The International Journal of Indian Psychology
ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p)
Volume 3, Issue 4, No. 60, DIP: 18.01.082/20160304
ISBN: 978-1-365-26308-8
http://www.ijip.in | July-September, 2016

Measure of Attachment Style

Naseem Ahmad[1]*, Azmat Jahan[2], Nasheed Imtiaz[3]

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the development and standardization of a measure of perceived attachment styles. The four attachment styles namely secure, avoidant insecure, ambivalent insecure, and disorganized insecure attachment proposed by Mary Ainsworth (1970), Main and Soloman 1986 (Disorganized- insecure attachment). The items are constructed on socio-cultural and educational circumstances of the individuals using mix strategy for construction of the scale by selecting the items from various attachment scales and by writing some original items. Hence the tool will be largely suitable for measuring the attachment styles among the adults and adolescents in India. The tool has good construct validity and reliability.

Keywords: *Attachment Style, Secure, Avoidant Insecure, Ambivalent Insecure And Disorganized Insecure Attachment.*

Attachment has a huge impact on a person's life. The number of studies in the area of attachment styles matches its importance on the development of the personality. Researchers suggest that attachment has direct influence on personality. Psychologist John Bowlby was the first attachment theorist, describing attachment as a "lasting psychological connectedness between human beings."Bowlby (1969) believed that the earliest bonds formed by children with their caregivers have a tremendous impact that continues throughout life. He suggested attachment also serves to keep the infant close to the mother, thus improving the child's chances of survival.

Attachment style is considered to be somewhat constant or stable (e.g., Fraley, 2002, Klohnen and Bera, 1998, Simpson et al., 2007 and Gallith, Hart, Noftle & Stockdale, 2009), hence, most measures of adult attachment tend to focus on its trait-like characteristics. However, in recent years several authors have suggested that nevertheless its stability, attachment style is also likely to be influenced or shaped by major life events (Cozzarelli et al., 2003, Davila and Sargent, 2003, Feeney and Noller, 1992 and Hammond, Fletcher, 1991 and Gallith, Hart, Noftle&

[1] Research scholar, Department of Psychology, AMU, Aligarh, India
[2] Research scholar, Department of Psychology, AMU, Aligarh, India
[3] Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, AMU, Aligarh, India

Stockdale, 2009), and different contextual factors (e.g., Baldwin and Fehr, 1995, Davila et al., 1997 and Gallith, Shaver, 2007 and Gallith, Hart, Noftle & Stockdale, 2009). Regardless of this reasoning, and the procreation and predominant use of attachment measures in adult relationship research over the past 20 years, there is currently no Indian measure that captures temporary fluctuations in the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors underlying attachment processes. In the present article, we describe the rationale for creating an Indian measure of attachment, introduce a self-report measure that we developed, and describe the studies attesting to the reliability and validity of this new measure.

Definition and Dynamics of Attachment styles

Ever since Bowlby, 1969/1982, Bowlby, 1973 and Bowlby 1980 introduced attachment theory to explain the bonds that infants form with their primary caregivers (i.e., ‘‘attachment figures”), individual differences in “attachment styles” have been conceptualized and measured in terms of anxiety, avoidance, and security (e.g., Ainsworth et al., 1978, Carver, 1997, Hazan and Shaver, 1987, Simpson, 1990 and Gallith, Hart, Noftle & Stockdale, 2009). Attachment styles are believed to reflect individuals’ cognitive–affective “working models” (i.e., mental representations) of self and other and ensuing behavioral orientations toward close relationship partners. Attachment anxiety is characterized by self-doubt about one’s own worth and abilities, extreme need for interpersonal closeness, love, and support, and continuous worrying about being rejected or abandoned. Attachment avoidance is characterized by unwillingness to trust others, an emphasis on self-sufficiency and autonomy, a relatively low tolerance for interpersonal intimacy and interdependence, and a tendency to down-regulate one’s own emotions. Finally, attachment security relates to a sense of faith in the responsiveness of attachment figures, one’s own worth and abilities, and ease with intimacy and interdependence, as well as the relative absence of anxiety and avoidance (Mikulincer and Shaver, 2007a, Gallith, Hart, Noftle and Stockdale, 2009).

Attachment styles are often assumed of as stable personality dimensions and an outsized body of research supports that idea (e.g., Kirkpatrick and Hazan, 1994, Simpson et al., 2007 and Waters et al., 2000). However, Bowlby’s original theory and some of its contemporary conceptualizations (e.g., Fraley and Brumbaugh, 2004, Gallith et al., 2008 and Mikulincer and Shaver, 2007 and Gallith, Hart, Noftle & Stockdale, 2009) suggest that there is more to attachment style than stable dispositions – hence the terms *working models*, and *dynamic behavioral systems*. According to Bowlby (1969/1982), mental representations of self and other are mostly accurate reflections of actual experiences, especially in the context of close relationships, which are revised and updated as a person enters new relationships and has new experiences (although Bowlby suggested that working models that are formed early in life, or are particularly strong, will tend to persist).

Several studies have provided evidence to support Bowlby's conceptualization of working models and the dynamic attachment system. For example, Feeney and Noller (1992) found when following a sample of young adults for 10 weeks that the formation of a secure relationship was related to an increase in attachment security and a decrease in attachment insecurity (Gallith, Hart, Noftle and Stockdale, 2009). Similarly, Hammond and Fletcher (1991) found that involvement in satisfying relationships at one point in time was associated with increased security later. Kirkpatrick and Hazan (1994) also found that relationship experiences moderate the stability of attachment style when they monitored college students over 4 years. Relationship breakups were associated with changes from secure to insecure attachment styles and avoidant subjects who formed new relationships were less likely to remain avoidant than those who did not (Gallith, Hart, Noftle and Stockdale, 2009). Likewise, Davila and Saegent (2003) found that perceptions of greater interpersonal loss related to life events were positively associated with greater attachment insecurity on a day-to-day basis (Gallith, Hart, Noftle and Stockdale, 2009). Especially important for the current work, they also found that trait levels of attachment security did not moderate this association, suggesting that state attachment – or fluctuations in the sense of security – is independent from dispositional attachment style. Even though their encouraging preliminary findings, Davila and Sargent also found high week-to-week correlations between the attachment scores (over .90), which means they may not have adequately captured the cultural component of attachment. This highlights the need for a scale that is solely dedicated to the measurement of such a construct (Gallith, Hart, Noftle and Stockdale, 2009).

Recent empirical findings provide further evidence that working models, and thus attachment styles, are flexible across even very short durations, such as minutes or hours. For instance, reminding people of times when they have felt secure, anxious or avoidant momentarily activates a specific attachment schema (Baldwin et al., 1993 and Baldwin et al., 1996 and Gallith, Hart, Noftle& Stockdale, 2009). This momentary activation of a schema seems to temporarily dominate stable characters in terms of influencing participants' perceptions, expectations, and behaviors. For example, Gillath and Shaver (2007) showed that priming a specific attachment context (by asking people to imagine their partner as either responsive and sensitive or unresponsive and insensitive) affects their responses to relationship-related scenarios, and Gillath et al., (2006) showed that such priming also affects participants' goal pursuits. Gillath et al., (2008) bring evidence to suggest that these temporary changes can persist for a relatively long time (Gallith, Hart, Noftle & Stockdale, 2009).

According to Baldwin and others, changes in attachment style are possible because people simultaneously hold in their minds several models of self and other ordered in a hierarchy (Baldwin et al., 1996, Collins and Read, 1994, Klohnen et al., 2005 and Pierce and Lydon, 2001 and Gallith, Hart, Noftle & Stockdale, 2009). At higher levels of organization, these models include abstract rules or assumptions about attachment relationships, and at lower levels, they include information about specific relationships and events within relationships (e.g., Collins and

Read, 1990 and Overall et al., 2003). Each of these models can be activated and made more accessible at any given moment. Levels of attachment anxiety, avoidance, and security are then set as a function of the model or schema that is most strongly activated.

The need for a measure of attachment style scale in India

Based on the conceptualizations and research reviewed above, we found that at least life events (especially those belong to close relationships), and experimental activation of close relationship schemas, temporarily affect people's attachment style or levels of security and insecurity. Likewise, these temporarily fluctuations are not simply "noise" but result in meaningful behavior; priming studies have shown that enhancing security or insecurity influences prosocial behavior such as volunteering, well-being and mental health (e.g., lowering PTSD symptoms), and increases intergroup tolerance (e.g., Mikulincer, Shaver, Gillath & Nitzberg, 2005; for reviews see Gillath et al., 2008 and Milkulincer and Shaver, 2007a and Gallith, Hart, Noftle & Stockdale, 2009). In other words, attachment style changes across moments in time and situations, though within a range constrained in part by a person's stable dispositions. Fleeson (2001) has already demonstrated similar findings for the Big Five personality traits – although individuals' average level of behavior relevant to each trait was very stable from one week to the other, their scores on Big Five dimensions varied across specific occasions (Gallith, Hart, Noftle& Stockdale, 2009). Thus, scores on an attachment measure have the potential to account for a unique portion of the variance in psychological, behavioral, and relationship outcomes (e.g., emotions, interpersonal communications, and relationship constancy and fulfillment).

And as we know, culture influences the many aspects of mental health and well-being though the aspects of the attachment. As we found none or very few scales are available in India, which have been standardized and validated on Indian sample.

What should an Indian attachment measure look like?

Currently, there are two main approaches to measuring adult attachment style: self-reports and interviews. The Adult Attachment Interview (AAI; George, Kaplan & Main, 1985) and measures based on it (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) usually defines attachment in terms of three or four categories; however several of the self-report measures, including the ECR (and the revised ECR-R; Fraley, Waller and Brennan (2000) conceptualize adult attachment in terms of two orthogonal dimensions (anxiety and avoidance), with security defined as low scores on both of these dimensions. Because of this, one might assume that a measurement scale would have a similar structure but, three orthogonal dimensions (i.e. Secure attachment, Ambivalent-insecure attachment and Avoidant-insecure attachment style) consists a total of 27 items on five point rating scale (Secure-). Nevertheless, other measures, such as Simpson (1990) and Hazan and Shaver (1987) original measure have suggested a different structure in which security is an independent dimension, related negatively, but moderately, to anxiety and avoidance (which are in turn mostly or totally independent of each other).

We therefore tested various possible structures, with a varying number of dimensions, and different links between the dimensions. The only restriction we had for our measure was that the items had to reflect attachment-related thoughts, feelings, or behaviors that would be interpretable in light of existing measures and structural conceptualizations.

METHOD

Participants

The scale was administered on 1000 (500 males and 500 females) individuals from various schools and universities of Aligarh and Delhi NCR. The age range of the sample was 15 to 30 years with the mean age being 22.5 years. Participants responded to each item using a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (S*trongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*), with 3 (*Don't know*) as the midpoint of the scale. The 52 items were presented in a randomized order.

Development of the scale

This scale was constructed to assess the attachment patterns of the individual. Initially an item pool was gathered for the scale keeping in mind the attachment patterns proposed by Ainsworth et al. (1970, 1986). Before administering the scale a number of experts in this particular area were asked to review the items for appropriateness. After their feedback it was decided to select 40 items. These 40 items were tested on a sample of 1000 individuals. Each item was rated on 5 point Likert type rating scale ranging from 1 "Strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree". The higher score shows the dominant attachment pattern.

Exploratory factor analysis

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis testing 1, 2, 3, and 4-factor solutions, which reflected common structures in existing trait attachment style measures. A one-factor solution might indicate a single secure–insecure bipolar dimension, which we thought possible but unlikely for an India-based attachment. A two-factor solution might suggest a similar structure to Brennan et al., (1998) ECR, with a state dimension for both anxiety and avoidance. A three-factor structure could represent an organization similar toHazan and Shaver's (1987) prototype approach of secure, avoidant, and anxious–ambivalent styles or Collins and Read's (1990) dimensions of anxiety, closeness, and dependency. A four-factor structure could represent the quadrants formed by the RQ (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

We predicted different patterns of correlations between the factors as a function of the different factor solutions. For example, we predicted that with a two-factor solution that was similar to Brennan et al.'s orthogonal structure of attachment, we might observe relatively uncorrelated factors. However, a two-factor structure that contrasted secure vs. insecure styles, or approach-related vs. avoidance-related styles, might be negatively correlated. A three-factor structure similar to Hazan and Shaver (1987) might result in a relatively small negative correlation between the secure and anxious factors, but larger, negative correlations between the other two-

factor pairings (e.g., Shaver & Brennan, 1992). After an exploratory factor analysis was done by using SPSS 20.0. In this scale 3 factors were emerged confirming 3 dimensions of the attachment and the percent of variance (factorial/construct validity) explained by factors varies from 6.25 to 15.96 and cumulative variance 30.27%. This confirms high level of construct validity of the tool.

Reliability

The consideration of the validity and the reliability are typically viewed as essential elements for determining the quality of any standardized test. However, professionals and practitioners associations frequently have placed these concerns within broader context when developing standards and making overall judgment about the quality of any standardized test as a whole within a given context. For establishing the internal consistency reliability: Cronbach's alpha is used which was found to be 0.80 for the entire scale.

Validity

There are various methods to establish construct validity of the tool. But majority of them are having limitations as a role of time and existence of subjectivity in experts' ratings. To overcome these limitations, Factor Analysis with Varimax rotation was used to establish the construct validity of the tool. Data screening was carried out in order to existence of multi-colinearity (i.e. items that are highly correlated) and singularity (i.e. items that are perfectly correlated) in the scale. For testing multi-colinearity and singularity 'Determinant' of the R-matrix was estimated and it has to be greater than 0.00001.

Procedure

The respondents were from various schools, colleges and universities of Aligarh and Delhi NCR. To gain the entry in these institutions the authority person was contacted. A rapport was established with him/her and he/she was briefed about the purpose of the study. It was only when he/she was satisfied with the explanation that the date collection could proceed. The schools, colleges and universities were conveniently selected so that it could be easy to reach there for the data collection. We then explained the purpose of the study to the respondents. It was also made clear that survey was not affiliated to any government agency and it was purely for the research purpose. They were assured about the confidentiality of their responses and were requested to extend their full co-operation. After they finished the questionnaires were taken back and further statistical analysis was done by using SPPS 20.0.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The underlying structure of the 40 items have been examined through a series of exploratory factor analyses in SPSS 20.0 with unweighted least squares extraction in the initial factoring process, and Varimax rotation, because it was expected that the factors may not be necessarily orthogonal. The initial 40-item solution was examined using the scree test (Cattell, 1966; 1978,

p. 7), rather than the traditional Eigenvalue greater than one test. Using the scree test, the first significant jump between eigenvalues seemed to be between the fourth (eigenvalue = 1.56) and the third factor (eigenvalue = 2.50), or more conservatively, between the third factor and the second factor (eigenvalue = 3.25). Therefore, the scree pattern suggested either a three- or two-factor solution, but because of theoretical ideas about one-factor to four-factor solutions, it was decided to examine these solutions as well. Therefore, the three-factor solution has been examined. This solution included three factors with items that had high positive loadings on their respective factors, no negative main loadings on any of the factors, and negligible cross-loadings on other factors. In addition, there were several items that did not load strongly on any of the factors. The two-factor solution also had a number of high loadings but they were relatively unbalanced.

Table 1: The final set of MOAS items and their loadings as part of the exploratory factor analysis.

	Items	**Factor I (Ambivalent)**	**Factor II (Avoidant)**	**Factor III (Secure)**
35	I get depressed when my closed ones are not around me as much as I would like.	**.626**		
31	It is worrying for me, if others neglect me.	**.591**		
32	I get annoyed when people are unavailable at the time of need.	**.559**		
31	I feel worry about being abandoned by others.	**.557**		
29	I worry about being alone.	**.515**		
36	I sometimes worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.	**.493**		
8	I feel shy in sharing things to others	**.488**		
30	At times, I feel like getting close to others, but then something draws me back.	**.481**		
15	I feel depressed if someone close to me is unavailable at the time of need.	**.471**		
4	I am least interested in being attached with others.		**.655**	
38	I do not find it easy in being close to others.		**.579**	
10	I don't prefer people getting too close to me.		**.577**	
22	The moment someone starts to get closer, I find myself pulling away.		**.552**	
28	I am comfortable, irrespective of people being with me or not.		**.528**	
19	Unlike others, I am usually unwilling to get closer.		**.502**	
39	I become irritated or upset in maintaining the			

	Items	Factor I (Ambivalent)	Factor II (Avoidant)	Factor III (Secure)
	relationship with others.		**.483**	
14	I withdraw myself to get too close to others.		**.477**	
13	I don't worry if others don't accept me.		**.468**	
27	I don't bother, if closed ones like or love me.		**.460**	
34	I prefer to express my feelings.			**.642**
18	I share almost everything with my closed one.			**.613**
40	I don't usually feel hesitant and demeaned discussing my problems with others.			**.597**
17	I usually discuss my problems with my relatives and friends.			**.577**
1	I find it relatively easy to get close to others.			**.568**
37	It is not difficult for me to get emotionally close to others.			**.530**
20	I find people trustworthy.			**.515**
33	I find it very easy to depend on others.			**.492**

Table 1 shows the loadings of the 21 items on each of the factors.

In the next step, the numbers of items were reduced from 40 to 27, to include only the items that had high loadings on factor solutions, and then once again the factor structure was examined using exploratory factor analyses. This analysis suggested that the best structure was a 3-factor solution, which included factors relating to security, avoidance, and ambivalence, accounting for 68.08% of the total variance (30.27%, 20.39%, and 10.42% for the three factors, respectively). The final version of the scale was obtained through several filtering steps, where the items were eliminated that had cross-loadings greater than .20 on more than one factor or had loadings smaller than .40 on the proposed factor, resulting in a 27-item scale, with 8, 10 and 9 items measuring each of the three content domains.

Cronbach alpha coefficients for the three MOAS subscales ranged from .80 to .81, suggesting good internal consistency.

Acknowledgments
The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interests
The author declared no conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Oxford, UK: Erlbaum.

Banse, R. (2004). Attachment style and marital satisfaction: Evidence for dyadic configuration effects. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*, 273–282.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 226–244.

Bowlby, J. (1969/1982).Attachment and loss. Attachment (Vol. 1). New York: Basic Books (1st ed. pub. 1969; 2nd ed. pub. 1982).

Bowlby, J. (1973).Attachment and loss. Separation: Anxiety and anger, Vol. 2. New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1980).Attachment and loss. Loss: Sadness and depression, Vol. 3. New York: Basic Books.

Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), Attachment theory and close relationships ,46–76. New York: Guilford Press.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959).Convergent and discriminant validation by the multi-trait-multi-method matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*, 81–105.

Carver, C. S. (1997). Adult attachment and personality: Converging evidence and a new measure. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 865–883.

Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1*, 245–276.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990).Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 644–663.

Cozzarelli, C., Karafa, J. A., Collins, N. L., & Tagler, M. J. (2003). Stability and change in adult attachment styles: Associations with personal vulnerabilities, life events and global construals of self and others. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 22*, 315–346.

Davila, J., & Sargent, E. (2003). The meaning of life (events) predicts change in attachment security.*Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1383–1395.

Davila, J., Burge, D., & Hammen, C. (1997). Why does attachment style change? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 826–838.

Downey, G., & Feldman, S. I. (1996).Implications of rejection sensitivity for intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 1327–1343.

Edelstein, R. S., & Gillath, O. (2008).Avoiding interference. Adult attachment and emotional processing biases. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 171–181.

Elizur, Y., & Mintzer, A. (2003). Gay males' intimate relationship quality: The roles of attachment security, gay identity, social support, and income. *Personal Relationships, 10*, 411–435.

Elliot, A. J., & Reis, H. T. (2003).Attachment and exploration in adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 317–331.

Feeney,J. A., & Noller, P. (1992). Attachment style and romantic love: Relationship dissolution. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 44*, 69–74.

Fleeson, W. (2001). Towards a structure- and process-integrated view of personality: Traits as density distributions of states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 1011–1027.

Fleeson, W. (2007).Situation-based contingencies underlying trait-content manifestation in behavior. *Journal of Personality, 75*, 825–862.

Fletcher, G. J. O., Simpson, J. A., & Thomas, G. (2000). The measurement of perceived relationship quality components: A confirmatory factor-analytic approach. *Psychology Review, 6,* 123–151.

Fraley, R. C. (2002). Attachment stability from infancy to adulthood: Meta-analysis understanding stability and change in attachment security. In W. S. Rholes& J. (pp. 86–132). New York: Guilford Press.

Fraley, R. C., & Brumbaugh, C. C. (2004).A dynamical systems approach to Personality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26, 340–354.*

Fyffe, C., & Waters, E. (1997). Empirical classification of adult attachment status: Predicting group membership. *Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development*, Washington, DC.

Gallith O., Hart J., Noftle Erick E. & Stockdale Gary D, (2009). Development and validation of a state adult attachment measure (SAAM).*Journal of Research in Personality 43.,* 362–373

George, C., Kaplan, M., & Main, M. (1985).Adult attachment interview. *Unpublished manuscript*, University of California, Berkeley.

Hart, J., Shaver, P. R., & Goldenberg, J. L. (2005). Attachment, self-esteem, worldviews, and terror management: Evidence for a tripartite security system. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 999–1013.

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

Heatherton, T. F., & Polivy, J. (1991).Development and validation of a scale for measuring state self-esteem.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 895–910.

Hughes, D. A. (2007).Attachment-focused family therapy. New York: W.W. Norton.

Johnson, S. M., & Whiffen, V. (2003). Attachment processes in couples and families. New York: Guilford Press.

Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Hazan, C. (1994). Attachment styles and close relationships: A four-year prospective study. *Personal Relationships, 1*, 123–142.

Klohnen, E. C.,& Bera,S.J.(1998). Behavioral and experiential patterns of a voidantly and securely attached women across adulthood: A 30-year longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 211–223.

Kobak, R. R., Cole, H. E., Ferenz-Gillies, R., Fleming, W. S., & Gamble, W. (1993). Attachment and emotion regulation during mother-teen problem-solving: A control theory analysis. *Child Development, 64*, 231–245.

Levy, M. B., & Davis, K. E. (1988). Love styles and attachment styles compared: Their relations to each other and to various relationship characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5,* 439–471.

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). Boosting attachment security to promote mental health, prosocial values, and inter-group tolerance. *Psychological Inquiry, 18,* 139–156.

Mikulincer, M., Gillath, O., & Shaver, P. R. (2002). Activation of the attachment system in adulthood: Threat-related primes increase the accessibility of mental representations of attachment figures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83,* 881–895.

Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R., Gillath, O., &Nitzberg, R. E. (2005). Attachment, caregiving, and altruism: Boosting attachment security increases compassion and helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89,* 817–839.

Muthen & Muthen.Noftle, E. E., & Shaver, P. R. (2006). Attachment dimensions and the Big Five personality traits: Associations and comparative ability to predict relationship quality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40,* 179–208.

Oppenheim, D., & Goldsmith, D. F. (Eds.). (2007). Attachment theory in clinical work with children: Bridgingthegap between research and practice. NewYork: Guilford.

Overall, N. C., Fletcher, G. J. O., & Friesen, M. (2003).Mapping the intimate relationship mind: Comparisons between three models of attachment representations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 1479–1493.

Pierce, T., & Lydon, J. E. (2001). Global and specific relational models in the experience of social interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* 613–631.

Rempel, J. K., Ro ss, M., & Holmes, J. G. (2001). Trust and communicated attributions in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81,* 57–64.

Robins, R. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2000). Two personalities, one relationship: Both partners' personality traits shape the quality of their relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79,* 251–259.

Russell, J. A., & Carroll, J. M. (1999). On the bipolarity of positive and negative affect. *Psychological Bulletin, 125,* 3–30.

Shaver, P. R., & Brennan, K. A. (1992). Attachment style and the big five personality traits: Their connection with romantic relationship outcomes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18,* 536–545.

Simpson, J. A., Collins, W. A., Tran, S., & Haydon, K. C. (2007). Attachment and the experience and expression of emotions in adult romantic relationships: A developmental perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92,* 355–367.

Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Nelligan, J. S. (1992). Support seeking and support giving within couples in an anxiety-provoking situation: The role of attachment styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62,* 434–446.

Waters, E., Weinfield, N. S., & Hamilton, C. E. (2000). The stability of attachment security from infancy to adolescence and early adulthood: General discussion. *Child Development, 71,* 703–706.

Measure of Attachment Style

Name:	**Age:**	**sex:**	**Religion:**
Class:	**Name of the University/School:**		
Contact No.:	**Email:**		

Measure of Attachment Style (MOAS)

Please read each of the following statements and the extent to which it describes your feelings you or others. Please think and respond how you generally feel.

Show how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by rating them on this scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree

1. I do not find it easy in being close to others. ___
2. I don't usually feel hesitant and demeaned discussing my problems with others. ___
3. I worry about being alone. ___
4. I am least interested in being attached with others. ___
5. It is not difficult for me to get emotionally close to others. ___
6. At times, I feel like getting close to others, but then something draws me back. ___
7. I don't prefer people getting too close to me. ___
8. I find it very easy to depend on others. ___
9. I feel worry about being abandoned by others. ___
10. I don't worry if others don't accept me. ___
11. I prefer to express my feelings. ___
12. I get annoyed when people are unavailable at the time of need. ___
13. I withdraw myself to get too close to others. ___
14. I find people trustworthy. ___
15. I feel depressed if someone close to me is unavailable at the time of need. ___
16. Unlike others, I am usually unwilling to get closer. ___
17. I usually discuss my problems with my relatives and friends. ___
18. It is worrying for me, if others neglect me. ___
19. The moment someone starts to get closer, I find myself pulling away. ___
20. I share almost everything with my closed ones. ___
21. I get depressed when my closed ones are not around me as much as I would like. ___

22. I don't bother, if closed ones like or love me. ___
23. I find it relatively easy to get close to others. ___
24. I sometimes worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others. ___
25. I am comfortable, irrespective of people being with me or not. ___
26. I feel shy in sharing things to others. ___
27. I become irritated or upset in maintaining the relationship with others. ___

How to cite this article: N Ahmad, A Jahan, N Imtiaz (2016), Measure of Attachment Style, International Journal of Indian Psychology, Volume 3, Issue 4, No. 60, ISSN 2348-5396 (e), ISSN: 2349-3429 (p), DIP: 18.01.082/20160304, ISBN: 978-1-365-26308-8