

A Spanish version of the Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) adult attachment questionnaire

ITZIAR ALONSO-ARBIOL,^a NEKANE BALLUERKA,^a AND
PHILLIP R. SHAVER^b

^a*University of the Basque Country, Spain* and ^b*University of California, Davis*

Abstract

A Spanish adaptation of the Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) measure of the 2 dimensions of adult attachment (K. A. Brennan, C. L. Clark, & P. R. Shaver, 1998) was created using a back-translation procedure. Called the ECR-S, the new scale displays the same 2-factor structure as the English-language ECR in both university and community samples and is reliable in both the internal consistency and the temporal stability senses. In a sample of married and cohabiting couples, the 2 subscales of the ECR-S, anxiety and avoidance, are orthogonal and correlate with other theoretically appropriate variables (scores on K. Bartholomew and L. M. Horowitz's, 1991, measure of adult attachment style, relationship status, and various dimensions of love and couple satisfaction). Cross-cultural differences between American and Spanish results are briefly discussed.

Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969/1982) has become one of the most influential frameworks for studying close relationships across the life span (Cassidy & Shaver, 1999), and the study of adult attachment has led to many insights concerning adolescent and adult romantic and sexual relationships (e.g., Feeney & Noller, 1996; Tracy, Shaver, Albino, & Cooper, 2003). The major individual difference constructs in the theory—attachment styles or attachment style dimensions—have proven useful in understanding relationship processes and individuals' emotion regulation processes in both normal and clinical populations (see

Cassidy & Shaver; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003, for overviews).

Attachment theory was initially developed to explain the formation and continuing significance of emotional bonds between human infants and their primary caregivers (usually the parents). In the 1980s (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1987), the theory was extended to provide a framework for studying close relationships between adults, such as romantic relationships or marriage. In its original form, attachment theory was oriented around the emotional bond that an infant usually establishes with one or more special caregivers during the first and second years of life. The caregiver provides the infant with a “safe haven” in times of threat or pain and a “secure base” from which to explore the world and develop skills. When threats or troubles arise, the infant signals or approaches the caregiver for protection, comfort, and assistance with emotion regulation. In the case of close relationships between adults, a similar emotional bond is formed as one person comes to rely on the other as a safe haven and secure base. The nature of secure and insecure attachments has

Itziar Alonso-Arbiol, Faculty of Psychology, University of the Basque Country, Donostia, Spain; Nekane Balluerka, Faculty of Psychology, University of the Basque Country, Donostia, Spain; Phillip R. Shaver, Department of Psychology, University of California at Davis.

This research was partly supported by a grant from the Research Bureau of the University of the Basque Country (UPV05/111). The authors thank Keith F. Widaman for assistance with the statistical analyses.

Correspondence should be addressed to Itziar Alonso-Arbiol, University of the Basque Country, Faculty of Psychology, 20018 Donostia, Spain, e-mail: itziar.alonso@ehu.es.

now been extensively studied in children (as reviewed in Cassidy & Shaver, 1999), adolescents (e.g., Allen & Land, 1999), and adults (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003, 2007).

As research on adult attachment has begun spreading around the world, it has become important to create and evaluate attachment measures in languages other than English. Even without a good Spanish-language measure of attachment style, the number of publications encountered in PsycINFO when searching under both "Spain" and "attachment" has reached 71. In the Psicodoc database, which compiles psychological articles and conference proceedings from Spain and South America, there are now 143 documents referring to attachment, and the Spanish TESEO database (compiling doctoral dissertations in Spain) lists 17 dissertations about attachment.

The purpose of the present article is to analyze the psychometric properties of a new Spanish-language adaptation of one of the most frequently used English-language self-report measures of adult romantic attachment style, the Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) measure (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998).¹ Having a high-quality translation of the ECR will make attachment research with Spanish-speaking samples easier and increase the comparability of findings across cultures and languages. Previous findings based on the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) suggested that attachment anxiety levels may be higher among Spaniards than among Americans (Schmitt et al., 2004) and that avoidance levels may be lower among Spaniards, but this finding needs to be replicated using a more

sensitive measure of attachment style that can be confidently used with samples from both Spanish-speaking countries and the United States.

Initially, research on attachment style was based on Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall's (1978) three-category typology of infant-caregiver attachment patterns—secure, anxious, and avoidant—and on Hazan and Shaver's (1987) identification of similar styles in the adult romantic relationship domain. Subsequent studies (e.g., Brennan et al., 1998; Fraley & Waller, 1998; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994) revealed, however, that attachment styles are more appropriately conceptualized as regions in a continuous two-dimensional space. The two dimensions have been called self-model and other model by Bartholomew and her colleagues (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew) and attachment-related anxiety and avoidance by Brennan et al. The first dimension (self-model or anxiety) is concerned with fear of rejection and abandonment by romantic partners; the second dimension (other model or avoidance) is concerned with the degree to which a person feels uncomfortable depending on and being close to (i.e., psychologically intimate with) others.

Brennan et al.'s (1998) self-report measure of the two dimensions was derived by factor analysis of hundreds of items written by many different investigators following the creation of Hazan and Shaver's (1987) self-report. Brennan et al. collected data from over 1,000 university students and found that two orthogonal factors provided a good summary of the structure of all the items and that the two factors corresponded conceptually to both the two-function discriminant analysis included in Ainsworth et al.'s (1978) book (based on research with infants) and the two dimensions used by Bartholomew and colleagues to define four adult attachment styles.

Brennan et al. (1998) created two 18-item attachment insecurity scales, one to measure attachment-related anxiety, and one to measure attachment-related avoidance. The two scales, like the factors from which they were derived, were orthogonal and exhibited high internal consistency reliability. Since 1998, researchers have used them in hundreds of studies that

1. The ECR was slightly revised by Fraley, Waller, and Brennan in 2000, based on Item Response Theory analyses designed to see whether the ECR scales could be made to discriminate better at their secure ends. Fraley et al. (2000) went back to the data set used originally to create the ECR and searched for relevant items. In our opinion, this attempt resulted in the choice of some awkwardly worded items, and each of the revised scales correlated about .95 with the parallel original scale in any case. There are more studies based on the ECR than on the ECR-R; if one's goal is to see whether existing findings replicate across cultures, it seems reasonable to use a translation of the ECR.

provide extensive evidence for construct validity (see Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003, for a review).

Increasingly, the ECR measure is being translated into languages other than English (e.g., Chinese: Mallinckrodt & Wang, 2004; French: Lafontaine & Lussier, 2003; Italian: Picardi, Bitetti, Puddu, & Pasquini, 2000; Japanese: Nakao & Kato, 2004). When an American measure such as the ECR is adapted for use in another language and in other countries, more than translation is required. It is also important to check the reliability and validity of the new scale in the population and culture where it will be used (Hambleton, 1994). In a previous study, we (Alonso-Arbiol, Shaver, & Yáñez, 2002) translated the ECR into Spanish to examine theoretically predicted links between the attachment style dimensions and dependency in a large university sample in Spain. The study worked out well, but relatively little information was provided concerning the scale adaptation process. Here, we focus on neglected psychometric issues and also extend the use of the scale to nonuniversity, Spanish-speaking adults.

In three studies, we examine the factor structure of the ECR-S (the "S" indicating the Spanish version of the ECR), the internal consistency reliability of subscales based on the two major factors, the test-retest reliability, and the validity of the scale. In all, we report results for three large samples, including two comprising community-residing adults and one of university students.

Study 1

Overview

The aim of Study 1 was to analyze the psychometric properties of the ECR-S. We report details of the translation process, factor validity (examined with common factor analysis), and internal consistency. We also report criterion validity associations between the two ECR-S scales and Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) RQ, and between the two ECR-S scales and being, or not being, in a romantic relationship. Previous studies (e.g., Nofle & Shaver, 2006) have revealed

an association between attachment-related avoidance and not being involved in a relationship.

Method

Participants. Participants were 602 undergraduates enrolled at the University of the Basque Country (291 women, 311 men). All of them were Basque, heterosexual, and Caucasian. They were recruited from different colleges on campus. Only 1% were married or cohabiting; 37% were single but stably involved in a romantic relationship; the other 62% were single and not involved in a romantic relationship. They ranged in age from 18 to 36, with a median age of 20 years. To increase their motivation to participate in the study, we offered them a chance to win one prize in a raffle (music CDs, tickets for local soccer games, etc.) from a total of seven different prizes.

ECR item translation and back-translation. Before translating the items of a questionnaire into another language to be used in another country with its own culture, conceptual equivalence and content equivalence of the underlying construct should be considered. Conceptual equivalence refers to having similar meanings in different cultures (Flaherty et al., 1988). Schmitt et al. (2004) conducted studies using the RQ in scores of different languages, including Spanish, and in countries around the world including Spain. From their studies, it is already clear that the dimensions underlying the fairly simple RQ (which requires single ratings of four short paragraphs describing Bartholomew & Horowitz's, 1991, attachment types) are meaningful in Spanish culture. The four RQ ratings can easily be combined to form two underlying dimensions (e.g., Brennan, Shaver, & Tobey, 1991).

Content equivalence is established by showing that the content of each item is relevant to each culture and likely to have similar meanings in the two cultural contexts. In our case, two bilingual attachment researchers who are fluent in both English and Spanish evaluated the content equivalence of each item. All 36 items of the ECR were thought

to be relevant to couple relationships in Spain. In order to increase linguistic equivalence between the existing English-language ECR and the new Spanish-language ECR-S, a back-translation method was used. The same two bilingual researchers translated each English item into Spanish independently, and the two translations were compared, discussed, and reduced to a single mutually agreeable wording. A third bilingual person who was unfamiliar with attachment theory then translated the proposed Spanish-language items back into English. We examined this translation to determine whether the items seemed to be essentially the same as the English-language originals.

Some changes were made during this process to adjust the items' fit with contemporary Spanish. For example, we use the wording *pareja* (partner) when "romantic partner" was used in English items because the word "romantic" would not have had the appropriate meaning in Spanish (see items 3, 6, 7, 9, 21, 23, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 34 in Appendix A). Because we explained in the instructions to participants that the questions did not refer only to a *current* couple relationship but also referred to all such important relationships a person may have had, we decided to use only the singular form of the word for "partner," because the plural form had a misleading or unclear sense in Spanish (perhaps implying that the respondent had several relationships going on at the same time; see items 3, 6, 9, 12, 13, 20, 21, 23, 26, 29, 31, 32, and 34 in Appendix A). The final wordings of all items, which seemed acceptable to the research team, can be compared with their English-language matches in Appendix A of the present article.

Once the item wording had been decided, we placed the items in a questionnaire format in which participants were asked to rate each one on a 1–7 Likert-type response scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree [totalmente en desacuerdo]*) to 7 (*strongly agree [totalmente de acuerdo]*). The items appeared in the same order as in the English-language ECR (as shown in Appendix A).

Other measures. Participants completed the Spanish version (Schmitt et al., 2004) of Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) four-

item RQ, which asked them to choose which of four attachment style prototypes characterized them best. The four prototypes describe what Bartholomew and Horowitz called secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissing attachment styles. Each of these styles is located in one of the four quadrants formed by the two insecurity dimensions, with the secure and preoccupied styles being low on avoidance (or having a "negative model of others," in Bartholomew and Horowitz's terms), the dismissing and fearful styles being high on avoidance, the secure and dismissing styles being low on anxiety (or having a "positive model of self"), and the preoccupied and fearful styles being high on anxiety. We included this measure to assess the associations, implied in the preceding sentence, between the four RQ style categories, on the one hand, and the ECR-S anxiety and avoidance scales, on the other.

We also asked respondents whether they were or were not involved in a romantic relationship at the time of data collection. English-language studies, beginning with Hazan and Shaver (1987), have shown that insecure attachment, especially avoidant attachment, is associated with having shorter relationships and not being involved in a relationship at a particular time. We converted the relationship lengths reported by participants in the present study into months. RQ attachment style categories, being in a relationship or not, and length of relationship (for those who were involved in a relationship) were used to assess the validity of the ECR-S.

Procedure. Chairpersons or other professors from most departments in the University of the Basque Country, as well as student organizations, were contacted about the study. Most colleges agreed to help with participant recruitment. After an instructor granted permission for us to present the study in his or her classroom, students who agreed to participate filled out the questionnaire, including demographic questions, before the class itself began. Students were completely free to participate or not, as they chose, in line with the deontological (ethics) code of the Spanish Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos (Official

Committee of Psychologists) during the whole process. (We followed this deontological code in all three studies reported in this article.)

Results

Exploratory factor analysis. A common factor analysis, followed by oblique rotation, of the items in the ECR-S yielded two major factors (both with eigenvalues greater than 1) accounting for 34.6% of the variance. Factor 1 (eigenvalue = 6.8) accounted for 18.9% of the variance and corresponded to the avoidance dimension, and Factor 2 (eigenvalue = 5.6) accounted for 15.7% of the variance and corresponded with the anxiety dimension. As expected, the two factors were orthogonal despite the oblique rotation ($r = -.02$, ns). The remaining factors had eigenvalues ranging downward from 1.69 to .28 and were not interpretable. Thus, the first two dimensions represented the major structure in this set of items. Each of the first two factors correlated highly ($rs > .95$) with one of the unit-weighted scales intended to parallel the English-language ECR scales.

The item loadings on the two major factors appear in parentheses following each of the Spanish-language items in Appendix A. The corresponding loadings from a sample of 1,263 undergraduate students at the University of California, Davis, appear in parentheses following each of the English-language ECR items. In the American sample, all the items load substantially higher on the expected factor than on the other factor. In the Spanish sample, four of the items (numbers 4, 12, 26, and 29) did not work quite as expected.

In the case of item #4—worrying about relationships—the loading on the expected factor (anxiety) was in the correct direction, but the item also loaded negatively on the avoidance factor. Regarding item #12—desire to merge with partners—the loading on the expected factor (anxiety) was in the correct direction, but the loading on the avoidance factor was similar in size. In the case of item #26 as well—partners not wanting to get too close—the loading on the expected factor (anxiety) was in the correct direction, but the loading on avoidance was higher. In the case

of #29—feeling comfortable depending on others—the loading on the expected factor (avoidance) was in the correct direction (negative), but the positive loading on anxiety was higher.

Despite these differences, when we correlated the list of 36 loadings for each of the four factors (two in the Spanish sample and two in the American sample), the parallel lists of factor loadings (i.e., avoidance with avoidance and anxiety with anxiety) correlated very highly across languages ($r = .83$ for avoidance and $.87$ for anxiety) and the nonparallel lists (i.e., avoidance loadings with anxiety loadings) were essentially uncorrelated across languages ($r = -.03$ for American avoidance with Spanish anxiety and $.06$ for American anxiety with Spanish avoidance). Thus, the factor structures were very similar, even in terms of relative loading sizes, despite the failure of a few items on the Spanish-language measure to perform perfectly. Mean scores on the two ECR-S scales (determined by averaging item scores after appropriately reversing reverse-scored items) and standard deviations were as follows for avoidance ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 0.86$) and anxiety ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.85$).²

Internal consistency. We evaluated internal consistency for the two factor-based scales. The coefficient alphas were $.87$ and $.85$ for the avoidance and anxiety scales, respectively, which are similar to the corresponding coefficients in English-language studies using the ECR (Alonso-Arbiol, Balluerka, Shaver, & Gillath, 2006.)

Validity. To assess the criterion validity of the ECR-S scales, we examined the mean differences in ECR-S anxiety and avoidance

2. There is no reason for American and Spanish means and standard deviations to be identical because there might be cross-cultural differences in attachment anxiety and avoidance, but we will mention, nevertheless, that in the large sample of American university students already mentioned, the means and standard deviations were 2.99 and 1.17 for avoidance and 3.65 and 1.19 for anxiety. Compared to the means of our sample, there was a small difference for avoidance (Cohen's $d = .15$) and a medium-sized difference for anxiety (Cohen's $d = .42$).

scores for the four categories of Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) RQ (which had already been translated into Spanish). The results, shown in Table 1, were as expected. On the avoidance scale, the secure and preoccupied attachment categories differed significantly from the dismissing and fearful categories. The effect sizes for the mean differences between secure and fearful types, and between secure and dismissing types were large (Cohen's $d = .84$ and $.79$, respectively.) The effect sizes for the mean differences between preoccupied and fearful types (Cohen's $d = .55$), and between preoccupied and dismissing types (Cohen's $d = .53$) were also considerable.

On the anxiety subscale, the secure and dismissing types scored significantly lower than the preoccupied and fearful types. The effect sizes for the mean differences between preoccupied and dismissing types, and between preoccupied and secure types were large (Cohen's $d = .97$ and $.74$, respectively). The effect sizes for the mean differences between fearful and dismissing types (Cohen's $d = .67$), and between fearful and secure types (Cohen's $d = .36$) were also considerable, especially in the first case.

These results are fully in line with the theoretical idea that avoidance corresponds to the dimension Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) called "model of other" and anxiety corresponds to the dimension they called "model of self." Together, these two dimensions define Bartholomew's four major attachment categories.

The second issue we examined was the association between relationship status (being or not being in a relationship at the time of the study) and a person's scores on the ECR-S avoidance and anxiety scales. As expected, the uncoupled participants were significantly more avoidant than their coupled counterparts, $t(600) = 11.61$, $p < .001$ (uncoupled $M = 3.13$, $SD = .79$; coupled $M = 2.37$, $SD = .76$). Because this statistically significant difference might have resulted from the large sample size, we calculated the effect size and found it to be large (Cohen's $d = .98$). The difference between the two groups on the anxiety dimension (uncoupled $M = 4.13$, $SD = .83$; coupled $M = 4.01$, $SD = .87$) was in the same direction but not statistically significant, $t(600) = 1.75$, $p = .08$; Cohen's $d = .14$, which is compatible with the previous literature (Noftle & Shaver, 2006).

The third issue we examined was the relation between attachment style and length of relationship for participants who were involved in a relationship at the time of the study (38% of the sample). The lengths of these people's relationships ranged from 1 to 156 months ($M = 28.06$, $SD = 23.56$.) Anxiety was not significantly correlated with relationship length ($r = -.04$, ns), but the correlation between relationship length and avoidance was significantly negative ($r = -.16$, $p < .05$). Since the correlation might have been affected by the few participants who had been involved in a relationship for a long time, we also computed the analysis excluding 16 participants whose relationships had lasted for

Table 1. Mean differences on the attachment dimensions as a function of RQ attachment style categories^a

ECR-S dimensions	RQ attachment style categories				$F(3, 596)$
	Secure ($n = 265$)	Dismissing ($n = 99$)	Preoccupied ($n = 134$)	Fearful ($n = 102$)	
Avoidance	2.37 (.79) _a	3.04 (.96) _b	2.56 (.84) _a	3.06 (.99) _b	23.56***
Anxiety	3.91 (.81) _a	3.75 (.77) _a	4.51 (.78) _b	4.29 (.83) _b	24.31***

Note. ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; RQ = Relationship Questionnaire.

^aWithin rows, means with different subscripts differ at $p < .001$, according to a Scheffé comparison test.

*** $p < .001$, two tailed.

70 or more months (3 standard deviations above the mean). The negative correlation between avoidance and relationship length for the remaining participants was slightly stronger ($r = -.19$, $p < .01$.)

Discussion

Overall, the ECR-S scale yielded essentially the same two-factor structure as the ECR in English, and the two scales based on the factors were internally consistent, essentially uncorrelated (as intended), and coherently related to the frequently used RQ measure of attachment style. The avoidance scale was related to not being in a relationship and to shorter relationship length for participants who were involved in a relationship. In a previous study (Alonso-Arboli et al., 2002), the ECR-S anxiety scale was related, as predicted, to emotional and instrumental dependency in romantic relationships among university students. Thus, the ECR-S appears to work well in Spanish-speaking university samples, despite the fact that a few of the items did not load perfectly on their expected factors (an issue that will be revisited in Study 2). The purpose of Study 2 was to explore the measure's performance in a Spanish community sample.

Study 2

Overview

Study 2 had three aims: (a) to confirm the factor structure of the ECR-S in a heterogeneous community sample, (b) to assess the internal consistency of the two ECR-S scales in this new sample; and (c) to assess the temporal stability, or test-retest reliability, of the ECR-S scales.

Method

Participants. There were 393 people (203 women, 190 men) in the sample, all residing in the Basque Country (the autonomous Basque region of Spain), which is the location of the university sampled in Study 1. Their ages ranged from 16 to 63 years ($M = 31.2$, $SD = 11.9$). Their levels of education were representative of the general population in the region:

20% had a basic or primary level of education, 46.9% had completed the secondary level (high school), 31.5% had a university degree, and 1.6% failed to respond to this question. Their relationship status varied: 24.6% were unmarried and not involved in an exclusive relationship, 34.2% were unmarried but seriously involved in an exclusive relationship, 37.6% were married or cohabiting, 1.3% were separated or divorced, and 0.8% were widowed. Overall, 71.8% were involved in a romantic relationship at the time of the study. They were recruited using friendship networks, beginning with faculty members and other adults in the community. After being contacted personally, they received the measures, instructions, and a stamped envelope with a confidential identification code in which to return the materials to the researchers. They completed the questionnaires on their own time. At Time 2, 6 weeks later, we contacted them again and provided them with a questionnaire and another prestamped envelope in which to return it. Data were matched across time using the confidential identification codes.

Results

Exploratory factor analysis. As in Study 1, we conducted common factor analyses to evaluate the predicted two-dimensional structure of the scale. We ran the exploratory analysis because we wished to check the item loadings again, especially for the four items that were problematic in Study 1. Once again, the first two factors had high eigenvalues compared to the subsequent factors and accounted for 31.7% of the variance. Factor 1 (eigenvalue = 6.6) accounted for 18.4% of the variance and corresponded to the avoidance dimension, and Factor 2 (eigenvalue = 4.8) accounted for 13.3% of the variance and corresponded with the anxiety dimension. As expected, the two factors were essentially independent despite the oblique rotation ($r = -.15$, ns). The remaining factors had eigenvalues ranging downward from 2.04 to .27 and were not interpretable. Thus, as in Study 1, the first two dimensions represent the major structure in the item set.

The loadings on the two major factors appear in the second set of parentheses following each of the Spanish-language items in Appendix A. (In each case, the loading on the expected factor is italicized.) As in Study 1, four of the Spanish-language items (4, 12, 26, and 29) were somewhat problematic, and in the same ways.

In the case of item #4—worrying about relationships—the loading on the expected factor (anxiety) was in the correct direction and larger than the loading on the avoidance factor, but the negative loading on the avoidance factor was fairly large. In the case of item #12—desire to merge with partners—the loading on the expected factor (anxiety) was in the correct direction, but the loading on avoidance was of similar size. In the case of item #26—partners not wanting to get too close—the loading on the expected factor (anxiety) was in the correct direction, but the loading on avoidance was higher. (In the American sample, this item loaded positively on both factors too, but the loading for avoidance was much lower than the one for anxiety.) In the case of item #29—feeling comfortable depending on others—the loading on the expected factor (avoidance) was in the correct direction (negative), but the positive loading on anxiety was higher. The consistency of the loading patterns for these four items across the two Spanish samples suggests that these items are nonoptimal.

Despite these differences, when we correlated the list of 36 loadings for each of the six factors (two in each of the Spanish samples and two in the American sample), the parallel lists of factor loadings (i.e., avoidance with avoidance and anxiety with anxiety) continued to be high, as in Study 1. The avoidance loadings from the Study 2 sample correlated .95 with the avoidance loadings from the American comparison sample and .99 with the Study 1 Spanish student sample. The anxiety loadings from the Study 2 sample correlated .75 with the anxiety loadings from the American sample and .73 with those from the Study 1 Spanish sample. As in Study 1, the correlations of loadings on one factor with loadings on the other factor, within or across languages, were essentially zero. Thus, the factor structures and

relative loadings were similar across languages and different Spanish samples. The means for the attachment scales and their corresponding standard deviations in this study were $M = 2.59$ and $SD = 0.91$ for avoidance and $M = 4.20$ and $SD = 0.93$ for anxiety.

Internal consistency and test-retest reliability. The coefficient alphas for the avoidance and anxiety scales were again quite acceptable, .86 and .83 for avoidance and anxiety, respectively. We also assessed the temporal stability of the two ECR-S scales over a 6-week test-retest period. A total of 265 participants (67.4% of the initial sample) completed the ECR-S a second time. To evaluate the attrition, we compared the Time 1 scores of people who participated in the retest with the Time 1 scores of those who did not. There were no significant Time 1 differences on either the avoidance scale, $t(391) = .34$, $p = .74$, or the anxiety scale, $t(391) = -.72$, $p = .47$. The test-retest reliability of the anxiety scale was .75 ($p < .001$) and of the avoidance scale, .69 ($p < .001$). In line with the notion that attachment style is relatively stable but can be influenced by social experience (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003), the stability was high but not so high as to indicate no change over a 6-week period.

Shortened scales (without the four problematic items). Because the scales may work better without the four problematic items, we also recomputed the scale scores and standard deviations after deleting those four items. All new values were very similar. The revised means and standard deviations were as follows: $M = 2.51$ and $SD = 0.93$ for avoidance and $M = 4.29$ and $SD = 0.99$ for anxiety. The revised coefficient alphas were .87 and .82 for avoidance and anxiety, respectively; and the revised test-retest correlations were .69 for avoidance and .76 for anxiety.

Discussion

Having determined that the ECR-S scale had the predicted factor structure in two samples, yielded high alpha coefficients in both studies, and displayed criterion-related validity with

the RQ measure and construct validity with other relationship status variables, we undertook a third study that included measures of constructs that have been demonstrated in English-language studies to be related to attachment style. In this study, we used the shortened scales, to avoid any weaknesses of the four nonoptimal items, and assessed both members of couples so that we could explore the effects of both sets of ECR-S scale scores on relationship quality.

Study 3

Overview

We used six measures to obtain additional evidence concerning the construct validity of the ECR-S: (a) three subscales from a Spanish adaptation of Critelli, Myers, and Loos's (1986) Components of Love Scale (Carreño & Serrano, 1995): romantic dependence, communication intimacy, and physiological arousal; and (b) three subscales from a Spanish adaptation of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised (MSI-R; Reig-Ferrer, Cepeda-Benito, & Snyder, 2004): poor affective communication, poor problem-solving communication, and sexual dissatisfaction. As can be inferred from their titles, these scales concern couple communication and sexual attraction and dissatisfaction, which should be related to attachment avoidance and anxiety. We administered these measures to a sample of married and cohabiting heterosexual couples residing in the Basque region of Spain.

Insecure attachment has been linked in previous studies with communication and sexual variables. For example, those high in attachment-related anxiety and low in avoidance tend to exhibit an obsessive, dependent style of love (e.g., Alonso-Arbiol et al., 2002; Collins & Read, 1990; Shaver & Hazan, 1988), whereas avoidant individuals typically display high levels of independence and intimacy avoidance. In the present study, we expected ECR-S avoidance to be negatively associated with communication intimacy, a dimension of Critelli et al.'s (1986) Love Scale, and ECR-S anxiety to be positively associated with romantic dependence, another dimension of

Critelli et al.'s scale. The same kinds of differences are likely to have a negative effect on couple problem solving because more anxious people tend to become defensively angry and more avoidant ones tend to withdraw from conflict (e.g., Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003).

There is extensive evidence for links between insecure attachment and lower levels of marital satisfaction (e.g., Brennan & Shaver, 1995; Feeney, 1994; Feeney, Noller, & Callan, 1994; Fuller & Fincham, 1995; Lussier, Sabourin, & Turgeon, 1997). An important aspect of marital quality is each person's perception of his or her partner's affection and understanding, forms of satisfaction that are generally associated with high intimacy and good communication (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991; Pistole, 1993). We therefore expected both anxiety and avoidance to correlate with communication difficulties and dissatisfaction. We predicted that dissatisfaction with problem-solving communication would correlate with both ECR-S anxiety and avoidance.

Davis and her collaborators (Davis, Shaver, & Vernon, 2003, 2004) have studied attachment insecurity and sexual motivation. They found that anxious adults use sexual attraction and interest as means to retain a partner's investment in a relationship. Attachment anxiety, measured with the English-language ECR, was consistently associated in the Davis et al. studies with stronger sexual arousal and motivation, but avoidant adults reported lower sexual interest and motivation. Therefore, we expected the ECR-S scales to correlate with physiological arousal (a measure of romantic excitement included in the Critelli et al. measure); we expected the attachment anxiety scale to correlate positively, and the avoidance negatively, with arousal. We also expected avoidant attachment to correlate with lower sexual satisfaction, a construct measured by one of the scales in the MSI-R.

Attachment security is generally linked with sexual satisfaction because secure individuals tend to have more positive emotions and fewer negative emotions associated with sexual experiences (e.g., Brennan et al., 1998; Gentzler & Kerns, 2004; Tracy et al., 2003). Avoidant individuals, perhaps especially

avoidant men (Gentzler & Kerns), are more likely to be uncomfortable with the intimacy involved in sexual experiences. We therefore expected insecurity to be associated with relative sexual dissatisfaction in couple relationships, especially with avoidance in men.

Method

Participants and procedure. The sample consisted of 92 participants (both members of each of 46 cohabiting or married heterosexual couples). They ranged in age from 21 to 80 years ($M = 38.6$, $SD = 13.6$). Levels of education were as follows: 9.8% had a basic or primary education, 30.4% had a secondary education, 56.5% had a university degree, and 3.3% left this question blank. Relationship length in months ranged from 15 to 222 ($M = 175.9$, $SD = 139.1$). Some of the participating couples had children (46.7%, with most of them—55.8%—having two children), and the average ages of the older and younger children were 8.2 years ($SD = 12.8$) and 6.4 years ($SD = 11.5$). We recruited the couples through friendship networks. After being contacted personally by one of the investigators, they were sent copies of the study instructions and questionnaires, which they completed on their own time and returned by mail.

Measures. In addition to completing the ECR-S³ (whose scales were again internally consistent, with an alpha of .87 for anxiety and .86 for avoidance), participants completed a Spanish adaptation of three subscales of Critelli et al.'s Love Scale (Carreño & Serrano, 1995) and a Spanish adaptation of three scales of the MSI-R (Reig-Ferrer et al., 2004). The correlation between the two ECR-S scales was again small and nonsignificant ($r = .14$, $p = .19$). When we computed correlations for each gender separately, we obtained similar results for men ($r = .11$, $p = .49$) and for women ($r = .19$, $p = .22$). The means for the attachment scales and their corresponding standard deviations were 2.51

and 0.86 for avoidant and 3.91 and 1.10 for anxiety, respectively.

Regarding the subscales of the Spanish version of Critelli et al.'s Love Scale (Carreño & Serrano, 1995), romantic dependence (measured with six items) refers to obsessive rumination on one's partner and relationship (e.g., "It would be hard for me to get along without _____" [my partner's name]), communication intimacy (seven items) refers to the degree of intimate communication between couple members (e.g., "_____ [my partner's name] is someone I can really communicate with"), and physiological arousal (five items) refers to sexual or passionate excitement related to one's partner (e.g., "I am very physically attracted to _____" [my partner's name]). Items in these subscales were rated on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), and the higher the score, the higher the romantic dependence, communication intimacy, or physiological arousal. The alpha coefficients for the three scales were acceptable, .69, .89, and .81, and were essentially the same for men and women.

Of the three scales from the Spanish version of the MSI-R (Reig-Ferrer et al., 2004), poor affective communication (13 items) assesses dissatisfaction with the amount of affection and understanding displayed by one's partner (e.g., in English: "My partner doesn't take me seriously enough sometimes"), poor problem-solving communication (19 items) assesses one's perception of ineffectiveness in resolving couples' disagreements (e.g., "Minor disagreements with my partner often end up in big arguments"), and sexual dissatisfaction (13 items) assesses dissatisfaction with the frequency and quality of sexual relations (e.g., "My partner sometimes shows too little enthusiasm for sex"). Statements in these scales were rated as true or false. Alpha coefficients for these scales were acceptable, .77, .82, and .78, respectively, and were essentially the same for men and women. (On all three scales, higher scores imply greater dissatisfaction.)

Results

Validity. To determine whether attachment anxiety and avoidance are associated as

3. The four weak items were dropped in this study (see Appendix A).

predicted with the three components of the Love Scale and the three dimensions of marital dissatisfaction, and to assess whether those relations are moderated by gender, we conducted multilevel analyses. We found that the models using random slopes (i.e., those based on the assumption that the relation between explanatory variables and criterion variables are different across dyads) fit less well than models assuming fixed slopes, so we present here only the results based on models with random intercepts and fixed slopes.

We estimated the models using version 2.0 of MLwiN (Rasbash et al., 2000). Although there are several options for analyzing data in situations in which individuals are nested within dyads, multilevel analysis is distinct in (a) allowing simultaneous examination of the effects of dyad-level and individual-level predictors and the testing of hypotheses about associations occurring at different levels and even across levels, (b) accounting for the non-independence of observations within each dyad, (c) treating the study dyads as coming from a larger population of dyads, and (d) being more appropriate than conventional analyses for acknowledging systematic variation due to sampling error (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002).

We estimated two different models, using as criterion variables the communication intimacy, romantic dependence, and physiological arousal dimensions of love (see Table 2) and the poor affective communication, poor problem-solving communication, and sexual dissatisfaction dimensions of marital satisfaction (see Table 3). To avoid any destabilizing effects due to multicollinearity and to make the results easier to interpret, for each model, ECR-S anxiety and avoidance scores were centered on their means. We calculated the estimates and standard errors of fixed parameters (ECR-S scales and gender) and random parameters (unexplained variance), as well as the degree of model fit based on comparison with the previous or alternative model (ΔD), and the percentage of change in the unexplained variance of criterion variables, at both individual and group levels, resulting from adding the explanatory variables (i.e., ECR-S scales, gender, and interactions) to the model.

Love variables. The results of the analyses predicting the three Love Scale variables are shown in Table 2. When centered ECR-S anxiety and avoidance scores were added to the “empty model” (Model 0, based only on the grand mean) in Model 1, the fit of the model in accounting for communication intimacy improved significantly ($\Delta D = 19.29$, $p < .001$), and unexplained variance decreased both at the individual level (12%) and at the group (couple) level (42%). Avoidance was significantly and negatively related to communication intimacy ($\beta = -.377$, $z = -3.14$), but anxiety was not significantly associated with this variable (see Table 2). In this final model, a dummy variable representing gender was also entered, as were terms representing the interactions between anxiety and gender, and between avoidance and gender, but none added significantly to the results.

We conducted a similar series of analyses for romantic dependence. When ECR-S anxiety and avoidance, as well as gender, were added to the empty model, the model fit improved significantly ($\Delta D = 29.35$, $p < .001$), and unexplained variance decreased at the individual level (35%). The beta coefficients for both anxiety and avoidance were statistically significant ($\beta = .251$, $z = 3.64$, and $\beta = -.376$, $z = -3.65$, respectively), indicating that anxious individuals were more romantically dependent, whereas avoidant individuals were less dependent. The beta coefficient for gender ($\beta = .333$, $z = 2.95$) indicated that men were more romantically dependent than women. No significant interactions appeared.

In the analysis predicting physiological arousal, the addition of attachment anxiety and avoidance to the empty model increased fit ($\Delta D = 26.33$, $p < .001$), and unexplained variance decreased at the individual level (32%). The beta coefficients for both anxiety and avoidance were statistically significant ($\beta = .335$, $z = 3.49$, and $\beta = -.483$, $z = -3.43$, respectively), indicating that anxious attachment was associated with greater physiological arousal and avoidant attachment with less arousal. Adding gender to the model did not increase fit, nor did the addition of the interactions.

Table 2. Multilevel analyses predicting communication intimacy, romantic dependence, and physiological arousal from the ECR-S scales (anxiety and avoidance) and gender^a

Parameters	Communication intimacy		Romantic dependence		Physiological arousal	
	Model 0	Model 1	Model 0	Model 1	Model 0	Model 1
Grand mean (B_{0j})	6.122 (.089)	6.118 (.100)	5.447 (.070)	5.277 (.084)	4.619 (.113)	4.564 (.124)
Main effects						
Anxiety		−.029 (.081)		.251*** (.069)		.335*** (.096)
Avoidance		−.377** (.120)		−.376*** (.103)		−.483*** (.141)
Gender (dummy variable)		.010 (.127)		.333** (.113)		.116 (.139)
Interaction terms						
Anxiety × Gender		−.155 (.128)		−.102 (.110)		−.127 (.148)
Avoidance × Gender		.059 (.164)		.127 (.145)		.096 (.191)
Variance components						
Individual level	.406 (.088)	.357 (.078)	.439 (.065)	.284 (.060)	.632 (.133)	.427 (.090)
Group level	.162 (.088)	.093 (.067)	.000 (.000) ^b	.035 (.048)	.266 (.139)	.270 (.111)
Model fit						
Deviance (D)	202.975	183.691	181.354	152.008	244.365	218.036
Δ Model 0 (ΔD)		19.284***		29.346***		26.329***
Δ df		5		5		5
Δ individual level R^2		12%		35%		32%
Δ group (couple) level R^2		42%		0%		0%
Intraclass correlation	.2852	.2067	0	.1097	.2962	.3874

Note. ECR-S = Experiences in Close Relationships-Spanish.

^a p values are based on two-tailed z distributions.

^bZero values are displayed when a very small amount of variance is present.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

Table 3. Multilevel analyses predicting poor affective communication, poor problem-solving communication, and sexual dissatisfaction from the ECR-S scales (anxiety and avoidance) and gender^a

Parameters	Poor affective communication		Poor problem-solving communication		Sexual dissatisfaction	
	Model 0	Model 1	Model 0	Model 1	Model 0	Model 1
Grand mean (B_{0j})	2.919 (.333)	3.225 (.330)	6.197 (.545)	5.771 (.565)	4.237 (.394)	3.706 (.413)
Main effects						
Anxiety		.835** (.258)		.640 (.340)		.306 (.292)
Avoidance		1.147** (.386)		−.210 (.493)		.936* (.427)
Gender (dummy variable)		−.587 (.401)		.735 (.441)		1.138** (.403)
Interaction terms						
Anxiety × Gender		.195 (.409)		.289 (.538)		.544 (.456)
Avoidance × Gender		−.675 (.547)		1.554* (.686)		.174 (.595)
Variance components						
Individual level	3.973 (.886)	3.336 (.741)	5.145 (1.149)	3.771 (.844)	4.834 (1.089)	3.110 (.701)
Group (couple) level	2.913 (1.155)	1.398 (.771)	10.813 (2.915)	10.472 (2.656)	4.442 (1.596)	4.240 (1.307)
Model fit						
Deviance (D)	402.114	374.122	457.695	441.379	420.396	394.987
Δ Model 0 (ΔD)		27.992***		16.316**		25.409***
Δ df		5		5		5
Δ individual level R^2		16%		27%		36%
Δ group (couple) level R^2		52%		3%		5%
Intraclass correlation	.4230	.2953	.6776	.7353	.4789	.5769

Note. ECR-S = Experiences in Close Relationships-Spanish.

^a*p* values are based on two-tailed *z* distributions.

**p* < .05.

***p* < .01.

****p* < .001.

In summary, avoidant attachment was associated with poor communication intimacy, low romantic dependence, and low physiological arousal (i.e., romantic excitement). Anxious attachment was associated with greater romantic dependence and higher physiological arousal (excitement). These findings are completely in line with predictions and are therefore supportive of the validity of the ECR-S. There was a gender effect only in the case of romantic dependence, men being more romantically dependent than women, on average. The reduction in variance due to entering the ECR-S scales occurred mostly at the group (i.e., couple) level for poor communication intimacy, but occurred mostly at the individual level for romantic dependence and romantic excitement, or arousal.

Marital dissatisfaction. The results of the analyses predicting the three components of marital dissatisfaction appear in Table 3. When centered ECR-S anxiety and avoidance scores were added to the empty model, the fit of the model accounting for poor affective communication improved significantly ($\Delta D = 27.99, p < .001$), and unexplained variance decreased both at the individual level (16%) and at the group level (52%). Anxiety was significantly related to poor affective communication ($\beta = .835, z = 3.24$), as was avoidance ($\beta = 1.147, z = 2.97$). Neither gender nor any of the interactions had significant effects in this model.

In the analyses for poor problem-solving communication, the fit of the revised model (model 1) improved significantly ($\Delta D = 16.32, p < .01$). The beta coefficients for anxiety and avoidance were not statistically significant, but the interaction between gender and avoidance was ($\Delta D = 16.32, p < .01$); unexplained variance decreased at the individual level (27%). The beta coefficient for this interaction was 1.554 ($z = 2.27$). There were no effects of gender or the interaction between anxiety and gender. To interpret the interaction between gender and avoidance, we reconducted the analysis for men and women separately and found that the relation between avoidance and poor problem-solving communication was statistically significant for men

($\beta = .354, p < .05$) but not for women ($\beta = .178, p = .22$), although the direction of the associations was the same.

In the analyses for sexual dissatisfaction, the addition of the attachment variables and gender improved model fit ($\Delta D = 25.41, p < .001$), and unexplained variance decreased mainly at the individual level (36%). The beta coefficient for avoidance was statistically significant, $\beta = .936$ ($z = 2.19$), but the coefficient for anxiety was not. Gender also had a significant effect ($\beta = 1.138, z = 2.82$), indicating that men were more sexually dissatisfied than women. The interactions were not statistically significant.

In summary, both attachment anxiety and avoidance predicted poor affective communication between relationship partners, and these effects were not moderated by gender. There was an interaction between avoidance and gender in predicting poor problem-solving communication because the positive association was somewhat stronger for men than for women. Sexual dissatisfaction was predicted by both avoidance and male gender, but gender and avoidance did not interact. These findings are good evidence for the validity of the ECR-S.

General Discussion

Together, the three studies indicate that the new Spanish version of the ECR, the ECR-S, has the intended factor structure; its two scales exhibit high internal consistency and appropriate test-retest reliability over a 6-week period. We have also provided preliminary evidence of the scales' criterion and construct validity. Because the factor structure of the measure and the internal consistency of its two scales replicated across samples, we recommend using the ECR-S in studies of Spanish-speaking adults, whether sampled from university communities or broader populations. Thirty-two of the 36 items functioned in Spanish much as they do in English (based on comparisons of factor loadings in the two languages), but four of the Spanish items produced nonoptimal loadings in both Study 1 and Study 2. For that reason, even though all the items might be used in further exploratory measurement

studies or cross-cultural comparisons at the item level, or might be used to examine the benefits of reworded items, we recommend using the 32-item version, with 17 avoidance items and 15 anxiety items—for most substantive purposes.

Regarding criterion-related validity, scores on the ECR-S subscales produced the predicted pattern with respect to Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) popular four-category measure of attachment style. That is, preoccupied and fearful adults had higher scores on the ECR-S anxiety scale than secure and dismissing adults, and dismissing and fearful adults had higher scores on the ECR-S avoidance scale than secure and preoccupied adults. In addition, people who were not involved in close relationships at the time of the study proved to be more avoidant, on average, than those who were involved in relationships, as expected. And those who had been in relationships longer were significantly less avoidant.

Supporting the construct validity of the ECR-S, its scales were related in theoretically predictable ways to two measures of couple functioning, one focusing on love and the other on marital dissatisfaction. Scores on the avoidance scale were associated with poor communication intimacy, low romantic dependence, and low romantic excitement or arousal. Scores on the attachment anxiety scale were associated with romantic dependence and excitement. Both anxiety and avoidance predicted poor affective communication, and anxiety predicted poorer problem-solving communication. Aside from the psychometric issues on which we have focused here, these results for a Spanish sample are substantively valuable and worth following up in future studies.

Another interesting substantive result was that the pattern of means on the two scales was different in the Spanish and American samples, with the Spanish anxiety mean being higher than the American anxiety mean, and the Spanish avoidance mean being slightly lower than the American avoidance mean. This difference is compatible with a previous cross-cultural study by Schmitt et al. (2004), suggesting that these differences indicate true cross-cultural differences in avoidant and anx-

ious romantic attachment, which researchers, family therapists, and social workers might take into account in their daily work.

One limitation of the study is that we sampled people in Studies 2 and 3 through social networks. In future studies, it might be useful to check the replicability of the findings in a random sample. It would also be worthwhile to study the general applicability of our results to other Spanish-speaking countries and subcultures. Over 300 million people in the world speak Spanish, and there are likely to be differences between dialects and subcultures that affect how people think and talk about close relationships. The nature and importance of these differences remain to be clarified.

Meanwhile, the ECR-S will prove useful in future studies of adult attachment, and for psychological assessment of Spanish-speaking individuals and couples in applied settings (e.g., adoption and foster care settings, marital therapy, and individual psychotherapy). If shorter scales are needed for some reason, items could be dropped based on the factor loadings provided in Appendix A. As research continues, the scales can be improved further, providing an increasingly important measurement tool for both researchers and professionals in applied settings.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Allen, J. P., & Land, D. (1999). Attachment in adolescence. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 319–335). New York: Guilford.
- Alonso-Arbiol, I., Balluerka, N., Shaver, P. R., & Gillath, O. (2006, July). *Psychometric properties of American and Spanish versions of the ECR adult attachment scale: A comparative study*. Poster presented at the 18th International Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Isle of Spetses, Greece.
- Alonso-Arbiol, I., Shaver, P. R., & Yáñez, S. (2002). Insecure attachment, gender roles, and interpersonal dependency in the Basque Country. *Personal Relationships*, 9, 479–490.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1969)
- 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.

- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46–76). New York: Guilford.
- Brennan, K. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1995). Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation, and romantic relationship functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 267–283.
- Brennan, K. A., Shaver, P. R., & Tobey, A. E. (1991). Attachment styles, gender, and parental problem drinking. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 451–466.
- Carreño, M., & Serrano, G. (1995). Análisis de instrumentos para la medida del amor [Analysis of tools for the measurement of love]. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 10, 131–148.
- Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (Eds.). (1999). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications*. New York: Guilford.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 783–802.
- Critelli, J. W., Myers, E. J., & Loos, V. E. (1986). The components of love: Romantic attraction and sex role orientation. *Journal of Personality*, 54, 354–370.
- Davis, D., Shaver, P. R., & Vernon, M. L. (2003). Physical, emotional, and behavioral reactions to breaking up. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 871–884.
- Davis, D., Shaver, P. R., & Vernon, M. L. (2004). Attachment style and subjective motivations for sex. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1076–1090.
- Feeney, J. A. (1994). Attachment style, communication patterns, and satisfaction across the life cycle of marriage. *Personal Relationships*, 1, 333–348.
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1996). *Adult attachment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Feeney, J. A., Noller, P., & Callan, V. J. (1994). Attachment style, communication and satisfaction in the early years of marriage. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships: Vol. 5. Attachment processes in adulthood* (pp. 269–308). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Flaherty, J. A., Gaviria, M., Pathak, D., Mitchell, T., Wintrob, R., Richman, J., et al. (1988). Developing instruments for cross-cultural psychiatric research. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 176, 257–263.
- Fraley, R. C., & Waller, N. G. (1998). Adult attachment patterns: A test of the typological model. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 77–114). New York: Guilford.
- 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.
- Fuller, T. L., & Fincham, F. D. (1995). Attachment style in married couples: Relation to current marital functioning, stability over time, and method of assessment. *Personal Relationships*, 2, 17–34.
- Gentzler, A. L., & Kerns, K. A. (2004). Associations between insecure attachment and sexual experiences. *Personal Relationships*, 11, 249–265.
- Griffin, D. W., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Models of self and other: Fundamental dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 430–445.
- Hambleton, R. K. (1994). Guidelines for adapting educational and psychological tests: Progress report. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 10, 229–244.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511–524.
- Lafontaine, M. F., & Lussier, Y. (2003). Structure bidimensionnelle de l'attachment amoureux: anxiété face à l'abandon et évitement de l'intimité [Bidimensional structure of attachment in love: Anxiety over abandonment and avoidance of intimacy]. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, 35, 56–60.
- Lussier, Y., Sabourin, S., & Turgeon, C. (1997). Coping strategies as moderators of the relationship between attachment and marital adjustment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14, 777–791.
- Mallinckrodt, B., & Wang, C. C. (2004). Quantitative methods for verifying semantic equivalence of translated research instruments: A Chinese version of the Experiences in Close Relationship Scale. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 51, 368–379.
- Mikulincer, M., & Nachshon, O. (1991). Attachment styles and patterns of self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 321–331.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2003). The attachment behavioral system in adulthood: Activation, psychodynamics, and interpersonal processes. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 35, pp. 53–152). New York: Academic Press.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. New York: Guilford.
- Nakao, T., & Kato, K. (2004). Constructing the Japanese version of the Adult Attachment Style Scale (ECR). *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, 75, 154–159.
- Noftle, E. E., & Shaver, P. R. (2006). Attachment dimensions and the big five personality traits: Associations and comparative ability to predict relationship quality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 179–208.
- Picardi, A., Bitetti, D., Puddu, P., & Pasquini, P. (2000). La scala "Experiences in close relationships" (ECL), un nuovo strumento per la valutazione dell'attaccamento negli adulti: Traduzione, adattamento e validazione della versione italiana [Development and validation of an Italian version of the questionnaire Experiences in Close Relationships, a new self-report measure of adult attachment]. *Rivista di Psichiatria*, 35, 114–120.
- Pistole, M. C. (1993). Attachment relationships: Self-disclosure and trust. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 15, 94–106.
- Rasbash, J., Browne, W., Goldstein, H., Yang, M., Plewis, I., Healy, M., et al. (2000). *A user's guide to MLwiN*. London: Institute of Education.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Reig-Ferrer, A., Cepeda-Benito, A., & Snyder, D. K. (2004). Utility of the Spanish Translation of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised in Spain. *Assessment*, 11, 17–26.
- Schmitt, D. P., Alcalay, L., Allensworth, M., Allik, J., Ault, L., Austers, I., et al. (2004). Patterns and universals of

- adult romantic attachment across 62 cultural regions: Are models of self and of other pancultural construct? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 367–402.
- Shaver, P. R., & Hazan, C. (1988). A biased overview of the study of love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 473–501.
- Tracy, J. L., Shaver, P. R., Albino, A. W., & Cooper, M. L. (2003). Attachment styles and adolescent sexuality. In P. Florsheim (Ed.), *Adolescent romance and sexual behavior: Theory, research, and practical implications* (pp. 137–159). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Appendix A. Expected item loadings (*italicized*) and item loadings on the ECR-S items and their equivalents in the original English ECR

English wording	Spanish wording
1. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down. (.551, .053)	1. Prefiero no mostrar a mi pareja cómo me siento por dentro. (.515, -.060) (.541, -.045)
2. I worry about being abandoned. (.053, .689)	2. Me preocupa que me abandonen. (-.079, .572) (-.066, .444)
3. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners. (R) (-.705, .045)	3. Me siento muy cómodo/a teniendo un alto grado de intimidad con mi pareja. (R) (-.453, .095) (-.476, .171)
4. I worry a lot about my relationships. (-.002, .647)	4. Me preocupo mucho por mis relaciones. (-.401, .359) (-.327, .416) (D)
5. Just when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away. (.676, .218)	5. Cuando mi pareja comienza a establecer mayor intimidad conmigo, me doy cuenta que me suelo cerrar. (.618, .198) (.597, .046)
6. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them. (.141, .709)	6. Me preocupa que mi pareja no se interese por mí tanto como me intereso yo por ella. (.030, .608) (-.026, .634)
7. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close. (.660, .137)	7. Me siento violento/a cuando mi pareja quiere demasiada intimidad afectiva. (.542, .206) (.467, .109)
8. I worry a fair amount about losing my partner. (.035, .734)	8. Me preocupa bastante el hecho de perder a mi pareja. (-.178, .597) (-.221, .564)
9. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners. (.705, .149)	9. No me siento cómodo/a abriéndome a mi pareja. (.570, .073) (.611, .052)
10. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him/her. (.133, .689)	10. A menudo deseo que los sentimientos de mi pareja hacia mí fueran tan fuertes como mis sentimientos hacia él/ella. (.047, .528) (.025, .600)
11. I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back. (.677, .251)	11. Quiero acercarme afectivamente a mi pareja, pero a la vez marco las distancias con él/ella. (.648, .175) (.624, .190)

(continued)

Appendix A. (continued)

English wording	Spanish wording
12. I often want to merge completely with romantic partners, and this sometimes scares them away. (.176, .538)	12. A menudo quiero fusionarme completamente con mi pareja, pero me doy cuenta que esto a veces le asusta. (.343, .323) (.310, .340) (D)
13. I am nervous when partners get too close to me. (.703, .207)	13. Me pongo nervioso/a cuando mi pareja consigue demasiada intimidad afectiva conmigo. (.617, .280) (.576, .138)
14. I worry about being alone. (.046, .724)	14. Me preocupa estar sólo/a. (-.089, .538) (-.133, .476)
15. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner. (R) (-.591, .075)	15. Me siento a gusto compartiendo mis sentimientos y pensamientos íntimos con mi pareja. (R) (-.629, .129) (-.617, .208)
16. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away. (.148, .563)	16. A veces mi deseo de excesiva intimidad asusta a la gente. (.196, .271) (.143, .273)
17. I try to avoid getting too close to my partner. (.694, .198)	17. Intento evitar establecer un grado de intimidad muy elevado con mi pareja. (.485, .083) (.450, .082)
18. I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner. (-.073, .694)	18. Necesito que mi pareja me confirme constantemente que me ama. (-.097, .520) (-.022, .564)
19. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner. (R) (-.665, -.045)	19. Encuentro relativamente fácil establecer intimidad afectiva con mi pareja. (R) (-.557, -.074) (-.466, -.030)
20. Sometimes I feel that I force my partners to show more feeling, more commitment. (-.051, .625)	20. A veces siento que presiono a mi pareja para que muestre más sentimientos, más compromiso. (.140, .540) (.098, .412)
21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners. (.459, .265)	21. Encuentro difícil permitirme depender de mi pareja. (.270, -.135) (.230, -.034)
22. I do not often worry about being abandoned. (R) (-.049, -.449)	22. No me preocupa a menudo la idea de ser abandonado/a. (R) (.060, -.582) (-.066, -.379)
23. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners. (.734, -.004)	23. Prefiero no tener demasiada intimidad afectiva con mi pareja. (.700, -.064) (.561, .064)
24. If I can't get my partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry. (.024, .639)	24. Si no puedo hacer que mi pareja muestre interés por mí, me disgusta o me enfado. (.059, .530) (.067, .539)
25. I tell my partner just about everything. (R) (-.745, .090)	25. Se lo cuento todo a mi pareja. (R) (-.567, .117) (-.501, .155)

(continued)

Appendix A. (continued)

English wording	Spanish wording
26. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like. (.239, .542)	26. Creo que mi pareja no quiere tener tanta intimidad afectiva conmigo como a mí me gustaría. (.441, .273) (.348, .292) (D)
27. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner. (R) (-.739, .089)	27. Normalmente discuto mis problemas y preocupaciones con mi pareja. (R) (-.650, .102) (-.654, .074)
28. When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure. (.046, .560)	28. Cuando no tengo una relación, me siento un poco ansioso/a e inseguro/a. (.028, .470) (-.014, .386)
29. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners. (R) (-.611, .059)	29. Me siento bien dependiendo de mi pareja. (R) (-.173, .311) (-.199, .308) (D)
30. I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like. (-.249, .645)	30. Me siento frustrado/a cuando mi pareja no me hace tanto caso como a mí me gustaría. (.027, .635) (.040, .657)
31. I don't mind asking romantic partners for comfort, advice, or help. (R) (-.700, .111)	31. No me importa pedirle a mi pareja consuelo, consejo, o ayuda. (R) (-.586, .120) (-.595, .109)
32. I get frustrated if romantic partners are not available when I need them. (-.216, .633)	32. Me siento frustrado/a si mi pareja no está disponible cuando la necesito. (-.054, .488) (-.047, .415)
33. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need. (R) (-.724, .161)	33. Ayuda mucho recurrir a la pareja en épocas de crisis. (R) (-.539, .244) (-.579, .176)
34. When romantic partners disapprove of me, I feel really bad about myself. (-.138, .592)	34. Cuando mi pareja me critica, me siento muy mal. (.026, .437) (-.007, .392)
35. I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance. (R) (-.712, .224)	35. Recurro a mi pareja para muchas cosas, entre otras, consuelo y tranquilidad. (R) (-.571, .340) (-.550, .330)
36. I resent it when my partner spends time away from me. (-.023, .578)	36. Me tomo a mal que mi pareja pase tiempo lejos de mí. (.067, .450) (-.060, .500)

Note. ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; (R) = reversed item; (D) = deleted item (in the final versions of the scales).