

Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment

A Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Validation of the Vulnerable Attachment Style Questionnaire

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	JOBA-811R2
Full Title:	A Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Validation of the Vulnerable Attachment Style Questionnaire
Article Type:	Original Research
Keywords:	attachment; Vulnerable Attachment Style Questionnaire (VASQ); Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA); disordered eating; Mood; Stress
Corresponding Author:	Nuriye Kupeli, M.Sc University of Hertfordshire Hertfordshire, UNITED KINGDOM
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Hertfordshire
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Nuriye Kupeli, M.Sc
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Nuriye Kupeli, M.Sc Sam Norton, Ph.D Joseph Chilcot, Ph.D Ulrike Schmidt, Ph.D Iain Campbell, Ph.D Nicholas Alexander Troop, Ph.D
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	<p>Objective: The Vulnerable Attachment Style Questionnaire (VASQ; Bifulco, Mahon, Kwon, Moran & Jacobs, 2003) was developed to assess adult attachment as a vulnerability factor for developing depression and identified two subscales, insecure attachment and proximity-seeking. The present study sought to confirm and further validate the factor structure of the VASQ in a large community convenience sample.</p> <p>Method: The VASQ was completed by a large sample of men and women (N = 1236) as part of an online survey. The data were randomly split to allow both independent exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) to be conducted.</p> <p>Results: A four-factor model consisting of two types of proximity-seeking (lack of autonomy and anxious-dependent) and insecurity (ambivalent and avoidant-dismissive) attachment patterns proved to be the best-fitting measurement model in this sample ($\chi^2=186.7$, $df=71$, $p<.001$; CFI=.945, TLI=.929, RMSEA=.05). Although similar to the original questionnaire, the new factor structure resulted in the elimination of several items. Validity was confirmed with the shortened VASQ as similar associations with mood, stress, eating pathology and sex were observed for both the new shortened VASQ and original version of the VASQ.</p> <p>Conclusions: The structure of the VASQ was broadly consistent with the original solution although some items were removed and both subscales were further split into two sub-factors. Future research should use this tool in clinical and non-clinical groups to provide further support for its factor structure and to determine the clinical and theoretical usefulness of the different subscales.</p>

A Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Validation of the Vulnerable Attachment Style Questionnaire

Nuriye Kupeli*¹, Sam Norton², Joseph Chilcot², Ulrike H. Schmidt², Iain C. Campbell²
& Nicholas A. Troop³

¹ Marie Curie Palliative Care Research Unit, University College London, UK

² Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London, UK

³ School of Psychology, University of Hertfordshire, UK

*Requests for correspondence should be addressed to: Nuriye Kupeli, Marie Curie Palliative Care Research Unit, Division of Psychiatry, University College London, 67-73 Charles Bell House, Riding House Street, London, W1W 7EJ, U.K (Email: N.Kupeli@ucl.ac.uk; Tel: 020 7679 9724)

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Professor Antonia Bifulco for her helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. This research was supported by a Medical Research Council-Economic and Social Research Council (MRC-ESRC) interdisciplinary award.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

A Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Validation of the Vulnerable
Attachment Style Questionnaire

Abstract

Objective: The Vulnerable Attachment Style Questionnaire (VASQ; Bifulco, Mahon, Kwon, Moran & Jacobs, 2003) was developed to assess adult attachment as a vulnerability factor for developing depression and identified two subscales, insecure attachment and proximity-seeking. The present study sought to confirm and further validate the factor structure of the VASQ in a large community convenience sample.

Method: The VASQ was completed by a large sample of men and women ($N = 1236$) as part of an online survey. The data were randomly split to allow both independent exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) to be conducted.

Results: A four-factor model consisting of two types of proximity-seeking (*lack of autonomy* and *anxious-dependent*) and insecurity (*ambivalent* and *avoidant-dismissive*) attachment patterns proved to be the best-fitting measurement model in this sample ($\chi^2=186.7$, $df=71$, $p<.001$; CFI=.945, TLI=.929, RMSEA=.05). Although similar to the original questionnaire, the new factor structure resulted in the elimination of several items. Validity was confirmed with the shortened VASQ as similar associations with mood, stress, eating pathology and sex were observed for both the new shortened VASQ and original version of the VASQ.

Conclusions: The structure of the VASQ was broadly consistent with the original solution although some items were removed and both subscales were further split into two sub-factors. Future research should use this tool in clinical and non-clinical groups to provide further support for its factor structure and to determine the clinical and theoretical usefulness of the different subscales.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Keywords

Attachment

Vulnerable Attachment Style Questionnaire (VASQ)

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Disordered eating

Mood

Stress

Introduction

Attachment refers to the bond that develops between an infant and its caregiver to provide young children not only with a sense of security and to aid survival but to develop patterns of emotion regulation (Bowlby, 1977). Following observations of caregiver-infant interactions, Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall (1978) formulated the three types of attachment styles known as secure, anxious/ambivalent and avoidant, with the latter two referring to insecure attachment styles. The attachment between an infant and its caregiver can persist and even shape later affectional bonds formed during adulthood (Ainsworth, 1985). Hazan and Shaver's (1987) research suggests that the infant-caregiver attachment bond described by Ainsworth (1985) provides a plausible framework for understanding attachments formed in adulthood. Secure attachment patterns in adulthood characterise adults who are comfortable with getting close to and depending on others. However, those with an avoidant attachment style have difficulty trusting others and are uncomfortable with intimacy. Anxious/ambivalent adults worry that others do not really care about them and are often characterised as being highly dependent on others.

The theoretical foundations of attachment theory (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1977) have been used to develop measures to assess patterns of attachment behavior in adulthood (see reviews: Crowell & Treboux, 1995; Lyddon, Bradford & Nelson, 1993; Ravitz, Maunder, Hunter, Sthankiya & Lancee, 2010). These include both interview-based and self-report assessments. Research demonstrates that securely attached individuals (as opposed to insecurely attached) develop the ability to self-

1
2
3
4 soothe and regulate their emotions (Sloman, Gilbert & Hasey, 2003). Therefore,
5
6
7 measures assessing adult attachment styles have been used to evaluate the impact of
8
9
10 adult attachments (specifically insecurity of attachment) on psychopathology including
11
12 depression, anxiety, stress and eating disorders (e.g., Bifulco, Kwon, Jacobs, Moran,
13
14 Bunn & Beer, 2006; Ditzen, Schmidt, Strauss, Nater, Ehlert & Heinrichs, 2008; Kidd,
15
16 Hamer & Steptoe, 2011; Mickelson, Kessler & Shaver, 1997; Ward, Ramsay & Treasure,
17
18 2000; Zachrisson & Skårderud, 2010).
19
20
21

22 A review of adult attachment measures is beyond the scope of this report (for a
23
24 full review see; Ravitz et al., 2010) but a brief summary of some of the key measures
25
26 may be useful. The Adult Attachment Styles (AAS; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) is a categorical
27
28 measure consisting of three short descriptions of adult attachment attitudes. Collins and
29
30 Read (1990) used the individual statements of the AAS (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) to
31
32 develop a continuous measure of adult attachment. Using factor analysis, these authors
33
34 identified three types of attachment styles, trusting and depending on others (Depend
35
36 dimension), relationship anxiety including fear of being abandoned (Anxiety dimension)
37
38 and being comfortable with closeness and intimacy (Close dimension). Other measures
39
40 of adult attachment styles include the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew &
41
42 Horowitz, 1991) and the Experiences in Close Relationships questionnaire (ECR;
43
44 Brennan, Clark & Shaver, 1998). Although both of these measures assess secure,
45
46 preoccupied, fearful and dismissing attachment styles, the ECR (Brennan et al., 1998)
47
48 examines these four styles based on attachment-related anxiety and avoidance.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 While a number of authors have sought to develop measures of attachment that
5
6 identify theoretically meaningful styles, Bifulco, Mahon, Kwon, Moran and Jacobs
7
8 (2003) argued that it is important to develop a measure which not only assesses the
9
10 severity of vulnerable attachment in adulthood but one that can identify those at high
11
12 risk for psychopathology such as depression. Based on the Attachment Style Interview
13
14 (ASI; Bifulco, Moran, Ball & Bernazzani, 2002a; Bifulco, Moran, Ball & Lillie, 2002b)
15
16 Bifulco et al. (2003) developed the Vulnerable Attachment Style Questionnaire (VASQ).
17
18 This is a 22-item scale used to assess the degree of vulnerability to psychopathology due
19
20 to attachment issues. Specifically two subscales were identified, labelled as 'Insecurity'
21
22 and 'Proximity-seeking'. Insecurity was a stronger predictor of depression than was
23
24 Proximity-seeking, although in some analyses the combined scores were stronger
25
26 predictors of depression than either scale on its own (Bifulco et al., 2003). Other authors
27
28 have also found that it is the Insecurity subscale rather than Proximity-seeking which is
29
30 more strongly related to psychopathology. The Insecurity subscale is positively related
31
32 to depressive symptoms, loneliness and detached mourning (an attitude that
33
34 maintaining an emotional involvement with a close one who has died will hinder the
35
36 mourning process) and negatively correlated with perceptions of competence,
37
38 autonomy, relatedness and social support (Carr, Colthurst, Coyle & Elliott, 2012; Sochos
39
40 & Bone, 2012).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Ravitz et al.'s (2010) systematic review of adult attachment measures suggests
54
55 that the VASQ has good validity and reliability indicating that it is a promising measure
56
57 and the authors recommend its further use and development. Its potential importance
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 also stems from the fact that Bifulco et al. (2003) demonstrated that it is a better
5
6
7 predictor of the subsequent onset of depression than another widely used measure of
8
9 attachment styles, the RQ (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).
10

11
12 Clearly, further psychometric evaluation of the VASQ is warranted as to date, the
13
14 original study (Bifulco et al., 2003) is the only study which has examined the
15
16 psychometric properties of the VASQ. In addition, the original development of the VASQ
17
18 was based on a sample of middle-aged women and their family members (Bifulco et al.,
19
20 2003), thus limiting its generalizability to the general population. Therefore, the aim of
21
22 the current study was to examine the factor structure using exploratory and
23
24 confirmatory factor analyses in a large and diverse sample. It was hypothesized that
25
26 based on Bifulco et al.'s (2003) study, a two-factor solution consisting of Insecurity and
27
28 Proximity-seeking would be found with the current data. However, as other measures of
29
30 adult attachment styles reflect between two and four types of attachment patterns, the
31
32 current study will also explore three and four factor solutions of the VASQ. For example,
33
34 the ECR (Brennan et al., 1998) differentiates between anxious and avoidance
35
36 attachment behaviours, whilst the AAS (Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987)
37
38 and the RQ (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) assess three and four types of adult
39
40 attachment styles, respectively. There are many similarities between VASQ items and
41
42 statements that have been used in these other measures to reflect different attachment
43
44 patterns in adulthood. For example, the Insecurity scale of the VASQ includes items such
45
46 as 'I find it hard to trust others' which correspond to 'I find it difficult to trust them'
47
48 (Avoidant category; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Similarly, the Proximity-seeking component
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 includes items such as 'I worry about things happening to close family and friends'
5
6
7 which reflects 'I worry a lot about my relationships' (Anxiety category; Brennan et al.,
8
9 1998).

10
11
12 In addition, the current study validated the VASQ in terms of its associations with
13
14 mood, stress and eating disorder symptoms. In particular, associations between these
15
16 constructs and the newly confirmed factor structure were compared with associations
17
18 between these constructs and the original scoring method for the VASQ. Finally, as the
19
20 original paper by Bifulco et al. (2003) and later studies (Carr et al., 2012; Doyle,
21
22 McNamara, Cheevers, Finnegan, Logue & McEntee, 2010) which used the VASQ did not
23
24 examine sex differences, the current study also explored any differences that may be
25
26 present between men and women when assessing adult attachment patterns using the
27
28 VASQ. Although, Scohos and Bone (2012) did find that gender was associated with the
29
30 Proximity-seeking subscale but not with the Insecurity subscale. Also, based on previous
31
32 studies (Kobak & Hazen, 1991; Roberts, Gotlib & Kassel, 1996) using other adult
33
34 attachment measures it is hypothesized that women will indicate more attachment
35
36 insecurity compared to men.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 In summary, it is plausible that the VASQ contains one, two, three or four
47
48 factors. The aim of the present study is to confirm the factor structure of the VASQ,
49
50 explore the relationship between the VASQ and other psychological constructs such as
51
52 mood, stress and disordered eating behaviours, and examine sex differences using data
53
54 gathered from a large predominantly community-based sample.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Method

Participants and procedure

Participants were recruited as part of a longitudinal study investigating stress, mood, bodyweight and disordered eating ($N = 1236$). Participants were recruited from several sources including social networking sites and health and well-being forums and at the University of Hertfordshire. Participants completed the survey online which was created using the Bristol Online Survey (BOS; University of Bristol, 2010) facility. For the overall sample, mean age was 28.7 (s.d 10.7) and most participants were female, white, either employed or were students and either single or married/in a relationship (see Table 1).

Measures

Primary Measure: Attachment

The VASQ (Bifulco et al. 2003) is a 22-item scale assessing behaviors, emotions and attitudes relating to adult attachment. Participants are asked to rate each statement on a 5-point Likert scale (“Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”). The VASQ can be used to compute a total score reflecting vulnerable attachment and two separate subscales indicating insecure and proximity-seeking attachment patterns. Items 14 and 15 were positive items and so were reversed in order to be scored consistently with other vulnerable attachment items. Higher scores indicate a more vulnerable attachment when computing a total score and more insecurity and proximity-seeking attachment when using the subscales. Cronbach’s alpha for the overall VASQ and its

1
2
3
4 subscales, insecurity and proximity-seeking, in the current study were $\alpha = .79$, $\alpha = .82$
5
6
7 and $\alpha = .73$, respectively, which are similar to the Cronbach's alpha's reported for the
8
9
10 insecurity ($\alpha = .82$) and proximity-seeking ($\alpha = .67$) scales by Bifulco et al., (2003).
11
12
13

14 Mood

15
16
17 Mood was assessed using the Short Depression-Happiness Scale (SDHS; Joseph,
18
19
20 Linley, Harwood, Lewis & McCollam, 2004). The SDHS (Joseph et al. 2004) consists of 6
21
22
23 statements, which requires participants to rate how they have felt over the last 7 days
24
25
26 on a 4-point Likert scale ("Never" to "Often"). The SDHS (Joseph et al. 2004) is a bi-
27
28
29 directional scale with lower scores indicating low mood and higher scores indicating
30
31
32 happiness. Cronbach's alpha for the SDHS (Joseph et al. 2004) in the present sample was
33
34
35
36
37
38 .88.
39

40 Disordered Eating Behaviors

41
42
43 Disordered eating was assessed using the Eating Disorder Examination
44
45
46 Questionnaire (EDE-Q; Fairburn & Beglin, 1994). The EDE-Q (Fairburn & Beglin, 1994) is
47
48
49 a 36-item questionnaire consisting of 4 subscales assessing dietary restraint and weight,
50
51
52 shape and eating concerns. Of the 36 items, 22 are rated on a 7-point Likert scale from
53
54
55 "No days" to "Every day". From the remaining 14 items are diagnostic rather than
56
57
58 continuous and were not included in the present analysis. Only the total EDE-Q score is
59
60
61 reported here. Cronbach's alpha for the EDE-Q (Fairburn & Beglin, 1994) in the current
62
63
64
65 sample was $\alpha = .94$.

Stress

Stress was assessed using the Perceived Stress Scale-4 (PSS-4; Cohen & Williamson, 1988), a 4-item measure of stress perceptions. Individuals were required to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (“Very often” to “Never”) the degree to which they appraise situations as stressful with higher scores indicating greater perceptions of stress. Cronbach’s alpha for the PSS-4 (Cohen & Williamson, 1988) in the present sample was .80.

Statistical analysis

The data were randomly split to perform Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) using the first half of the randomly split dataset (the training sample, $n = 602$) in Mplus version 6 (Muthén & Muthén, 2010). Oblique Geomin rotation was employed since the extracted factors were expected to correlate. A number of methods were used to determine the appropriate number of factors to extract. These were the Kaiser criterion (eigenvalues > 1), scree plot, optimal co-ordinates, acceleration factor and comparison data method. This was undertaken in R using the nFactors package (Raiche & Magis, 2011) and the comparison data method described by Ruscio and Roche (2012). Items were removed from the EFA if their factor loadings were non-significant or if they loaded significantly but weakly (i.e., $<.40$) onto more than one factor.

The best fitting models identified from the EFA (after removal of non-significant and double loadings) were subsequently selected for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

1
2
3
4 using the second half of the dataset (the testing sample, $n = 634$) from which post-hoc
5
6
7 modifications could be sought and evaluated.
8

9
10 CFA was conducted using Mplus version 6 (Muthén & Muthén, 2010) with
11
12 analyses computed using the Maximum Likelihood estimator (ML) as responses were
13
14 approximately normally distributed. Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 2010) generates several
15
16 fit indices to assess how well the proposed model fits the sample data. Firstly, the χ^2
17
18 statistic may be used as a measure of fit between the sample covariance and fitted
19
20 covariance matrices (Byrne, 1998). Although a non-significant χ^2 is desired, due to the
21
22 large sample size of the current study, a significant χ^2 is expected based on standard
23
24 statistical theory of how sample size, power and significance are associated (Cohen,
25
26 1992). Therefore, in addition to the χ^2 statistic several fit indices were evaluated
27
28 including the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the
29
30 Tucker Lewis Index (TLI). The model with the lowest BIC is preferred (Raftery, 1995) and
31
32 values $> .95$ for the CFI and TLI indicate a reasonable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The Root
33
34 Mean Square Error of the Approximation (RMSEA) is another fit index which takes into
35
36 account the error of approximation in the population (Byrne, 1998). RMSEA values $< .05$
37
38 indicate a good model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Composite Reliability (ρ) was used as a
39
40 measure of internal reliability (ρ values $> .70$ indicate good internal reliability; Bacon,
41
42 Sauer & Young, 1995).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Similar to the original paper by Bifulco et al. (2003), further analyses were
55
56 conducted to examine associations between the subscales of the VASQ and mood.
57
58
59 Associations between the VASQ and disordered eating and stress were performed in
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 order to validate the measure further. Additional analyses were also conducted to
5
6
7 examine sex differences as a test of concurrent validity for each of the subscales. Effect
8
9 sizes as measured by Cohen's d were also reported with .20, .50 and .80 representing
10
11 small, medium and large effects, respectively (Cohen, 1992).
12
13
14

15 16 17 **Results**

18 19 20 *Sample characteristics*

21
22 The data set of 1236 participants was randomly split into two training and
23
24 testing samples from which EFA ($n = 602$) and CFA ($n = 634$) were conducted.
25
26 Comparisons between the training and testing samples with regards to demographic
27
28 variables are shown in Table 1. The two groups did not differ with respect to age, BMI,
29
30 gender, ethnicity, marital and employment status. Furthermore, individual scores on the
31
32 Proximity-seeking and Insecurity scales of the VASQ and the SDHS, EDE-Q and PSS-4 did
33
34 not differ between the groups (p values range between .11 to 1.0). These results suggest
35
36 that the random split was successful, allowing two independent samples to be analysed.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Table 1 about here
47
48
49

50 51 *Exploratory Factor Analysis of the VASQ*

52
53 Models extracting between 2 and 4 factors were considered based on the
54
55 indication of the scree plot (elbows at 2 and 4 factors), acceleration factor (2 factors)
56
57 optimal co-ordinates (4 factors), parallel analysis (4 factors) and comparison data
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 method (4 factors). Six eigenvalues were observed to be greater than one, however the
5
6 Kaiser criterion is known to over extract the number of factors (Fabrigar, 1999) and
7
8 eigenvalues for the fifth and sixth factors were close to one so were not considered. The
9
10 two factor EFA model revealed the expected insecurity and proximity-seeking structure,
11
12 however the fit of the model was poor using standard SEM criteria ($X^2=946.5$, $df=188$,
13
14 $p<.001$; $BIC=37917.198$, $CFI=.765$, $TLI=.711$, $RMSEA=.08$). The three factor EFA model
15
16 split the proximity-seeking scale into separate factors, but still exhibited poor model fit
17
18 ($X^2=982.3$, $df=168$, $p<.001$; $BIC=37781.035$, $CFI=.840$, $TLI=.781$, $RMSEA=.07$). The four
19
20 factor model further split the insecure factor into two subscales ($X^2=513.3$, $df=149$,
21
22 $p<.001$; $BIC=37733.595$, $CFI=.887$, $TLI=.825$, $RMSEA=.06$). The fit of the four factor model
23
24 was still outside acceptable limits but was chosen for further analysis because it
25
26 provided closer fit to the data than the two or three factor solutions, the pattern of
27
28 loadings made theoretical sense and the extraction of four factors was indicated by both
29
30 the parallel analysis and comparison data methods, which have been shown to perform
31
32 well in simulation studies (Ruscio & Roche, 2012).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Using the criteria outlined above, items 1 (“I take my time getting to know
44
45 people”), 3 (“People let me down a lot”), 9 (“People close to me often get on my
46
47 nerves”) and 17 (“I feel uneasy when others confide in me”) from the original Insecurity
48
49 scale and items 4 (“I miss the company of others when I am alone”), 14 (“I look forward
50
51 to spending time on my own”) and 21 (“Its important to have people around me”) from
52
53 the Proximity-seeking scale were excluded. Based on the four-factor structure, items 3,
54
55 4, 17 and 21 were removed as their factor loadings were weak ($<.40$) while items 1, 9
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 and 14 were eliminated due to both weak factor loadings (<.40) and double loadings
5
6 thus limiting their interpretation. The four-factor solution was re-estimated after
7
8 excluding these items and the fit of the model was within acceptable limits ($X^2=98.1$,
9
10 $df=51$, $p<.001$; $BIC=25951.783$, $CFI=.978$, $TLI=.955$, $RMSEA=.04$). The loading pattern was
11
12 similar to the original solution described by Bifulco et al. (2003) but with the original
13
14 Insecurity and Proximity-seeking scales each split into two further subscales and item 13
15
16 (“I am clingy with others”) loading onto one of the insecurity subscales instead of a
17
18 proximity-seeking subscale. Of the two subscales that spilt from the original proximity-
19
20 seeking subscale, one reflected overreliance and difficulty making decisions while the
21
22 other reflected dependence and fear of abandonment. These were labelled *lack of*
23
24 *autonomy* (common variance explained = 19.8%) and *anxious-dependent* (common
25
26 variance explained = 20.7%), respectively. Of the two subscales that split from the
27
28 original insecure subscale, one reflected dismissiveness and mistrust, while the other
29
30 reflected antagonism and clinginess. These were labelled *avoidant-dismissive* (common
31
32 variance explained = 29.6%) and *ambivalent* (common variance explained = 30.0%),
33
34 respectively. The rotated Geomin factor solution can be seen in table 2.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Table 2 about here
49
50
51
52

53 *Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the VASQ*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Firstly, the original factor structure proposed by Bifulco et al. (2003) was
5
6
7 examined in the testing sample and revealed poor fit to the data since all fit indices
8
9
10 were outside their recommended cut-off ranges (see model A, Table 3).
11
12
13

14
15 Table 3 about here
16
17
18
19

20 Following the exclusion of several items (see above), the four-factor model
21
22 derived from the EFA was evaluated in the testing sample using CFA. This model (model
23
24 B) demonstrated a reasonable fit to the data as evidenced by the fit indices (see Table
25
26 3). However, there were issues regarding item 13, as in the EFA solution: item 13 loaded
27
28 onto the *Ambivalent* factor but the modification indices (MI) ranged between 20.73 to
29
30 65.22, suggesting this item should also load on the other three factors. Given the
31
32 multiple loading of item 13 and, as the wording of this item seemed to be best
33
34 described by the *Ambivalent* subscale, a further CFA was carried out removing item 13
35
36 completely (see model C, Table 3). The fit indices of this modified model were within
37
38 acceptable levels (see model C, Table 3).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Figure 1 about here
49
50
51
52

53 While a four-factor solution has been found here, the original factor structure
54
55 described by Bifulco et al. (2003) suggests that a two-factor solution, combining the two
56
57 Proximity-seeking subscales (*Lack of autonomy* and *Anxious-dependent* [6 items]) and
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the two Insecurity subscales (*Avoidant-dismissive* and *Ambivalent* [8 items]) identified
5
6 here, might also be sufficient. This alternative higher-order model was tested and
7
8 revealed a slight decline in all fit indices but still had a reasonable fit to the data,
9
10 providing support for Bifulco et al.'s (2003) two-factor structure (see model D, Table 3),
11
12 albeit with a smaller number of items ($n = 14$). The higher-order model is shown in
13
14 figure 1 accompanied by standardised model coefficients.
15
16
17
18
19

20 Composite reliabilities (ρ) for the four subscales of *Lack of autonomy*, *Anxious-*
21
22 *dependent*, *Avoidant-dismissive* and *Ambivalent* in the modified VASQ were .69, .67, .79
23
24 and .64, respectively. In addition, and similar to the original study by Bifulco et al.
25
26 (2003), internal reliabilities were calculated for the shortened 14-item version of the
27
28 VASQ by combining the *Lack of autonomy* and *Anxious-dependent* subscales to create
29
30 the Proximity-seeking scale and the *Avoidant-dismissive* and *Ambivalent* to create the
31
32 Insecurity scale. Composite reliabilities for the Proximity-seeking ($\rho = .55$) and Insecurity
33
34 ($\rho = .82$) scales show that the Proximity-seeking scale is outside of the reasonable
35
36 threshold ($\rho < .70$; Bacon et al., 1995).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 VASQ: Intercorrelations with mood, disordered eating, stress and gender differences

46
47

48 High intercorrelations were found between the subscales of the original 22-item
49
50 and the new 14-item version of the VASQ. The Insecurity subscales taken from the two
51
52 versions correlated at .97 ($p < .001$) and the Proximity-seeking subscales correlated at .91
53
54 ($p < .001$). Table 4 shows the intercorrelations between the VASQ subscales for the
55
56 original 22-item version and the new shortened 14-item version of the VASQ. Significant
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 correlations were found between the Insecurity and Proximity-seeking scales for both
5
6
7 the original 22-item version and the new shortened 14-item version of the VASQ.

8
9 Significant correlations are present between the two Proximity-seeking subscales and
10
11 the two Insecurity subscales for the 14-item VASQ and between the individual subscales
12
13 except between the *Lack of autonomy* and *Avoidant-dismissive* subscales ($p = .81$). As
14
15 expected, smaller correlations are present between the subscales of the Insecurity scale
16
17 and the subscales of the Proximity-seeking scale highlighting that these are distinct
18
19
20
21
22 patterns of adult attachment.
23
24
25
26

27
28 Table 4 about here
29
30
31

32
33 Correlations between the SDHS, EDE-Q and PSS-4 and the Proximity-seeking and
34
35 Insecurity scales of the VASQ were very similar for both the original 22-item and the
36
37 new 14-item versions. High scores on the Proximity-seeking and Insecurity scale were
38
39 associated with lower scores on the SDHS and higher scores on the EDE-Q and PSS-4.
40
41
42 Significant correlations between the SDHS, EDE-Q and PSS-4 and the individual subscales
43
44 of the 14-item version of the VASQ were found (Pearson r 's ranging from $-.47$ to $.41$).
45
46
47

48
49 Women scored higher on both the overall Proximity-seeking scale and its
50
51 subscales (*Lack of autonomy* and *Anxious-dependent*) than men for the 14-item version
52
53 of the VASQ but did not differ significantly for the Insecurity scale or its subscales. These
54
55 differences are consistent with the results for the full 22-item VASQ (see Table 5).
56
57

58
59 Cohen's d was calculated as a measure of effect size which revealed small to large
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Cohen, 1992) effect sizes, with medium effects for the proximity-seeking scale (and its subscales) and large effects for the EDE-Q.

Table 5 about here

Discussion

An EFA and CFA were conducted to determine the factor structure of the VASQ in a large and demographically diverse sample. To our knowledge the only study that has previously examined the factor structure of the VASQ is the original paper in which the measure was developed (Bifulco et al., 2003). Current findings indicate that the VASQ measures four factors, two types of proximity seeking, labelled *Lack of autonomy* and *Anxious-dependent* and two types of Insecurity of attachment, labelled *Avoidant-dismissive* and *Ambivalent*. *Lack of autonomy* and *Anxious-dependent* differ as forms of proximity-seeking in that the former refers to relying on the attachment figure for help and support whereas the latter refers to anxiety over the attachment figure's absence. *Avoidant-dismissive* and *Ambivalent* differ as forms of Insecurity in that the former has a focus on one's internal emotional state in relation to others whereas the latter has a focus on the expectations of the individual and interactions with the attachment figure.

This is similar to Bifulco et al.'s (2003) original findings but with the two attachment subscales each splitting into two further subscales. The analyses revealed that several modifications were required to achieve a good fit. These included the removal of several items due to low factor loadings and/or double loadings. The results

1
2
3
4 also showed that a two-factor solution could be created by combining the two
5
6 Proximity-seeking subscales (*Lack of autonomy* and *Anxious-dependent*) together and
7
8 the two Insecurity subscales (*Avoidant-dismissive* and *Ambivalent*) together (should
9
10 researchers prefer). Although combining the subscales together to create a two-factor
11
12 solution does not show a detrimental effect on the psychometric quality of the VASQ,
13
14 researchers should be cautious when combining these subscales as the Proximity-
15
16 seeking scale of the 14-item solution was found to have low composite reliability which
17
18 can present some challenges. A reason for low reliability found for the Proximity-seeking
19
20 scale could be due to the small number of items that were retained following EFA and
21
22 CFA. Elimination of several items during EFA and CFA can pose a threat to the validity of
23
24 the measure. However, the original structure of the VASQ was maintained with both
25
26 two- and four-factor solutions producing the same two Insecurity and Proximity-seeking
27
28 subscales in this sample providing further support for Bifulco et al.'s (2003) original
29
30 model and also increasing its specificity. This is evidenced further by the fact that the
31
32 effect size between the original and the modified VASQ scales with other psychological
33
34 constructs are equivalent in size, thus suggesting that construct validity is maintained
35
36 with the removal of eight items.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The original 22-item and the new 14-item versions performed almost identically
49
50 in terms of intercorrelations between the Proximity-seeking and Insecurity scales
51
52 (demonstrating high construct validity) and in their associations with mood, disordered
53
54 eating, stress and sex. In terms of the more specified four-factor solution, while Bifulco
55
56 et al. (2003) reported an association between depression and the Insecurity scale but
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 not the Proximity-seeking scale, the present study found that mood was associated with
5
6
7 both Insecurity and Proximity-seeking scales, although the correlations between the
8
9
10 Insecurity scales and mood were larger compared to those between the Proximity-
11
12 seeking scales and mood. All scales and subscales were associated with disordered
13
14 eating and perceptions of stress. Finally, sex differences were found for the overall
15
16 Proximity-seeking scale for both the 14-item and 22-item versions of the VASQ and its
17
18 subscales (*Lack of autonomy* and *Anxious-dependent*) with women reporting less
19
20 autonomy and more dependence on others than men. Similarly, research using the
21
22 VASQ has found that gender is associated with Proximity-seeking subscale but not with
23
24 the Insecurity subscale (Sochos & Bone, 2012). Studies using other measures of
25
26 attachment styles have shown that men report feeling more comfortable with getting
27
28 close to others than do women (Roberts et al., 1996) and married men report
29
30 themselves to be less reliant on their wives (Kobak & Hazen, 1991). In support of these
31
32 findings, effect size analyses revealed that there is a medium effect of sex on proximity-
33
34 seeking behaviours. Also, in line with previous research, a very large effect of sex on
35
36 disordered eating behaviours were found with women reporting more dysfunctional
37
38 eating behaviours compared to men (e.g., Lewinsohn, Seeley, Moerk & Striegel-Moore,
39
40 2002). Additionally, the associations between the VASQ and psychopathology and sex
41
42 are maintained and further highlight the predictive validity of the VASQ when using a
43
44 psychometrically improved version identified through CFA.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 *Strengths and limitations*

59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The current study recruited a non-clinical sample and responses from a clinical
5
6 group may have revealed a different factor solution. Another possible limitation is that
7
8 the data were collected online and it is arguable that the use of traditional paper-and-
9
10 pencil methods of data collection may have led to a different set of results. However,
11
12 previous research has demonstrated that online responses are generally as valid and
13
14 reliable as those collected offline (Hiskey, 2002).
15
16
17
18
19

20 The present study has noteworthy strengths, for example the recruitment of a
21
22 large predominantly community-based sample. This not only provided the analyses with
23
24 good power but also allows the findings to be generalised to groups outside of the
25
26 sample of middle-aged women and their family members with which the VASQ was
27
28 originally developed. Nevertheless, the sample in the present study was predominantly
29
30 white and female and therefore was not entirely representative of the general
31
32 population. A caveat of these findings is that further testing should be conducted before
33
34 this measure is used in older adults, as the mean age of the present sample was 29
35
36 years old. In addition, associations with mood, disordered eating and stress were cross-
37
38 sectional rather than longitudinal, in contrast to the association between onset of
39
40 depression and the VASQ in Bifulco et al.'s (2003) study. Finally, as very few items were
41
42 found to load onto the Proximity-seeking scale and its subscales, the overall reliability of
43
44 this component of the measure was compromised.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 *Implications*

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Notwithstanding the above limitations, our findings have a number of important
5
6
7 implications. From a theoretical point of view, the present study supported the original
8
9
10 findings of Bilfulco et al. (2003), indicating that a two-factor structure consisting of
11
12
13 insecurity of attachment and proximity-seeking patterns provides a suitable fit.
14
15 Furthermore, the discovery that the two original scales can be split into two further
16
17
18 subscales in order to differentiate between avoidant-dismissive and ambivalent types of
19
20
21 insecure attachment and lack of autonomy versus anxious-dependent types of
22
23
24 proximity-seeking attachment patterns is potentially important. Although measures of
25
26
27 attachment in adulthood label attachment patterns differently, there are similarities
28
29
30 between measures such as the number of attachment patterns that are found and the
31
32
33 items that reflect each style. Therefore, the finding that the two original VASQ scales
34
35
36 split into two further subscales each is similar to other (and more widely used) adult
37
38
39 attachment measures (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Brennan et al., 1998;
40
41
42 Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Similarities between the four attachment
43
44
45 patterns derived from the VASQ are also similar to those described by other measures
46
47
48 of adult attachment. For example, the anxious-dependent component of proximity-
49
50
51 seeking reflects a combination of the items that reflect the anxious and depend
52
53
54 categories by Collins and Read (1990) and anxiety items from the ECR (Brennan et al.,
55
56
57 1998). The avoidant-dismissive component of the insecurity of attachment scale
58
59
60 contains items that are similar to the dismissive-avoidant category reflected in the RQ
61
62
63 (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).
64
65

1
2
3
4 Furthermore, the use of both two- and four-factor models of the VASQ will allow
5
6
7 future research to build on our current understanding of these attachment patterns and
8
9
10 how these separable attachment styles can impact differently on outcomes and/or
11
12 respond differently to intervention. These four attachment patterns are clearly
13
14 separable aspects of adult attachment styles but the degree to which this distinction is
15
16 clinically and/or theoretically meaningful requires further investigation. The
17
18 demonstration of reliability and validity of the VASQ supports its future use by both
19
20 researchers and clinicians to evaluate those who are at high risk for psychopathology
21
22 such as depression, anxiety, stress and eating disorders.
23
24
25
26

27
28 Future research should explore the associations between the VASQ and other
29
30 measures of attachment. For example, the Avoidant-dismissive versus Ambivalent
31
32 subtypes of Insecure attachment found here may be related to the model-of-self versus
33
34 model-of-other scales that can be calculated in the RQ (Bartholomew & Horowitz,
35
36 1991). Whether the modified VASQ reported here outperforms other attachment
37
38 measures in predicting psychopathology (as was found in Bifulco et al.'s (2003) study)
39
40 also requires confirmation.
41
42
43
44

45
46 The current study has built on the original development of the VASQ.
47
48 Specifically, it has expanded its generalisability by using a large, predominantly
49
50 community-based sample. However, in order to develop the VASQ further, emphasis
51
52 must be placed on using this potentially valuable tool in other settings in order to
53
54 demonstrate its generalisability to a range of diverse clinical and non-clinical groups and
55
56 provide further support for its two- and four-factor structure.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1985). Attachments across the life span. *Bulletin of the New York*
8
9 *Academy of Medicine, 61, 792-811*
- 10
11 Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E. & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A*
12
13 *psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- 14
15 Bacon, D. R., Sauer, P. L. & Young, M. (1995). Composite reliability in Structural Equations
16
17 *Modeling. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55, 394-406*
- 18
19
20
21
22 Bartholomew, K. & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a
23
24
25 four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 226-244*
- 26
27
28 Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds: I. Aetiology and
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Psychopathology in the light of attachment theory. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 130, 201-*
210
- Bifulco, A., Kwon, J. H., Jacobs, C., Moran, P. M., Bunn, A. & Beer, N. (2006). Adult attachment
style as mediator between childhood neglect/abuse and adult depression and anxiety.
Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 41, 796-805
- Bifulco, A., Mahon, J., Kwon, J. H., Moran, P. M. & Jacobs, C. (2003). The Vulnerable
Attachment Style Questionnaire (VASQ): An interview-based measure of attachment
styles that predict depressive disorder. *Psychological Medicine, 33, 1099-1110*
- Bifulco, A., Moran, P. M., Ball, C. & Bernazzani, O. (2002a). Adult attachment style: I. Its
relationship to clinical depression. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 37, 50-*
59

- 1
2
3
4 Bifulco, A., Moran, P. M., Ball, C. & Lillie, A. (2002b). Adult attachment style: II. Its relationship
5
6
7 to psychosocial depressive-vulnerability. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*,
8
9
10 37, 60-67
- 11
12 Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L. & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult
13
14
15 attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment*
16
17
18 *theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford Press
- 19
20 Bristol Online Survey (BOS, 2010). University of Bristol. <http://www.survey.bris.ac.uk>
- 21
22
23 Byrne, B. M. (1998). *Structural equation modelling with Lisrel, Prelis, and Simplis: Basic*
24
25
26 *concepts, applications, and programming*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates,
27
28 Inc.
- 29
30 Carr, S., Colthurst, K., Coyle, M. & Elliott, D. (2012). Attachment dimensions as predictors of
31
32
33 mental health and psychosocial well-being in the transition to the University. *European*
34
35
36 *Journal of Psychology in Education*
- 37
38 Cohen, J. (1992). Power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155-159
- 39
40
41 Cohen, S. & Williamson, G. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United
42
43
44 States. In Spacapan, S. and Oskamp, S. (Eds.) *The Social Psychology of Health: Claremont*
45
46
47 *Symposium on Applied Social Psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- 48
49 Collins, N. L. & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality
50
51
52 in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 644-663
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 1
2
3
4 Ditzen, B., Schmidt, S., Strauss, B., Nater, U. M., Ehlert, U. & Heinrichs, M. (2008). Adult
5
6 attachment and social support interact to reduce psychological but not cortisol responses
7
8 to stress. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 64, 479-486
9
10
11 Doyle, O., McNamara, K., Cheevers, C., Finnegan, S., Logue, C. & McEntee, L. (2010). Preparing
12
13 for life early childhood intervention impact evaluation report 1: Recruitment and baseline
14
15 characteristics. *Discussion Paper Series, No. 201050*, Geary Institute: University College
16
17 Dublin
18
19
20
21
22 Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of
23
24 exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272–
25
26 299
27
28
29
30 Fairburn, C. G. & Beglin, S. J. (1994). Assessment of eating disorders: Interview or self-report
31
32 questionnaire. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 16, 363-370.
33
34 Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process.
35
36 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524
37
38
39 Hiskey, S. (2002). *Intrusive experiences and psychological adjustment following trauma*.
40
41 Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Essex, Essex, United Kingdom
42
43
44 Hu, L. & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:
45
46 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55
47
48
49 Joseph, S., Linley, S. J., Harwood, J., Lewis, C. A., & McCollam, P. (2004). Rapid assessment
50
51 well-being: The Short Depression-Happiness Scale (SDHS). *Psychology and*
52
53 *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 77, 463-478
54
55
56
57 Kidd, T., Hamer, M. & Steptoe, A. (2011). Examining the association between adult
58
59 attachment style and cortisol responses to acute stress. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 36,
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 771-779
5
6

7 Kobak, R. R. & Hazan, C. (1991). Attachment in marriage: Effects of security and accuracy of
8
9 working models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 861-869
10

11 Lewinsohn, P. M., Seeley, J. R., Moerk, K. C. & Striegel-Moore, R. H. (2002). Gender
12
13 differences in eating disorder symptoms in young adults. *International Journal of Eating*
14
15 *Disorders*, 32(4), 426-440
16
17

18 Lyddon, W. J., Bradford, E. & Nelson, J. P. (1993). Assessing adolescent and adult attachment:
19
20 A review of current self-report measures. *Journal of Counselling and Development*, 71,
21
22 390-395
23
24

25 Mickelson, K. D., Kessler, R. C. & Shaver, P. R. (1997). Adult attachment in a nationally
26
27 representative sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1092-1106
28
29

30 Muthén, L. K. & Muthén, B. O. (2010). *Mplus Version 6*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén
31
32

33 Raftery, A. E. (1995). Bayesian model selection in Social Research. *Sociological Methodology*,
34
35 25, 111-163
36
37

38 Raiche, G., & Magis, D. (2011). *R package nFactors (version 2.3.3): Parallel Analysis and Non*
39
40 *Graphical Solutions to the Cattell Scree Test*. Retrieved from [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nFactors)
41
42

43 [project.org/package=nFactors](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nFactors)
44
45
46

47 Ravitz, P., Maunder, R., Hunter, J., Sthankiya, B. & Lancee, W. (2010). Adult attachment
48
49 measures: A 25-year review. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 69, 419-432
50
51

52 Roberts, J. E., Gotlib, I. H. & Kassel, J. D. (1996). Adult attachment security and symptoms of
53
54 depression: The mediating roles of dysfunctional attitudes and low self-esteem. *Journal*
55
56 *of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 310-320
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Ruscio, J., & Roche, B. (2012). Determining the number of factors to retain in an exploratory
5
6 factor analysis using comparison data of known factorial structure. *Psychological*
7
8 *Assessment, 24*(2), 282-292
9
10
11
12 Scohos, A. & Bone, A. (2012). Attitudes towards continuing bonds, attachment vulnerability,
13
14 and the moderating effects of gender. *Journal of Loss and Trauma, 17*, 260-270
15
16
17 Sloman, L., Gilbert, P. & Hasey, G. (2003). Evolved mechanisms in depression: The role and
18
19 interaction of attachment and social rank in depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders,*
20
21 *74*, 107-121
22
23
24
25 Ward, A., Ramsay, R. & Treasure, J. (2000). Attachment research in eating disorders. *British*
26
27 *Journal of Medical Psychology, 73*, 35-51
28
29
30 Zachrisson, H. D. & Skårderud, F. (2010). Feelings of insecurity: Review of attachment and
31
32 eating disorders. *European Eating Disorders Review, 18*, 97-106
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1: Demographic variables across EFA and CFA split sample

Variable	Total (<i>n</i> = 1236)	EFA Sample (<i>n</i> = 602)	CFA Sample (<i>n</i> = 634)
Age (<i>SD</i>)	28.7 (10.7)	28.7 (10.8)	28.7 (10.7)
Male % (<i>n</i>)	20.2 (250)	19.1 (115)	21.3 (135)
Female % (<i>n</i>)	79.8 (986)	80.9 (487)	78.7 (499)
Ethnicity (<i>n</i>)			
White %	75.4 (932)	75.4 (454)	75.4 (478)
Other %	24.6 (304)	24.6 (148)	24.6 (156)
Marital status % (<i>n</i>)			
Single	39.0 (482)	38.7 (233)	39.3 (249)
Married	21.1 (261)	21.9 (132)	20.3 (129)
In a relationship	22.6 (279)	22.4 (135)	22.7 (144)
Living with a partner	13.5 (167)	13.1 (79)	13.9 (88)
Divorced	3.3 (41)	3.5 (21)	3.2 (20)
Widowed	.5 (6)	.3 (2)	.6 (4)
Employment % (<i>n</i>)			
Student	50.3 (622)	50.8 (306)	49.8 (316)
Employed	41.3 (510)	40.5 (244)	42.0 (266)
Unemployed	4.9 (60)	5.5 (33)	4.3 (27)
At home with children	2.5 (31)	2.5 (15)	2.5 (16)
Retired	1.1 (13)	.7 (4)	1.4 (9)
BMI (<i>SD</i>)	24.9 (6.2)	25.0 (6.0)	24.8 (6.3)
SDHS (<i>SD</i>)	11.8 (4.2)	12.0 (4.2)	11.6 (4.2)
EDE-Q (<i>SD</i>)	2.0 (1.4)	2.0 (1.5)	1.9 (1.4)
PSS-4 (<i>SD</i>)	7.2 (3.4)	7.1 (3.3)	7.2 (3.5)
<u>22-item VASQ</u>			
Insecurity (<i>SD</i>)	31.9 (7.6)	31.8 (7.4)	31.9 (7.7)
Proximity-seeking (<i>SD</i>)	29.0 (5.9)	29.0 (6.0)	29.0 (5.9)

Note. SDHS = Short Depression-Happiness Scale; EDE-Q = Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire; PSS-4 = Perceived Stress Scale-4

Table 2: EFA solution of the VASQ

No.	Item	Factor				Communalities
		1	2	3	4	
2	I rely on others to help me make decisions	.83	.01	.14	.24	.50
7	I usually rely on advice from others when I've got a problem	.67	-.09	.29	.20	.50
15	I like making decisions on my own*	.54	-.10	.13	.17	.25
5	It's best not to get too emotionally close to other people	.002	.63	.12	.35	.38
8	I feel uncomfortable when people get too close to me	.01	.75	.14	.29	.41
18	I find it hard to trust others	-.09	.65	.19	.37	.65
19	Having people around me can be a nuisance	-.11	.51	.09	.40	.24
22	I find it difficult to confide in people	-.10	.63	.08	.23	.49
6	I worry a lot if people I live with arrive back later than expected	.14	.10	.67	.22	.37
11	I worry about things happening to close family and friends	.04	.15	.57	.22	.31
16	I get anxious when people close to me are away	.19	.19	.68	.49	.60
10	I feel people are against me	.19	.43	.26	.69	.61
12	I often get into arguments	.11	.24	.23	.55	.25
13	I am clingy with others†	.29	.06	.38	.57	.22
20	I feel people haven't done enough for me	.07	.33	.16	.62	.28
Eigen value		3.84	2.31	1.43	1.16	

Note. *Item 15 was reverse coded; †Item 13 was excluded during CFA; Items loading onto the relevant factor are indicated in bold; Factor labels are: 1 = Lack of autonomy; 2 = Avoidant-dismissive; 3 = Anxious-dependent; 4 = Ambivalent

Table 3: Summary of the CFA results for the several VASQ models and fit indices

Model		Chi ²	No of free Parameters	df	<i>p</i> -value	BIC	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
A	Original VASQ	1407.2	67	208	<.001	39895.112	.675	.639	.095
B	VASQ from EFA	303.6	51	84	<.001	27191.946	.905	.881	.064
C	Modified model (Item 13 removed)	186.7	48	71	<.001	25376.599	.945	.929	.051
D	Higher-order model	212.0	45	74	<.001	25382.604	.934	.919	.054

Table 4: Intercorrelations between the VASQ subscales and psychopathology scores ($N = 1236$)

22 Item VASQ						
	Insecurity	Proximity- seeking	SDHS	EDE-Q		
Proximity-seeking	.16**					
SDHS	-.54**	-.19**				
EDE-Q	.33**	.18**	-.46**			
PSS-4	.45**	.31**	-.71**	.39**		

14 Item VASQ						
	Insecurity	Proximity- seeking	Avoidant- dismissive	Ambivalent	Lack of autonomy	Anxious- dependent
Proximity-seeking	.22**					
Avoidant-dismissive	.93**	.14**				
Ambivalent	.77**	.28**	.47**			
Lack of autonomy	.05	.76**	-.01	.13**		
Anxious-dependent	.29**	.80**	.22**	.30**	.21**	
SDHS	-.54**	-.22**	-.46**	-.47**	-.15**	-.18**
EDE-Q	.34**	.21**	.30**	.27**	.14**	.19**
PSS-4	.44**	.33**	.37**	.41**	.24**	.27**

Note. ** $p < .001$; SDHS = Short Depression-Happiness Scale; EDE-Q = Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire; PSS-4 = Perceived Stress Scale-4

Table 5: Means (Standard Deviation in brackets) for participant's age, BMI, SDHS, EDE-Q, PSS-4 and VASQ scores for the 22- and 14-item versions as a function of sex ($N = 1236$)

Variable	Men ($N = 250$)	Women ($N = 986$)	Significance	Cohen's d
Age	29.6 (11.3)	28.5 (10.6)	$t(1222) = 1.46, p = .15$.08
BMI	25.4 (5.6)	24.8 (6.3)	$t(417.45) = 1.67, p = .10$.16
SDHS	12.4 (4.2)	11.6 (4.2)	$t(1234) = 2.66, p = .01$.15
EDE-Q	1.3 (1.2)	2.1 (1.4)	$t(469.89) = -9.26, p < .001$	-.85
PSS-4	6.5 (3.5)	7.3 (3.3)	$t(1234) = -3.37, p = .001$	-.19
<u>Original 22-item VASQ</u>				
Insecurity	31.4 (7.5)	32.0 (7.6)	$t(1234) = -.98, p = .33$	-.06
Proximity-seeking	27.1 (5.9)	29.5 (5.8)	$t(1234) = -5.91, p < .001$	-.34
<u>New 14-item VASQ</u>				
Two-factor solution				
Insecurity	20.2 (5.7)	20.4 (5.8)	$t(1234) = -.59, p = .56$	-.03
Proximity-seeking	16.0 (4.0)	18.0 (4.0)	$t(1234) = -7.01, p < .001$	-.40
Four-factor solution				
Insecurity				
<i>Ambivalent</i>	6.7 (2.5)	6.6 (2.5)	$t(1234) = .33, p = .75$.02
<i>Avoidant-dismissive</i>	13.5 (4.2)	13.8 (4.2)	$t(1234) = -1.01, p = .32$	-.06
Proximity-seeking				
<i>Lack of autonomy</i>	7.5 (2.4)	8.5 (2.5)	$t(1234) = -5.56, p < .001$	-.32
<i>Anxious-dependent</i>	8.5 (2.5)	9.5 (2.7)	$t(1234) = -5.30, p < .001$	-.30

Note. SDHS = Short Depression-Happiness Scale; EDE-Q = Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire; PSS-4 = Perceived Stress Scale




Figure 1: CFA: Higher-order VASQ model

Note. All standardised coefficients are significant at $p < .001$