
Total	400	22.96	4.08

Table 8. Results of the two-way analysis of variance to reveal the significance of the differences in Secure Attachment among the research sample according to the variables of sex and age

Source of Variation	Subtotal of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Means of Squares	F Value	Significance
Sex	9.61	1	9.61	0.586	Unsignificant
Age	118.81	1	118.81	7.24	Significant
Sex X Age	2.56	1	2.56	0.156	Unsignificant
Error	6498.38	396	16.41	----	----
Total	217494	400	----	----	----

The results of Table 8 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in Secure Attachment according to the gender variable, as the calculated t-value was (0.586), which is less than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1 -396). The above results did not show any statistically significant differences among adolescents according to the gender variable; Because we are subject to the same method of socialization, specifically eastern societies. The mother offers great affection to the children, with some differences between

them. The methods of socialization among adolescents are similar.

There is a statistically significant difference in Secure Attachment according to the variable of age and in favor of age (14-15), as the calculated t-value reached (7.24) which is higher than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396). In addition, there are statistically significant differences between the sexes according to the age variable and in favor of the younger group (14-15), and here the ages of adolescents (males and females) may be somewhat small and they are still closely related to their parents because of fear, avoidance of

difficulties, dependence on others and lack of adventure and little challenge.

Also, there is no significant interaction between the variables (gender and age); The calculated value of the value reached (0.156), which is less than the tabular value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396), and this means that there are other variables H that are not included in the current research that affect the phenomenon.

2- Identifying the differences in Avoidant Attachment according to the variables of sex and age by extracting the two-way analysis of variance and the tables (9, 10) explaining that:

Table 9. Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the Avoidant Attachment Scale according to the variables of sex and age

Variables	Number	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
Male 15-14	100	21.77	3.63
Male 17-16	100	23.13	3.71
Male	200	22.45	3.73
Female 15-14	100	23.02	3.37
Female 17-16	100	23.19	3.88
Female	200	23.11	3.62
14-15	200	22.40	3.55
16-17	200	23.16	3.79
Total	400	22.78	3.69

Table 10. Results of the two-way analysis of variance to reveal the significance of the differences in Avoidant Attachment among the research sample according to the variables of sex and age

Source of Variation	Subtotal of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Means of Squares	F Value	Significance
Sex	42.90	1	42.90	3.215	Unsignificant
Age	58.52	1	58.52	4.386	Significant
Sex X Age	35.40	1	35.40	2.653	Unsignificant
Error	5284.37	396	13.34	----	----
Total	212947	400	----	----	----

Where the results of Table 9 indicate the following: There is no statistically significant difference in Avoidant Attachment according to the gender variable, as the calculated t-value was (3.215), which is less than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396). The above result indicates that there are no differences between males and females in the Avoidant Attachment pattern, because males and females are from the same environment and socialization and have the same social expectations system. There is a

statistically significant difference in Avoidant Attachment according to the variable of age and in favor of age (16-17), as the calculated t-value reached (4.386), which is higher than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396).

The above result also indicates that there are differences between the sexes according to the age variable and in favor of the older group (16-17), and this means that the group at the age of (16-17) is more attached and avoidant than the youngest; They tend to isolate and separate due to distrust

that leads to a lack of social interaction between them because of their positive view of themselves and their negative view of others, which causes them to be separated from others or to a lack of social relations. The calculated t value reached (2.653), which is less than the tabular maximal value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396).

3- Identifying the differences in Anxious Attachment according to the variables of gender and age by extracting the two-way analysis of variance, and the tables (11, 12) explain this:

Table 11. Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the Anxious Attachment Scale according to the variables of sex and age

Variables	Number	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
Male 15-14	100	19.40	4.18
Male 17-16	100	20.25	3.81
Male	200	19.83	4.01
Female 15-14	100	19.59	4.55
Female 17-16	100	19.00	4.18
Female	200	19.30	4.37
14-15	200	19.50	4.36
16-17	200	19.63	4.03
Total	400	19.56	4.20

Table 12. Results of the two-way analysis of variance to reveal the significance of the differences in Anxious Attachment among the research sample according to the variables of sex and age

Source of Variation	Subtotal of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Means of Squares	F Value	Significance
Sex	28.09	1	28.09	1.60	Unsignificant
Age	1.69	1	1.69	0.096	Unsignificant
Sex X Age	51.84	1	51.84	2.957	Unsignificant
Error	6942.94	396	17.53	----	----
Total	160062	400	----	----	----

The results of Table 11. indicate the following: There is no statistically significant difference in the Anxious Attachment according to the gender variable, as the calculated t value reached (1.60), which is less than the tabular maximal value of (3.84) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396). There is no statistically significant difference in the Anxious Attachment according to the age variable, as the calculated t-value was (0.096), which is less than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396). There is no significant interaction between the variables (gender and age); The calculated t-value was (2.957), which is less than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396).

The above results did not show any statistically significant differences according to the variables of sex, age, and interactions between the sexes, and this leads us to the fact that there are no differences among adolescents in the pattern of Anxious attachment, depending on the nature of the response to the circumstances in which the stressed people are, which led to no differences between adolescent students in the pattern of anxious attachment. Anxious Attachment.

4- Recognizing the differences in Contradictory Attachment according to the variables of gender and age by extracting the two-way analysis of variance, and the tables (13, 14) explain this:

Table 13. Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the Contradictory Attachment Scale according to the variables of sex and age

Variables	Number	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
Male 15-14	100	20.11	4.84
Male 17-16	100	21.22	4.26

Male	200	20.67	4.58
Female 15-14	100	19.52	5.06
Female 17-16	100	19.06	4.77
Female	200	19.29	4.91
14-15	200	19.82	4.95
16-17	200	20.14	4.64
Total	400	19.98	4.79

Table 14. Results of the two-way analysis of variance to reveal the significance of differences in Contradictory Attachment among the research sample according to the variables of sex and age

Source of Variation	Subtotal of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Means of Squares	F Value	Significance
Sex	189.06	1	189.06	8.415	Significant
Age	10.56	1	10.56	0.47	Unsignificant
Sex X Age	61.62	1	61.62	2.74	Unsignificant
Error	8897.55	396	22.469	----	----
Total	168799	400	----	----	----

The results of Table 13. indicate the following: There is a statistically significant difference in the Contradictory Attachment according to the gender variable and in favor of males, as the calculated t value reached (8.415), which is higher than the tabular value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of Freedom (1-396). Through the above results, it is clear to us that there are statistically significant differences for the Contradictory Attachment pattern according to the sex variable and in favor of males over females; This is consistent with the findings of Mary Ainsworth's study (Ainsworth, 1978), which showed that the male sex variable has a higher paradoxical attachment than the female. It requires the man to take courage and urge to work, to respond to aggression, and to face difficult matters himself. There is no statistically significant difference in Contradictory Attachment according to the age variable, as the calculated t value was (0.47), which is less than the tabular t value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396). There is no significant interaction between the variables (gender and age); The calculated t-value was (2.74) which is less than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1-396).

Objective (5): To know the relationship between Hostile Attribution Bias and Attachment Patterns in a sample of adolescents

By calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient to calculate the correlation coefficient between the total scores obtained by the sample children on the Hostile Attribution Bias scale and the Attachment patterns, and it was found from the results that there is a statistically significant inverse correlation between Hostile Attribution Bias and the Secure pattern, while there is a direct function relationship Between Hostile Attribution Bias and Attachment patterns (Anxious, and Contradictory), the calculated correlation values for these comparisons were higher compared with the value of the Pearson tabular correlation coefficient of (0.098) at the level (0.05) and degree of freedom (398), and Table (15) illustrates this.

Table 15. Pearson Correlation Coefficient of the Relationship Between Hostile Attribution Bias and Attachment Patterns

Attachment Patterns	Calculated Pearson value	Tabular Pearson value	Calculated T-value	Tabular T-value	degree of freedom	Sig
Secure Attachment	0.10-	0.098	2.01	1.96	398	Significant

Avoidant Attachment	0.05	0.098	0.99	1.96	398	Unsignificant
Anxious Attachment	0.25	0.098	5.15	1.96	398	Significant
Contradictory Attachment	0.23	0.098	4.72	1.96	398	Significant

The correlation coefficient between the Secure Attachment pattern and Hostile Attribution Bias was (-0.10), and after converting the correlation coefficient to the t-table value, it showed that it is a function of degree of freedom (398), and this indicates an inverse relationship between the Secure Attachment pattern and Hostile Attribution Bias, and that Secure Attachment children are the least Feeling of Hostile Attribution Bias compared to other Attachment Styles kids; Because they have a positive view of themselves and others and this helps them to develop their relationship with others and ease of social relations and maintain this relationship and feel safe with friends and this result is consistent with the theory adopted by Insworth (Ainsworth, 1978) which showed that secure children are easy to approach others and trust They feel comfortable in their dependence on others, and they are not anxious about someone approaching them. As for children with a non-secure attachment represented in Avoidant Attachment and its relationship to Hostile Attribution Bias, the correlation coefficient reached (0.05) and after converting the correlation coefficient to the T-value it reached (0.99), which is not statistically significant at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (398), and this Indicates that there is no relationship between Avoidant and Hostile Attribution Bias; This is because children of this style are characterized by having positive internal working models towards self and negative towards others, and their avoidance of relationships with others is a means of self-protection from rejection, so it is natural to obtain this result. As for Anxious Attachment, the correlation coefficient between Anxious Attachment and Hostile Attribution Bias was (0.25). When converting the correlation coefficient to a t-value, it reached (5.15), which is statistically significant at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (398), and this indicates the existence of a direct relationship

between the Anxious pattern and the Hostile Attribution Bias; Because children of this type are distinguished by having negative internal working models towards the self and positive towards others. With regard to Contradictory Attachment, the correlation coefficient between Contradictory Attachment and Hostile Attribution Bias reached (0.23) and when converted to a t-value, it reached (4.72), which is a statistical function when compared with the tabular t-value of (1.96) and the degree of freedom (398), and this indicates the existence of a relationship Contradictory and Hostile Attribution Bias.

Internal Contradictory working models are negative towards the self, as well as towards others. Children are characterized by distrust of others and prefer to be closed; This is a difference between Anxious Attachment and Contradictory Attachment.

The researcher believes that the sample of adolescents with unsecured attachments face difficulties in balancing autonomy and attachment needs, and that avoiding adolescents can cause them to have future problems related to social relationships, adopting aggressive self-biased behaviors, lack of understanding of others' feelings and inability to cooperate. that eventually leads to Hostile Attribution Bias and that hostile attribution is the result of a dismissive reaction that creates vulnerability in the individual and that adolescents with an unsecured attachment style show higher levels of biased aggression than secure children; That is why we found a relationship between Anxious Attachment and Contradictory style with aggression, while those with Avoidant Attachment show aggression but at a low rate, while children with Secure Attachment do not have aggressive behaviors.

Recommendations

1- Attention to raising the family's awareness as it is the first factor in upbringing as it is the first institution that is based on instilling positive

beliefs and qualities that enhance the value of work, academic achievement and self-respect; By holding the counseling side in primary, middle and middle schools, awareness seminars for them

2- The educational media takes its role in explaining the negative effects of aggression, which is a common behavior in society through workshops and dialogues with young people and adolescents.

3- Specialists should prepare educational guidance programs aimed at changing the unsecured attachment patterns of students to safe attachment patterns that can be established in guidance centers, middle schools and middle schools

4- It is necessary to include the middle and secondary teaching curricula for the subject of Psychology; In order to contribute to enhancing students' psychological and educational vocabulary and developing their positive feelings towards others and themselves.

5- The Ministry of Information, in cooperation with the Ministry of Education, should prepare television programs aimed at enlightening parents in creating an environment that helps reduce hostile behavior.

6- Instructing the Ministry of Education to activate sports, art, music and other lessons as a form of emotional venting for students whose ages are between (11-18) years.

Suggestion

1- Conducting a study similar to the current study on different age groups such as children.

2- Conducting a study on Hostile Attribution Bias and its relationship to social intelligence.

3- Conducting a study on Hostile Attribution Bias and adolescent emotions.

4- Conducting a study on Hostile Attribution Bias and the relationship to life satisfaction

5- Conducting a study on the relationship of attachment with emotional sympathy.

6- Conducting a pilot study on the effects of parental violence on Hostile Attribution Bias.

References

1. Al-Bakour, Manar Fahmy (2021). Attachment not secure and its relationship to resistance to temptation, Journal of Education, Issue (191), Part IV

2. Al-Hudaibi, Mustafa Abdel-Mohsen and Al-Dawash, Fouad Mohamed (2020). The causal model of the relationship between early adaptive cognitive schemas, attachment methods, and avoidant personality disorder symptoms among university students, Fayoum University Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, Volume Fourteen - Seventh Edition.

3. Al-Halabi, Sharif Mahrous Al-Sayed. (2014). Factors affecting bias in social perception among administrators working in the Ministry of Education in the Gaza Strip. Master's Thesis, Islamic University of Gaza, College of Commerce.

4. Al-Zoba'i, Abdul-Jalil et al. (1981). Psychological Tests and Measures, Mosul, Dar Al-Kutub Press for Printing and Publishing.

5. Lazarus, Richard (1990) Personal Translated by Syed Muhammad Ghoneim and others, Dar Al-Shorouk, Cairo.

6. Ainsworth , M. D. ; Blehar , M. ; Waters , & Wall , S. (1979) : Patterns of attachment . Hallsdale , NJ : Erlbaum.

7. Ainsworth, M, B. S. Blehar, M. C, Waters, E. & Wall. S. (1978): Patterns of attachment: A Psychological Study of The Strange Situation, Hillsade, NJ: Lawrence Elbanm.

8. Alexis, M, Unrau, M, Morry, M.(2019). The Subclnical psychopath in love: Mediating Effects of Attachment Styles. Journal of Social and personal Relationships.36,(2), 421-449.

9. Bailey, C. A., & Ostrov, J. M. (2008). Differentiating forms and functions of aggression in emerging adults: Associations with hostile attribution biases and normative beliefs. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 37, 713-722.

10. Cripps, K., & Zyromski, B. (2009). Adolescents' psychological well-being and perceived parental involvement: Implications for parental involvement in middle schools. RMLE Online, 33(4), 1-13

11. De Castro, B.O. (2010): Rage, Revenge, and Precious Pride: Emotions in Information Processing by Children with Aggressive Behavior Problems. In W.F. Arsenio and

E.A. Lemerise (Eds.), Emotions, Aggression and Morality in Children: Bridging Development and Psychopathology (pp 53-74).Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

12. Dodge, K. A. (1986). A social information processing model of social competence in children. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), The Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology: Vol. 18. Cognitive perspectives on children's social and behavioral development (pp. 77-125). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

13. Dodge, K. A. (2006). Translational science in action: Hostile attributional style and the development of aggressive behavior problems. Development and Psychopathology. https//dio.org//10.1017/so954579406060391.

14. Dodge, K. A.(2006). Translationnal science in action: Hostile attributional style and the development of aggressive behavior problem. Developmentand psychopathology, 18(3), 791-814.

15. Dodge, K. A., Lochman , J, E., Harnish, J.D., Bates, J.E., & Pettit, G.S. (1997)Reactive and proactive aggression in school children and psychiatrically impaired chronically assaultive youth.journal of Abnormal psychology. 106(1)37.

16. Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., McClaskey, C. L., Brown, M. M., & Gottman, J. M. (1986): Social Competence in Children. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 51(2), i-85.

17. Dodge.Kenneth (2006) ‹Translational science in action : Hostile attributional style and the development of aggressive behavior problems ‹Dev Psychopathol . 2006 ; 18 (3) : 791-814 ‹Duke University .

18. F. Coccaro, Kurtis L.Noblett, Michael S. McCLoskey(2009). Attributional and emotional responses to socially ambiguous cues : Validation of a new assessment of social / emotional information processing in healthy adults and impulsive aggressive patients . journal of psychiatric Research 43 (2009).

19. Feeney J.A ,N & Noller(1990):Attachment Styles as Predictor of Adult Romantic Relationship,.Journal of Personality Social Psychology ,Vol.58, PP.281-291.

20. Hatfield, E. (1984): The Dangers of Intimacy, In V. J. Derlega (Et.), communication, Intimacy and Close Relationships, New York: Academic.

21. Hendrick, C. & Hendrick s. (1986): A Theory and Method of Love, Joumal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50.

22. Mikulincer, M. & Arad, D. (1999) . Attachment working models and cognitive openness in close relationships : A test of chronic and temporary accessibility effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Vol. 77.

23. Nelson DA, Mitchell C, & Yang C (2008). Intent attributions and aggression: A study of children and their parents. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 36, 793–806.

24. Steinbock, Bonnie. (1978). Speciesism and the idea of Equality, Philosophy .(Vol. 53. No.20)

25. Yogesh Hole et al 2019 J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 1362 012121