

# Romantic Attachment in Chilean Adults: Development of a Short-form Version of the Experiences in Close Relationships

Rosario Spencer<sup>1</sup>, Itziar Alonso-Arbiol<sup>2</sup> and Andrés Fresno<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad de Talca (Chile)

<sup>2</sup> Universidad del País Vasco UPV/EHU (Spain)

**Abstract.** Though the study of *romantic attachment* has expanded into all areas of psychology, it remains the case that there is no valid, reliable test available to measure it in Latin America. The present research objective was to adapt a Chilean version of the Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR; Brennan, Clark, & Shaver 1998) questionnaire, developing a short-form version, and to determine its factor structure in two samples of Chilean adults of different ages. A pool of 25 items was chosen to capture the two dimensions (Anxiety and Avoidance), which were obtained through principal components analysis in a sample of 477 adults. Subsequently, the short-form ECR's two-dimensional structure was confirmed using confirmatory factor analysis in a new sample ( $N = 296$ ). All sub-dimensions' internal consistencies were found to be satisfactory. Evidence for the test's concurrent validity with the variables age, gender, and socioeconomic status was also obtained. The dimensions of romantic attachment showed no differences according to age or gender. However, participants of high socioeconomic status exhibited lower levels of anxious attachment than those with low socioeconomic status. It was concluded that the Chilean short-form version of the ECR has good psychometric properties and is a suitable assessment of adult attachment.

Received 6 October 2011; Revised 11 February 2012; Accepted 30 May 2012

**Keywords:** romantic attachment, experiences in close relationships, Chile.

Bowlby's *attachment theory* (1980/1993) attempts to explain the tendency for human beings to form certain selective, stable, and enduring emotional ties; when such ties are broken, intense emotional suffering ensues. Though this theory was originally developed to explain primary attachment between children and their caregivers (Bowlby, 1969/1998), in the '80s, research was extended into adulthood, and adult attachment came to mean the intimate bond one forms with his or her romantic partner (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Since then, adult attachment in romantic relationships has been the subject of numerous studies (for a review, see Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

Research on adult romantic attachment, aims to study beliefs about people's behavior, feelings, and ways of behaving in romantic relationships (Shaver, Belsky, & Brennan, 2000). Two dimensions of adult romantic attachment have been identified by means of self-report

questionnaires: avoidance and anxiety (Brennan et al., 1998). The avoidance dimension captures the extent to which one rejects or avoids intimacy and physical and psychological closeness with the other, and how comfortable he or she feels depending on and being supported by others. The anxiety dimension is the extent to which one worries about being abandoned or rejected, has low self-esteem, and undervalues him or herself (Obegi, Morrison, & Shaver, 2004). The two scales combine to determine a person's security or insecurity of attachment such that individuals with low anxiety and avoidance present with secure adult attachment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Secure romantic attachment is characterized by having positive models of oneself, others, and romantic relationships (Olsson, Sorebo, & Dahl, 2010).

As Alonso-Arbiol and her colleagues (2010), argue in one study, the *Experience in Close Relationships questionnaire -ECR-* (Brennan et al., 1998), which evaluates the two dimensions of adult attachment (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002), is among the tests most widely used in studies of adult romantic attachment conducted in the last 10 years. Likewise, an analysis conducted by Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000) conveys that of the self-report questionnaires most often employed to assess adult attachment, the ECR has the fewest limitations and best psychometric properties, justifying its vast

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rosario Spencer. Facultad de Psicología Universidad de Talca. Avenida Lircay s/n. Talca. (Chile). Phone: +5671-201784.

E-mails: rspencer@utalca.cl or rosariospencer@gmail.com

This research was funded by research grants from the Chilean government's National Scientific and Technological Development Fund (FONDECYT N 11080093) that were awarded to the first author.

This article was made possible in part by support from the Quality of Life and Healthy Environments Research Program at the University of Talca Department of Psychology.

use in an array of studies in the fields of social, personality, and clinical psychology. These studies have allowed researchers to examine connections between attachment and several variables, including self-esteem (e.g., Cassidy, Ziv, Mehta, & Feeney, 2003), coping skills (e.g., Lopez & Gormley, 2002), and the ability to maintain intimacy and commit oneself to a romantic relationship (Treboux, Crowell, & Waters, 2004). From a clinical perspective, adult attachment has been associated with domestic violence (Treboux et al., 2004), psychiatric symptomatology (Vogel & Wei, 2005), and depression in non-clinical samples (Lopez, Mauricio, Gormley, Simko, & Berger, 2001). In conclusion, attachment studies have measured romantic attachment in adults, particularly using the ECR, have been conducted in a variety of settings, and are addressing themes of great importance within psychology, and also to our understanding of romantic relationships.

Nevertheless, the majority of said studies have been carried out in North American and European populations (e.g., Alonso-Arbiol, Balluerka, & Shaver, 2007; Lafontaine & Lussier, 2003). Latin American countries are poorly represented within the body of research on adult attachment. This has made it difficult to generalize research findings to culturally distinct populations like ones in Latin America. One reason for the dearth of literature on romantic attachment in Chile and other Latin American countries is the lack of valid tests available to measure it and to conduct such studies (Martínez & Santelices, 2005). Though the CAMIR adult attachment questionnaire was validated in Chile (Garrido, Santelices, Pierrehumbert, & Armijo, 2009), it assesses adult attachment strategies in past and present relationships in general; it is not specific to romantic relationships. Thus, at a loss for an instrument to evaluate adult romantic attachment, it has been impossible to examine that variable in a Chilean population, nor to conduct cross-cultural comparisons to refine our understanding of romantic attachment and its expression in adults.

As Alonso-Arbiol and her colleagues (2007); (Shaver, Mikulincer, Alonso-Arbiol, & Lavy, 2010) assert, to adapt the ECR, it would not only have to be translated. Researchers would need to determine its psychometric properties for the population and culture in which it will be used (Hambleton, 1994). Toward that end, the present paper's objective was to develop a valid, reliable version of the ECR so that studies of romantic attachment could be conducted in Chilean adults of many ages, not just young college students. This study's second aim was to develop a short-form version of the questionnaire to be used in studies requiring an extensive battery of tests to be administered.

The objectives above were operationalized through a validation study based on exploratory factor analysis

where in addition to analyzing the Chilean ECR's psychometric properties and developing a short-form version of it, we have described how it was adapted into Chilean Spanish. This research was completed by applying confirmatory factor analysis to the short-form version created in the study.

## Method

### Participants

The sample was comprised of 773 adults (434 women and 339 men) from the Maule region of Chile. Of those, 555 belonged to 185 different families (father, mother, son, or daughter) that were taking part in a broader study of attachment's transmission across generations. The remaining 218 participants (youths and adults) had no family ties to one another. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 78 years ( $M_{age} = 38$ ,  $SD = 14.45$ ). In pursuit of our research objectives, independent factor analyses were conducted (exploratory and confirmatory), so the sample was divided randomly into two subsets. The first sub-sample was made up of 477 participants (56% women), while the remaining 296 formed the second sub-sample (56.4% women).

Regarding the sample's distribution in terms of socioeconomic status, it was observed that 0.3% were lower class, 6.7% lower-middle class, 51.1% middle class, 29.8% upper-middle class, and 12.2% upper class. As for participants' level of education, it is estimated that of the total sample, 295 were pursuing higher education at the time of assessment. The remaining participants are distributed as follows in terms of level of education: 0.6% no formal education, 4.2% incomplete elementary schooling, 6.6% completed elementary school, 25.1% incomplete secondary education, 14.2% completed secondary education, 12.6% incomplete vocational training, 12.0% completed vocational training or attended but did not complete college, 20.0% college graduates.

### Instruments

Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR, Brennan et al., 1998; the Spanish version validated in Spain was used, Alonso-Arbiol et al., 2007). This self-report questionnaire assesses the dimensions of adult attachment. Participants respond to the original test's 36 statements on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 ("not at all like me") to 7 ("very much like me"). This generates two separate scores based on average scores on each dimension's respective items, which correspond to the two dimensions of adult attachment: Avoidance (of intimacy) and Anxiety (about relationships). Low scores on the two scales indicate secure romantic attachment.

Due to differences between the Spanish spoken in Spain and Chile, items from the version validated in

Spain were linguistically adapted (Alonso-Arbiol et al., 2007) using an expert panel to ensure their validity. We chose to start with the Spanish version, more culturally similar than the original English version, to ease the translation (Balluerka, Gorostiaga, Alonso-Arbiol, & Haranburu, 2007). Following the suggestions of Balluerka and her colleagues, four psychologists familiar with attachment theory and/or romantic partner psychology independently assessed each original item, suggesting changes if the wording seemed inappropriate for a Chilean population. Later, the original and adapted items were evaluated by three of the four expert judges that participated in the first stage. They reviewed the proposed modifications' fit to the meaning of the original items. Judges were asked if the items were suitable, somewhat suitable, or unsuitable. Heeding their suggestions, problematic items were adjusted and resubmitted to be newly assessed by the judges. Next, we determined interjudge agreement about the modifications, yielding a Kappa coefficient of interjudge reliability of 0.7. The main changes had to do with the word "intimacy" because in Chile, it is more closely associated with the sexual element of romantic relations. Therefore, a note was included at the beginning of the test introducing the term "intimacy" and explaining its meaning in the context of the questionnaire. The questionnaire's internal consistency is high, yielding Cronbach's alpha values of .83 (avoidance) and .84 (anxiety), very similar to those reported by Alonso-Arbiol and her colleagues (2007).

#### *Sociodemographic Variables Questionnaire*

Participants' age, gender, and socioeconomic status (SES) were evaluated by means of a sociodemographic questionnaire. Socioeconomic status was determined in accordance with ADIMARK's matrix (2004). This method is based on assessing two main variables. The first is the level of education attained by the household's main financial provider (from no formal education up to post-graduate education). The second variable corresponds to goods whose presence or absence in the household discriminates among groups with different SESs. The two variables combine to form a socioeconomic status matrix. Initially, we assigned SESs values from 1 to 5 where 1 (*lower class*), 2 (*lower-middle*), 3 (*middle*), 4 (*upper-middle*), and 5 (*upper*). The variable was later dichotomized to create two groups with clearly distinct SESs. The values 1 and 2 were grouped together to generate a low SES sample ( $n = 54$ ), while the values 4 and 5 were lumped together to constitute a high SES sample ( $n = 324$ ). To gain discriminant power, the value 3 was not taken into account here, the objective being to forge two different groups in a sample whose middle socioeconomic stratum was overrepresented. Differences

have been observed in the literature when it comes to the lower, or at-risk, strata in that they reportedly score higher on insecure attachment (e.g., van IJzendoorn & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 2010).

#### *Procedure*

By contacting universities in the city of Talca, young college students were invited to take part in the study; they were also asked to invite their parents or some other adult to participate. In 185 cases, the young's parents agreed to collaborate in the study. All participants took part in the research voluntarily, signed an informed consent form, and were assured of their anonymity and the confidentiality of their responses. The research team administered the battery of tests either at each participant's college, or in his or her home. In the first case, families were reimbursed for any money spent commuting to the location where the tests were administered. Otherwise, participants received no incentive to participate. The questionnaires were completed individually (note that they were administered before an earthquake severely affected the region in February, 2010).

#### *Data Analysis*

Principal components analysis with varimax rotation was carried out. Subsequently, the reliability of the scales' subdimensions was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Next, confirmatory factor analysis was performed on the second sample utilizing a parceling procedure. Concurrent validity was also analyzed using several variables. First, Pearson's correlations were computed for the age variable. Second, parametric means comparison using Student's *t* test was complemented by calculating effect size using Cohen's *d* for the age variable. Third, means comparison using the Mann-Whitney *U* non-parametric test was supplemented by calculating effect size using eta square ( $\eta^2$ ) for the socioeconomic status variable.

#### **Results**

Principal components analysis with varimax rotation was applied to the original, 36-item version using the sub-sample of 447 participants. Prior to this analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was computed and Bartlett's test of sphericity applied to determine whether or not factor analysis ought to be done. Both analyses yielded adequate results (KMO = .85) and in the case of Bartlett's test of sphericity, statistically significant results,  $\chi^2(630) = 4,744.64$   $p < .0001$ .

In our analysis, the strategy was to extract factors based on the following criteria: (a) scree-plot, (b) the factors' interpretability (having different semantic

content), and (c) an item saturation pattern suggesting clearly defined, distinguishable factors (the majority of items had a loading of at least  $|.40|$  on its own factor and  $|.30|$  or less on the other). Based on criteria a and b, we concluded there was an underlying 2-factor structure like in the original English version (Brennan et al., 1998) and the Spanish version (Alonso-Arbiol et al., 2007). This solution explained 29.8% of variance. The third criterion also suggested the two-factor structure was satisfactory as well as parsimonious; only 6 out of 36 items did not meet the standards described above.

A series of decisions was made to create a short, more robust test to evaluate the Anxiety and Avoidance dimensions of adult attachment. First, the 6 items alluded to in the last paragraph were eliminated because they loaded on factors other than the dimensions they were designed to measure. Once that was done, item analyses were carried out (see Table 1). The objective was to eliminate any items with low item-total correlations (defined *a priori* under .40) or any item that, if eliminated, would improve the scale's Cronbach's alpha. Five new items were eliminated based on the first criterion, but none were discarded as a result of the second.

After eliminating 11 items, principal components analysis with varimax rotation was carried out anew, producing a two-factor solution explaining 35.1% of total variance. The two dimensions' lack of correlation ( $r = -.03$ ) highlights the ECR's distinctly orthogonal structure that also characterized the English (American) and Spanish (Spain) versions. The 25 final items' factor loadings on each sub-dimension appear in Table 2. Internal consistency (Table 1) was computed by means of Cronbach's alpha, which yielded good results (.83 in both cases). The final anxiety scale consisted of 11 items, and avoidance of 14.

### Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The two-factor structure was tested in the second sub-sample using confirmatory factor analysis and the method of maximum likelihood estimation. Following the procedure that Alonso-Arbiol, Balluerka, Shaver, and Gillath (2008) employed to determine the factor structure of the original ECR in English and the Spanish version created in Spain, here too we employed a parceling technique. To reduce the number of parameters to be estimated, making the model easier to identify, the B-ECR's 25 items were grouped into 9 parcels (for an in-depth explanation of this procedure, see Little, Cunningham, Shahar, & Widaman, 2002).

According to the criteria proposed by Hoyle (1995) and Byrne (2010), we report that all the goodness of fit statistics used were found to be adequate ( $\chi^2/df$ : 3.15,

AGFI: .90, TLI: .91, CFI: .95, RMSEA: .08). This supports the two-factor model.

### Analysis of Concurrent Validity

The test's concurrent validity was examined in terms of its dimensions' associations with age and gender variables in the total sample, and with SES in the sub-sample. In the literature, the dimensions of attachment seem to be unrelated to gender (e.g., Brennan et al., 1998; Alonso-Arbiol et al., 2007) and age (e.g., Alonso-Arbiol, Shaver, & Yáñez, 2002). In our study, correlations between age and avoidance ( $r = .05$ ) and between age and anxiety ( $r = .03$ ) support that non-association. As for the means comparison between men and women on the two dimensions of attachment, no differences were observed in this study, neither in the case of avoidance,  $t(771) = -0.87$ ,  $p = .39$ ,  $M = 2.59$ ,  $SD = 1.00$  in women and  $M = 2.66$ ,  $SD = 0.93$  in men, Cohen's  $d = .06$ ; nor anxiety,  $t(771) = .01$ ,  $p = .99$ ,  $M = 4.25$ ,  $SD = 1.12$  in women and  $M = 4.26$ ,  $SD = 1.12$  in men, Cohen's  $d = .001$ .

With respect to socioeconomic status (SES), in keeping with our expectations (e.g., van IJzendoorn & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 2010), anxiety discriminated between the low and high SES sub-samples, but the magnitude of that difference was small ( $\eta^2 = .04$ ). Meanwhile, the low and high SES sub-samples' avoidance levels did not differ. These results are displayed in Table 3.

### Chilean B-ECR Standards

So as to provide norms for interpreting scores on the Chilean B-ECR in related, future studies, we computed percentages in the total sample of 772 participants (see Table 4). This is crucial because total scores are computed using averages of item values, not the sum of their values, so one must retain both decimal points when using this test in assessment. Since gender differences were not observed, the same standards apply to men and women alike.

### Discussion

The present study was conducted with the objective to adapt and examine the psychometric properties of a short-form version of the ECR to assess adult romantic attachment in a Chilean population. Applying principal components analysis to an earlier, more extensive version, as well as confirmatory factor analysis to a 25-item, short-form version clearly revealed a two-factor structure. The internal consistency of the ECR's two sub-scales was also found to be optimal. Moreover, additional evidence for its concurrent validity in terms of the variables age, gender, and socioeconomic status reinforces that the Chilean short-form version of the

**Table 1.** Analysis of Items on the Chilean ECR by Dimension ( $n = 477$ )

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if Item is Eliminated
Avoidance ( $\alpha = .835$ )				
1	2.68	1.95	.40	.830
3	2.04	1.57	.35	.832
5	2.70	1.77	.48	.825
7	2.68	1.82	.44	.827
9	2.56	1.85	.54	.821
11	3.10	1.89	.51	.823
13	2.34	1.67	.45	.826
15	2.33	1.75	.43	.827
17	2.48	1.64	.55	.821
19	2.80	1.71	.36	.831
23	2.33	1.63	.60	.818
25	3.37	1.92	.41	.829
27	2.36	1.61	.40	.829
31	2.13	1.54	.45	.826
33	2.14	1.47	.41	.829
35	2.37	1.44	.41	.829
Anxiety ( $\alpha = .838$ )				
2	4.52	2.04	.45	.829
4	4.47	1.74	.37	.834
6	4.81	1.91	.55	.822
8	5.02	1.97	.60	.819
10	5.35	1.78	.52	.825
12	3.02	1.82	.36	.835
14	4.44	2.11	.53	.823
18	4.57	1.89	.49	.826
20	3.47	1.92	.46	.828
24	3.93	2.01	.48	.827
28	3.49	2.00	.55	.822
30	3.85	1.84	.42	.831
32	4.30	1.84	.38	.833
36	4.49	1.79	.45	.829

ECR (B-ECR) is a valid, reliable tool to assess attachment in Chilean adult populations of various ages.

The observed lack of gender differences in the dimensions of adult attachment is consistent with the literature on this subject (Brennan et al., 1998). No statistically significant differences have been reported in the disparate samples in which this instrument has been applied, not even adult samples of different ages (Alonso-Arbiol et al., 2002). Similarly, the finding that scores on the anxiety and avoidance dimensions do not vary as a function of gender are consistent with earlier findings about romantic attachment (Lafontanie & Lussier, 2003; Olsson, Sorebo, & Dahl, 2010; Tsagarakis, Kafetsios, & Stalikas, 2007). In that vein, the findings favor the hypothesis that the gender variable does not affect the quality of attachment in adults (Bakermans-Kranenburg & van IJzendoorn, 2009; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; van IJzendoorn & Bakermans-Kranenburg,

2010). Conversely, a recent meta-analysis reported significant differences between men and women in terms of romantic attachment (Del Giudice, 2011). Its results, however, should be taken with a grain of salt considering that, as the author himself suggests, no research samples whatsoever were taken from Latin American populations. Furthermore, Del Giudice's meta-analysis was carried out using different instruments. That being said, a cross-cultural study of gender differences on the ECR (Alonso-Arbiol et al., 2010) did report gender differences occurring in highly masculine countries (i.e. Italy, Japan), that is, according to Hofstede's conception of masculine and feminine (1998, 2001). According to his classification, Chile is considered a feminine country, so one would not expect gender differences in the dimensions of attachment. This notion was supported by data from the Chilean sub-sample in the study by Alonso-Arbiol and her colleagues (2010).

**Table 2.** Factor Loadings of Items Retained after Principal Components Analysis

Item	Avoidance	Anxiety
1. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.	<b>.517</b>	-.053
2. I worry about being abandoned.	-.043	<b>.561</b>
5. Just when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away.	<b>.584</b>	.153
6. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.	-.004	<b>.655</b>
7. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.	<b>.566</b>	.117
8. I worry a fair amount about losing my partner.	-.130	<b>.696</b>
9. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.	<b>.646</b>	.117
10. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him/her.	-.092	<b>.635</b>
11. I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back.	<b>.601</b>	.211
13. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.	<b>.570</b>	.234
14. I worry about being alone.	-.100	<b>.655</b>
15. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner (R).	<b>.501</b>	-.251
17. I try to avoid getting too close to my partner.	<b>.658</b>	.086
18. I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner.	-.010	<b>.582</b>
20. Sometimes I feel that I force my partners to show more feeling, more commitment.	.084	<b>.524</b>
23. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.	<b>.713</b>	.090
24. If I can't get my partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry.	.115	<b>.588</b>
25. I tell my partner just about everything (R).	<b>.494</b>	-.240
27. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner (R).	<b>.459</b>	-.139
28. When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure.	.061	<b>.616</b>
30. I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like.	.068	<b>.476</b>
31. I don't mind asking romantic partners for comfort, advice, or help (R).	<b>.512</b>	-.125
33. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need (R).	<b>.477</b>	-.147
35. I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance (R).	<b>.468</b>	-.242
36. I resent it when my partner spends time away from me.	-.102	<b>.526</b>

Note: R = Reworded items. Items with factor loadings over .40 appear in bold.

Regarding the association between low SES and anxiety, and the non-association between SES and the avoidance dimension, the results partially confirmed our expectations. However, the literature that directly links socioeconomic status to attachment usually stems from non-romantic conceptualizations of adult attachment. For example, van IJzendoorn, and Bakermans-Kranenburg (2010), who evaluated adult attachment using the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI; George, Kaplan & Main, 1985), observed an over-representation of dismissive and preoccupied attachment (similar to anxiety) in a sample of men with low SES. These results assert that socioeconomic status, particularly poverty and the difficulties associated with it, is a variable that can affect security of attachment in adults. The differential datum reported in our study, that low SES is only linked to anxiety (and not avoidance), might tentatively lead us to argue that an unfavorable economic situation specifically influences the dimension of attachment related to the need to find a partner. From a material standpoint, increased risk of losing one's partner would also entail losing the complementary resources a spouse can provide. Therefore, it stands to reason that one might adopt a more anxious attachment style where each member is overly vigilant of the other's presence and

interest in continuing the relationship. From a more psychological perspective, and bearing in mind the association between experiencing negative or unfavorable life events and higher levels of attachment anxiety (Drake, Sheffield, & Shingler, 2011), the support of one's partner (attachment figure) is key to decreasing that kind of anxiety. If more situations threaten one's security of attachment, perhaps the attachment system is continuously activated. If that were the case, a common strategy might be to rely on one's partner being constantly present to alleviate that anxiety.

This study makes one unequivocal contribution to the literature, a short-form test. Increasingly many authors advocate for creating short-form surveys. They are advantageous in that they can be more rapidly administered, and sample participants prefer them (e.g., Gallarin & Alonso-Arbiol, in press; Gorostiaga, Balluerka, Alonso-Arbiol, & Haranburu, 2011).

On a different note, this cultural adaptation deserves special mention. Balluerka and her colleagues (2007) argue the importance of cultural and linguistic aspects in adaptation, even when the same language is used. This aspect was previously emphasized in attachment research using the ECR (Alonso-Arbiol et al., 2007;

**Table 2.** Factor Loadings of Remaining Items after Principal Components Analysis

Item	Avoidance	Anxiety
1. Prefiero no mostrar a mi pareja mis sentimientos personales.	<b>.517</b>	-.053
2. Me preocupa que me abandonen.	-.043	<b>.561</b>
5. Cuando mi pareja comienza a establecer mayor intimidad, me doy cuenta que tiendo a cerrarme.	<b>.584</b>	.153
6. Me preocupa que mi pareja no se interese por mí tanto como yo me intereso por ella.	-.004	<b>.655</b>
7. Me siento muy irritado cuando mi pareja quiere demasiada intimidad emocional.	<b>.566</b>	.117
8. Me preocupa bastante la posibilidad de perder a mi pareja.	-.130	<b>.696</b>
9. Me siento incomodo abriéndome a mi pareja.	<b>.646</b>	.117
10. Frecuentemente deseo que los sentimientos de mi pareja hacia mí sean tan fuertes como son mis sentimientos hacia él/ella.	-.092	<b>.635</b>
11. Quiero acercarme afectivamente a mi pareja, pero a la vez pongo distancia entre nosotros.	<b>.601</b>	.211
13. Me pongo nervioso/a cuando mi pareja logra demasiada intimidad emocional conmigo.	<b>.570</b>	.234
14. Me preocupa estar solo/a.	-.100	<b>.655</b>
15. Me siento cómodo/a compartiendo mis sentimientos y pensamientos íntimos con mi pareja. (R)	<b>.501</b>	-.251
17. Intento evitar establecer demasiada intimidad con mi pareja.	<b>.658</b>	.086
18. Necesito que mi pareja me reafirme constantemente que me ama.	-.010	<b>.582</b>
20. A veces siento que presiono a mi pareja para que muestre más sentimientos, más compromiso hacia nuestra relación.	.084	<b>.524</b>
23. Prefiero no tener demasiada intimidad emocional con mi pareja.	<b>.713</b>	.090
24. Si no logro que mi pareja muestre interés por mí, me molesto o me enojo.	.115	<b>.588</b>
25. Se lo cuento todo a mi pareja. (R)	<b>.494</b>	-.240
27. Frecuentemente converso sobre mis problemas y preocupaciones con mi pareja. (R)	<b>.459</b>	-.139
28. Cuando no tengo una relación de pareja, me siento un poco ansioso/a e inseguro/a.	.061	<b>.616</b>
30. Me siento frustrado/a cuando mi pareja no me hace tanto caso como a mí me gustaría.	.068	<b>.476</b>
31. No me complica pedirle a mi pareja que me ayude, me consuele o me aconseje. (R)	<b>.512</b>	-.125
33. Me ayuda mucho recurrir a mi pareja en épocas de crisis. (R)	<b>.477</b>	-.147
35. Recorro a mi pareja para muchas cosas, por ejemplo cuando necesito consuelo y tranquilidad (R)	<b>.468</b>	-.242
36. Me molesta que mi pareja pase tiempo lejos de mí.	-.102	<b>.526</b>

Note: R = Reworded items. Items with factor loadings over .40 appear in bold.

**Table 3.** SES Differences in the Dimensions of Attachment

Dimensions	SES	Average Range	Mann-Whitney <i>U</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta^2$
Avoidance	Low SES	199.42	8212.500	.471	.01
	High SES	187.85			
Anxiety	Low SES	242.71	5874.500	.000	.04
	High SES	180.63			

Note: SES = Socioeconomic Status.

Shaver et al., 2010). Other Chilean authors have suggested the need to provide national standards for questionnaires created or validated in Spain to reflect the cultural specificity of the population in which the instrument will be used (Fernández, Dufey, & Kramp, 2011; Guerra Vio, Castro Arancibia, & Vargas Castro, 2011). The short-form ECR devised here is useful due to its brevity and its reliability. This study's results can be considered a starting point to study several variables associated with adult attachment in the Chilean context. In addition to its benefits to advancing research, developing this short-form version and reporting Chilean standards will be

of tremendous use to the multitude of professionals working in applied psychology.

Nevertheless, the present study is not without limitations that should be kept in mind and overcome in future research. Among its limitations is the sample utilized; it is not representative of the Chilean population because a considerable percentage of families (fathers-mothers and sons or daughters) of young college students were included. This created a bias toward over-representation of middle-class participants. Notwithstanding, this limitation, this sample was more representative than others made up entirely of college

**Table 4.** Chilean Standards for Dimensions of Attachment

Percentage	Avoidance	Anxiety
5	1.14	2.36
10	1.43	2.81
15	1.57	3.09
20	1.71	3.36
25	1.93	3.55
30	2.00	3.73
35	2.14	3.82
40	2.29	4.00
45	2.36	4.18
50	2.50	4.36
55	2.57	4.45
60	2.74	4.55
65	2.93	4.72
70	3.07	4.91
75	3.29	5.09
80	3.50	5.18
85	3.79	5.45
90	4.00	5.73
95	4.29	6.03

students (e.g., Alonso-Arbiol et al., 2002; Brennan et al., 1998; Wongpakaran, Wongpakaran, & Wedding, 2011) in which adults of other ages have been included. The sample's SES posed an additional limitation in that the poorest sectors of the population were very under-represented. Conversely, the middle-class was very well represented. This could be explained by how the sample was gathered. Participants were contacted through universities, to which only a portion of the population has access.

Future research could develop a short-form version of the ECR in non-Chilean, Spanish-speaking populations and test its psychometric properties. That way, a cross-cultural study of adult attachment could be conducted. In addition, future research should more deeply analyze the instrument's external validity and examine the relationship between adult romantic attachment, as evaluated by the B-ECR, and other psychological and behavioral variables that the literature shows may correlate with romantic attachment.

## References

- Adimark GfK** (2004). Mapa socioeconómico de Chile, nivel socioeconómico de los hogares del país basado en datos del Censo 2002 [Socioeconomic map of Chile, household socioeconomic status according to 2002 Census Data]. Santiago de Chile, Chile: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.adimark.cl/medios/estudios/Mapa\\_Socioeconomico\\_de\\_Chile.pdf](http://www.adimark.cl/medios/estudios/Mapa_Socioeconomico_de_Chile.pdf)
- Alonso-Arbiol I., Balluerka N., & Shaver P.** (2007). A Spanish version of the Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) adult attachment questionnaire. *Personal Relationships*, 14, 45–63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2006.00141.x>

- Alonso-Arbiol I., Balluerka N., Shaver P., & Gillath O.** (2008). Psychometric properties of the Spanish and American versions of the ECR adult attachment questionnaire: A comparative study. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 24, 9–13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.24.1.9>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1475-6811.00030>
- Alonso-Arbiol I., van de Vijver F. J. R., Shaver P. R., Azaiza F., Brassard A., Çelenk O., ... , & Spencer R.** (2010, July). Proceedings from the IARR Conference 2010: *Culture and the dimensions of romantic attachment*. Herzliya, Israel.
- Bakermans-Kranenburg M., & van IJzendoorn M.** (2009). No reliable gender differences in attachment across the lifespan. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32, 22–23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0900003X>
- Balluerka N., Gorostiaga A., Alonso-Arbiol I., & Haranburu M.** (2007). La adaptación de instrumentos de medida de unas culturas a otras: Una perspectiva práctica [Test adaptation from one culture to another: A practical perspective]. *Psicothema*, 19, 124–133.
- Bartholomew K., & Horowitz L.** (1991). Attachment styles among young-adults: A test of a 4 category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226–244. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226>
- Bowby J.** (1969/1998). *El apego y la pérdida Vol. 1: El apego* [Attachment and loss Vol. 1: Attachment]. Barcelona, Spain: Paidós.
- Bowlby J.** (1980/1993). *El apego y la pérdida Vol 3: La pérdida* [Attachment and loss Vol. 3: Loss]. Barcelona, Spain: Paidós.
- Brennan K., Clark C., & Shaver P.** (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. Simpson & W. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46–76). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Byrne B.** (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cassidy J., Ziv Y., Mehta T. G., & Feeney B. C.** (2003). Feedback seeking in children and adolescents: Associations with self-perceptions, attachment representations, and depression. *Child Development*, 74, 612–628. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.7402019>
- Del Giudice M.** (2011). Sex differences in romantic attachment: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 193–214. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167210392789>
- Drake K. E., Sheffield D., & Shingler D.** (2011). The relationship between adult romantic attachment anxiety, the experience of negative life events, and compliance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 742–746. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.12.034>
- Fernández A. M., Dufey M., & Kramp U.** (2011). Testing the psychometric properties of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) in Chile: Empathy in a different cultural context. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 27, 179–185. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000065>



- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.350>
- Gallarín M., & Alonso-Arbiol I.** (in press). Dimensionality of the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA): Evaluation with the Spanish version. *Spanish Journal of Psychology*.
- Garrido L., Santelices M. P., Pierrehumbert B., & Armijo I.** (2009). Validación chilena del cuestionario de evaluación de apego en el adulto CAMIR [Chilean validation of the CAMIR adult attachment assessment]. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología, 41*, 81–98.
- George C., Kaplan N., & Main M.** (1985). *The Adult Attachment Interview*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Gorostiaga A., Balluerka N., Alonso-Arbiol I., & Haranburu M.** (2011). Validation of the Basque Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 27*, 193–205. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000067>
- Guerra Vio C., Castro Arancibia L., & Vargas Castro J.** (2011). Examen psicométrico del Cuestionario de Clima Social del Centro Escolar en estudiantes chilenos [Psychometric test of the School Social Climate Questionnaire in Chilean students]. *Psicothema, 23*, 140–145.
- 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. R.** (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511–524. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511>
- Hofstede G.** (1998). *Masculinity and Femininity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede G. H.** (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hoyle R. H.** (Ed.) (1995). *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lafontaine M. F., & Lussier Y.** (2003). Structure bidimensionnelle de l'attachement amoureux: Anxiété face à l'abandon et évitement de l'intimité [The two-dimensional structure of romantic attachment: Abandonment anxiety and intimacy avoidance]. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement, 35*, 56–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0087187>
- Little T. D., Cunningham W. A., Shahar G., & Widaman K. F.** (2002). To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. *Structural Equation Modeling, 9*, 151–173. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902\\_1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_1)
- Lopez F. G., & Gormley B.** (2002). Stability and change in adult attachment style over the first-year college transition: Relations to self-confidence, coping, and distress patterns. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 355–364. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.49.3.355>
- Lopez F. G., Mauricio A. M., Gormley B., Simko T., & Berger E.** (2001). Adult attachment orientations and college student distress: The mediating role of problem coping styles. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 79*, 459–464. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2001.tb01993.x>
- Martínez C., & Santelices M. P.** (2005). Evaluación del apego en el adulto: Una revisión [Evaluation of adult attachment: A review]. *Psykhé, 14*, 181–191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-22282005000100014>
- Mikulincer M., & Shaver P.** (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Obegi J. H., Morrison T. L., & Shaver P. R.** (2004). Exploring intergenerational transmission of attachment style in young female adults and their mothers. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*, 625–638. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407504045891>
- Olsson I., Sorebo O., & Dahl A.** (2010). The Norwegian version of the experiences in close relationships measure of adult attachment: Psychometric properties and normative data. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry, 64*, 340–349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/08039481003728586>
- Shaver P. R., Belsky J., & Brennan K. A.** (2000). The adult attachment interview and self-reports of romantic attachment: Associations across domains and methods. *Personal Relationships, 7*, 25–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2000.tb00002.x>
- Shaver P. R., & Mikulincer M.** (2002). Dialogue on adult attachment: Diversity and integration. *Attachment and Human Development, 4*, 243–257. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14616730210157484>
- Shaver P. R., Mikulincer M., Alonso-Arbiol I., & Lavy S.** (2010). Assessment of adult attachment across cultures: Conceptual and methodological considerations. In P. Erdman, K. M. Ng, & S. Metzger (Eds.), *Attachment: Expanding the cultural connections* (pp. 89–108). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Treboux D., Crowell J. A., & Waters E.** (2004). When “new” meets “old:” Configurations of adult attachment representations and their implications for marital functioning. *Developmental Psychology, 40*, 295–314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.40.2.295>
- Tsagarakis M., Kafetsios K., & Stalikas A.** (2007). Reliability and validity of the Greek version of the revised experience in close relationships measure of adult attachment. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 23*, 47–55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.23.1.47>
- van IJzendoorn M. H., & Bakermans-Kranenburg M. J.** (2010). Invariance of adult attachment across gender, age, culture, and socioeconomic status? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27*, 200–208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407509360908>
- Vogel D. L., & Wei M.** (2005). Adult attachment and help-seeking intent: The mediating roles of psychological distress and perceived social support. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 347–357. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.3.347>
- Wongpakaran T., Wongpakaran N., & Wedding D.** (2011). Gender differences, attachment styles, self-esteem and romantic relationships in Thailand. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 36*, 409–417. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.12.001>