

ORIGINAL ATTACHMENT THREE-CATEGORY MEASURE

Reference:

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

Description of Measure:

This is the first measure of adult attachment. It is a 3-item questionnaire designed to measure one's attachment style.

The three attachment styles are (paraphrased from Hazan & Shaver, 1987):

Avoidant- Characterized as being afraid of intimacy, experiencing emotional highs and lows during relationships, along with much jealousy.

Anxious/Ambivalent- View love in an obsessive way, with strong need for constant reciprocation and validation, along with emotional highs and lows, and feelings of jealousy and strong sexual attraction.

Secure- Describe their romantic relationships as friendly, trusting, and happy. They accept their partners regardless of faults. They tend to have long and fulfilling relationships.

For more information on adult attachment, visit this website:

<http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/labs/Shaver/measures.htm>

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Bartholomew, K., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Methods of assessing adult attachment: Do they converge? In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 25–45). New York: Guilford Press.

In recent years, several streams of research have emerged from Bowlby's (1988) and Ainsworth's (1982) attachment theory. Originally, the theory was aimed at explaining child and adult psychopathology in terms of nonoptimal relationships between children and their caregivers, or "attachment figures." According to attachment theory, the long-term effects of early experiences with caregivers are due to the persistence of "internal working models" -- cognitive / affective schemas, or representations, of the self in relation to close relationship partners (Bartholomew, 1990; Shaver, Collins, & Clark, 1996). Theoretically, these representations influence a person's expectations, emotions, defenses, and relational behavior in all close relationships. Although the theory does not assume or require that internal working models persist without change across the life span, both theory and empirical evidence from longitudinal studies have led researchers to suspect that the effects of childhood attachment relationships extend into adulthood, where they can be seen in the domains of parenting and close peer relationships, including romantic relationships (e.g., Bartholomew, 1990, 1993; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985; Shaver, Hazan, & Bradshaw, 1988; Weiss, 1982).



Crowell, J., & Treboux, D. (1995). A review of adult attachment measures: Implications for theory and research. *Social Development, 4*, 294-327.

There has been increasing interest in adult attachment from both theoretical and empirical perspectives. Because the test of a theory is based on our ability to assess theoretical constructs, the review is organized around assessment techniques. Delineating the content, focus, assumptions, and correlates of different attachment measures highlights central issues and problems in conducting research in adult attachment. In this review, we present theoretical issues related to adult attachment, in particular, individual differences, working models, and the role of attachment in adult life. A summary of the measures commonly used in the study of adult attachment follows. The literature review is organized by measure, examining topics such as relations between childhood experiences and adult attachment status, and adult attachment and adult personality and functioning, parenting and partnership behavior. Studies which explore relations between measures are discussed before concluding with thoughts about future directions.

Feeney, J. A. (1994). Attachment style, communication patterns and satisfaction across the life cycle of marriage. *Personal Relationships, 1*, 333-348.

Questionnaire measures of attachment, communication patterns, and relationship satisfaction were administered to 361 married couples, sampled across the life cycle of marriage. Individuals who were secure in attachment (defined in terms of comfort with closeness and low anxiety over relationships) tended to be paired with secure spouses. Security of attachment was associated with one's own relationship satisfaction, although husbands' satisfaction was related primarily to the anxiety dimension. The most consistent effect of partners' attachment was an inverse relationship between wives' anxiety and husbands' satisfaction. The negative effect of wives' anxiety on perceived relationship satisfaction (for both partners) was evident primarily for couples in which husbands were uncomfortable with closeness. The association between attachment dimensions and relationship satisfaction was largely mediated by communication patterns for wives, but only partially mediated by communication patterns for husbands; for both husbands and wives, a measure of mutually constructive communication emerged as the strongest correlate of satisfaction. These findings were generally consistent across the life cycle of marriage, and they are important in clarifying the nature of the link between attachment and satisfaction in a broad sample.

Scale:

These questions are concerned with your experiences in romantic love relationships. Take a moment to think about these experiences and answer the following questions with them in mind.

Read each of the three self-descriptions below (A, B, and C) and then place a checkmark next to the single alternative that best describes how you feel in romantic relationships or is nearest to the way you feel. (Note: The terms "close" and "intimate" refer to psychological or emotional closeness, not necessarily to sexual intimacy.)

_____ A. I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others; I find it difficult to trust them completely, difficult to allow myself to depend on them. I am nervous when anyone gets too close, and often, others want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being.

_____ B. I find it relatively easy to get close to others and am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close to me.

_____ C. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me or won't want to stay with me. I want to get very close to my partner, and this sometimes scares people away.



THE RELATIONSHIPS QUESTIONNAIRE (RQ)

Reference:

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.

Description of Measure:

This is a 4-item questionnaire designed to measure adult attachment style. The RQ extends the original attachment Three-Category Measure (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) by rewording the descriptions of each of the attachment styles, and by adding a fourth style—dismissing-avoidant.

Dismissing-avoidant people are characterized as avoiding intimacy, being highly self-reliant and independent. (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

For more information on adult attachment, visit this website:

<http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/labs/Shaver/measures.htm>

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Scharfe, E., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Reliability and stability of adult attachment patterns. *Personal Relationships*, 1, 23-43.

A basic premise of attachment theory is that internal models of attachment remain relatively stable across the life span. We examined stability and change in adult attachment representations over 8 months in a sample of young adults (N = 144; Mean age = 24.5 years). Attachment patterns were assessed by categorical and continuous ratings across three methods—self-report ratings, expert ratings based on semi-structured interviews, and reports of romantic partners—and showed moderate stability. Interview ratings tended to show higher stability than self-report ratings. Changes in attachment ratings (across methods) were not consistently related to life events that had occurred in the intervening 8 months. The relationship between reliability and stability was discussed, and where the "true" stability could be estimated independent of unreliability, it was found to be very high (*r*'s ranging from .72 to .96). The results highlight the importance of using multiple indicators in assessing adult attachment and using continuous rather than categorical ratings in the assessment of stability.

Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of General Psychology*.

The authors review the theory of romantic, or pair-bond, attachment as it was originally formulated by C. Hazan and P. R. Shaver in 1987 and describe how it has evolved over more than a decade. In addition, they discuss 5 issues related to the theory that need further clarification: (a) the nature of attachment relationships, (b) the evolution and function of attachment in adulthood, (c) models of individual differences in attachment, (d) continuity and change in attachment security, and (e) the integration of attachment, sex, and caregiving. In discussing these issues, they provide leads for future research and outline a more complete theory of romantic attachment.



Bartholomew, K., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Methods of assessing adult attachment: Do they converge? In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 25–45). New York: Guilford Press.

In recent years, several streams of research have emerged from Bowlby's (1988) and Ainsworth's (1982) attachment theory. Originally, the theory was aimed at explaining child and adult psychopathology in terms of nonoptimal relationships between children and their caregivers, or "attachment figures." According to attachment theory, the long-term effects of early experiences with caregivers are due to the persistence of "internal working models" -- cognitive / affective schemas, or representations, of the self in relation to close relationship partners (Bartholomew, 1990; Shaver, Collins, & Clark, 1996). Theoretically, these representations influence a person's expectations, emotions, defenses, and relational behavior in all close relationships. Although the theory does not assume or require that internal working models persist without change across the life span, both theory and empirical evidence from longitudinal studies have led researchers to suspect that the effects of childhood attachment relationships extend into adulthood, where they can be seen in the domains of parenting and close peer relationships, including romantic relationships (e.g., Bartholomew, 1990, 1993; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985; Shaver, Hazan, & Bradshaw, 1988; Weiss, 1982).

Scale:

Following are four general relationship styles that people often report. Place a checkmark next to the letter corresponding to the style that best describes you or is closest to the way you are.

____ A. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

____ B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.

____ C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.

____ D. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

Now please rate each of the relationship styles above to indicate how well or poorly each description corresponds to your general relationship style.

Style A

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style B

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style C

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style D

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

THE EXPERIENCES IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS-REVISED (ECR-R) QUESTIONNAIRE

Reference:

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

Description of Measure:

A 36-item measure of adult attachment style. The ECR-R measures individuals on two subscales of attachment: Avoidance and Anxiety. In general Avoidant individuals find discomfort with intimacy and seek independence, whereas Anxious individuals tend to fear rejection and abandonment.

For more information on adult attachment, visit these websites:

<http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/labs/Shaver/measures.htm>

<http://www.psych.uiuc.edu/~rcfraley/measures/ecritems.htm>

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of General Psychology*.

The authors review the theory of romantic, or pair-bond, attachment as it was originally formulated by C. Hazan and P. R. Shaver in 1987 and describe how it has evolved over more than a decade. In addition, they discuss 5 issues related to the theory that need further clarification: (a) the nature of attachment relationships, (b) the evolution and function of attachment in adulthood, (c) models of individual differences in attachment, (d) continuity and change in attachment security, and (e) the integration of attachment, sex, and caregiving. In discussing these issues, they provide leads for future research and outline a more complete theory of romantic attachment.

Fraley, R. C. (2002). Attachment stability from infancy to adulthood: Meta-analysis and dynamic modeling of development mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 123-151.

A central tenet of attachment theory is that a person's attachment pattern in adulthood is a reflection of his or her attachment history—beginning with the person's earliest attachment relationships. However, the precise way in which early representations might shape adult attachment patterns is ambiguous, and different perspectives on this issue have evolved in the literature. According to the prototype perspective, representations of early experiences are retained over time and continue to play an influential role in attachment behavior throughout the life course. In contrast, the revisionist perspective holds that early representations are subject to modification on the basis of new experiences and therefore may or may not reflect patterns of attachment later in life. In this article, I explore and test mathematical models of each of these theoretical processes on the basis of longitudinal data obtained from meta-analysis. Results indicate that attachment security is moderately stable across the first 19 years of life and that patterns of stability are best accounted for by prototype dynamics.

Shiota, M.N., Keltner, D., & John, O. P. (2006). Positive emotion dispositions differentially associated with Big Five personality and attachment style. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 1*, 61-71.

Although theorists have proposed the existence of multiple distinct varieties of positive emotion, dispositional positive affect is typically treated as a unidimensional variable in personality research. We present data elaborating conceptual and empirical differences among seven positive emotion dispositions in their relationships with two core personality constructs, the “Big Five” and adult attachment style. We found that the positive emotion dispositions were differentially associated with self- and peer-rated Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Neuroticism. We also found that different adult attachment styles were associated with different kinds of emotional rewards. Findings support the theoretical utility of differentiating among several dispositional positive emotion constructs in personality research.

Scale:

The statements below concern how you feel in emotionally intimate relationships. We are interested in how you *generally* experience relationships, not just in what is happening in a current relationship. Respond to each statement by circling a number to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

	QUESTION	1=Strongly Disagree.....7=Strong Agree						
1.	I'm afraid that I will lose my partner's love.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	I worry a lot about my relationships.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	I rarely worry about my partner leaving me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	My romantic partner makes me doubt myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	I do not often worry about being abandoned.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	I worry that I won't measure up to other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	with my partner.							
21.	I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27.	It's not difficult for me to get close to my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	I tell my partner just about everything.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31.	I talk things over with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32.	I am nervous when partners get too close to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33.	I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34.	I find it easy to depend on romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35.	It's easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36.	My partner really understands me and my needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scoring:

(adapted from <http://www.psych.uiuc.edu/~rcfraley/asures/ecrritems.htm>):

Scoring Information: The first 18 items above comprise the attachment-related anxiety scale. Items 19 – 36 comprise the attachment-related avoidance scale. *In real research, the order in which these items are presented should be randomized.* To obtain a score for attachment-related *anxiety*, please average a person's responses to items 1 – 18. However, because items 9 and 11 are “reverse keyed” (i.e., high numbers represent low anxiety rather than high anxiety), you'll need to reverse the answers to those questions before averaging the responses. (If someone answers with a “6” to item 9, you'll need to re-key it as a 2 before averaging.) To obtain a score for attachment-related *avoidance*, please average a person's responses to items 19 – 36. Items 20, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, and 36 will need to be reverse keyed before you compute this average.