**Attachment Style Classification Questionnaire**

**Description:**
The Attachment Style Classification Questionnaire is a 15-item self-report questionnaire based on the Hebrew version (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) of the Attachment Questionnaire (AQ). The AQ was modified to assess familial and extrafamilial relationships and yields scores on three attachment categories: 1) Secure, 2) Anxious/Ambivalent, and 3) Avoidant. Children are given an attachment classification based on the highest scores they receive in a category.

**Theoretical Orientation:**
The Attachment Style Classification Questionnaire is adapted from the Hazan & Shaver (1987) Attachment Questionnaire for adults. The measure is theoretically grounded in attachment theory.

**Domains Assessed:**
1. Attachment
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 

**Languages Available:**
English, Hebrew
### Age Range:
7.00 - 14.0

### # of Items:
15

### Time to Complete (min):
5

### Time to Score (min):
2

### Periodicity:
Not specified

### Response Format:

### Measure Type:
Screening

### Measure Format:
Questionnaire

### Reporter:
Self

### Education Level:
99.00

### Materials Needed:
- Paper and pencil
- Computer
- Testing stimuli
- Video equipment
- Physiological equipment
- Other

### Material Notes:
Age to complete measure was determined by reviewing the literature and in consultation with the author. There is no education level needed. The author developed the measure with the help of children who "translated" the adult's measure into children's language. Only reading abilities are needed.

### Sample Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Sample Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>I make friends with other children easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxious/Ambivalent</td>
<td>Sometimes I'm afraid that other kids won't want to be with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>I don't feel comfortable when trying to make friends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes (additional scales and domains):
Attachment classification is derived by selecting the scale on which the child scores highest.

Scoring is as follows:
- Items 1, 3, 7, 10, 15: the secure attachment style
- Items 2, 4, 8, 12, 13: the avoidant style
- Items 5, 6, 9, 11, 14: the anxious/ambivalent style

### Information Provided:
- Diagnostic information DSM-III
- Diagnostic information DSM-IV
- Strengths
- Areas of concerns/risks
- Program evaluation information
- Continuous assessment
- Raw Scores

- Standard Scores
- Percentile
- Graph (e.g., of elevated scale)
- Dichotomous assessment
- Clinical friendly output
- Written feedback
- Other
### Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training to Administer:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Must be a psychologist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(check all that apply)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Via manual/video</td>
<td>Training by experienced clinician (&lt;4 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior experience psych testing &amp; interpretation</td>
<td>Training by experienced clinician (≥4 hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training to Interpret:</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Must be a psychologist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(check all that apply)</td>
<td>Via manual/video</td>
<td>Training by experienced clinician (&lt;4 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Prior experience psych testing &amp; interpretation</td>
<td>Training by experienced clinician (≥4 hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Training Notes:
The author reports that the measure can be administered by a range of professionals (e.g., teachers, social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists). Those who interpret the measure should be familiar with Attachment Theory in order to be able to understand the meaning of each style and the psychodynamic concepts that underlie them.

### Parallel or Alternate Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parallel Forms?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Forms:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms for Different Ages:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, are forms comparable:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Altered Versions of Measure:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe: As noted, the Attachment Style Questionnaire is an adapted version of the Attachment Questionnaire (AQ), a single-tem measure of attachment patterns in adults (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

The original AQ has been adapted for use with children by other authors. Muris, P., Meesters, M., van Melick, M., & Zwambag, L. (2001) developed the Attachment Questionnaire for Children (AQC), a 1-item version based on the original version. The AQC is also reviewed in this database.

### Population Used to Develop Measure

The psychometrics of the measure were first examined with 232 elementary school children from Israel, 50% boys and 50% girls, aged 6 to 12 (M=9.2, SD=2.1). Children were assessed in Hebrew. No additional demographics on the sample were available.

(Finzi, Har-Even, Weizman, Tyano, & Shnit, 1996: Note – The article was in Hebrew, so this information is presented from the translated abstract and later articles.)
Psychometrics

Global Rating (scale based on Hudall Stamm, 1996):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norms:</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For separate age groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For clinical populations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate for men and women:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For other demographic groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Cutoffs:</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify Cutoffs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used in Major Studies:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify Studies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test-Retest-# days:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Consistency:</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Rater:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel/Alternate Forms:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Psychometrics were reported in the abstract of Finzi, Har-Even, Weizman, Tyano, & Shnit (1996), but the article could not be directly reviewed, as it is in Hebrew. In the sample, described under “Population Used to Develop Measure,” internal consistency for the scales ranged from .69-.81. Two-week test-retest reliability was reported as .87-.95.

In another study that included an Israeli sample of 98 children with learning disorders and 107 typically developing children, Al-Yagon and Mikulincer (2004) reported internal consistencies ranging from .64-.73 for the 3 factors.

Content Validity:

Items are derived from the Attachment Questionnaire, a widely used measure of adult attachment.

Construct Validity: (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validity Type</th>
<th>Not known</th>
<th>Not found</th>
<th>Nonclinical Samples</th>
<th>Clinical Samples</th>
<th>Diverse Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convergent/Concurrent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal/Maturation Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to Theoretically Distinct Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factorial Validity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: In a sample of elementary school children, children characterized as secure had lower scores on depression (Children’s Depression Inventory, CDI) and anxiety (Trait anxiety scale of the State-Trait Anxiety Scale for Children) than did children characterized as Avoidant or Anxious/Ambivalent (Finzi et al., 1996).

The measure has been found to differentiate between learning disordered and typically developing children (Al-Yagon & Mukulincer, 2004), with 73% of typically developing children classified as having a secure attachment style and 45% of learning disordered children similarly classified. Learning disordered children reported significantly less security and more avoidance and anxiety in their close relationships.

Scores on the Attachment Style Questionnaire were related to children’s ratings of competence including loneliness (Loneliness and Social Dissatisfaction Questionnaire: Security: r=-.52, p<.01; Avoidance: r=.38, p<.01; Anxiety: r=.39, p<.01). They were also significantly correlated in the expected direction to teacher’s ratings of the student’s academic functioning and of their relationship.
with the student, assessed using the Teacher Assessment of Student Academic Functioning and Student-Teacher Relationship Scale, respectively).

FACTOR ANALYSIS
Finzi et al. (2002) report that a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation yielded 3 factors with eigen values > 1. Factor loadings ranged from .40-.55.

Summaries regarding a confirmatory factor analysis are reported in multiple papers (e.g., Finzi, Ram, Har-Even, Shnit, & Weizman, 2001). The authors report that loadings on the Avoidant style were > .50 in all cases. For the Anxious/Ambivalent style, 2 items had factor loadings > .40 and the other 3 had loadings > .50. For the Secure style, 2 items (10, 15) had low loadings, and the other three had loadings > .40.

STUDIES WITH TRAUMA-EXPOSED POPULATIONS
1. Finzi, Ram, Har-Even, Shnit, & Weizman (2001) examined differences between physically abused (n=41), neglected (n=38), and nonabused/nonneglected children (n=35) aged 6-12. Sexually abused children were excluded from the study. As evidence of validity, the nonabused group scored highest on the secure factor, followed by the neglected group, and then the physically abused group. The physically abused group had significantly higher scores on the Avoidant factor than did the other two groups. The neglected group had significantly higher scores on the Anxious/Ambivalent factors.

Chi-square analyses of classification types revealed that physically abused children (85.4%) were more likely to have an Avoidant style; neglected children (73.7%) were more likely to have a predominantly Anxious/avoidant style; and the nonabused/nonneglected group (68.6%) was more likely to have a secure attachment style. The physically abused group had higher scores on aggressive behavior, assessed using the Child Suicidal Potential Scales (CSPS); Assaultive behavior, Aggression, Antisocial behavior, and Impulsiveness).

Scores on the Secure factor were negatively correlated with Aggression scales (range: -.37 to -.52), and scores on the Avoidant factor were positively correlated with Aggression scales (range: .40 to .62). Scores on the Anxious/Ambivalent factor were not significantly correlated with aggression variables.

2. Using what appears to be the same sample, Finzi et al. (2002) reported that nonabused children had significantly lower scores on depressive anxiety and negative affect (CDI and CSPS) than did physically abused or neglected children. Physically abused children had higher scores on aggression and suicidality, assessed using the Children’s Suicidal Potential Scales for Aggression (Finzi et al., 1996; Finzi et al., 2002).

3. Finzi, Cohen, Sapir, & Weizman (2000) examined attachment styles in different groups of children: children of drug-using fathers (n=76), physically abused children (n=31), neglected children (n=38), and nonabused/nonneglected children (n=35). Compared to the other three groups, physically abused children had significantly lower scores on the Secure factor and the highest score on the Avoidant factor. Neglected children were significantly higher than did other children on the Anxious/Ambivalent factor.
Predictive Validity:
Postdictive Validity:

Sensitivity Rate(s):
Specificity Rate(s):
Positive Predictive Power:
Negative Predictive Power:
Notes:

Limitations of Psychometrics and Other Comments Regarding Psychometrics:
1. The three studies examining different populations (e.g., abused, neglected, nonabused/neglected) appear to have used the same sample. Results are supportive of the validity of the measure, but additional research with other samples would provide additional support.
2. All research has been conducted with children in Israel.

Consumer Satisfaction
No data available.

Languages Other than English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Translation Quality (check all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hebrew</td>
<td>1= Has been translated 2= Has been translated and back translated - translation appears good and valid. 3= Measure has been found to be reliable with this language group. 4= Psychometric properties overall appear to be good for this language group. 5= Factor structure is similar for this language group as it is for the development group. 6= Norms are available for this language group. 7= Measure was developed for this language group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4= Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5= No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6= Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Use with Trauma Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populations for which measure has demonstrated evidence of reliability and validity:</th>
<th>Physical abuse</th>
<th>Natural disaster</th>
<th>Terrorism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>Immigration related trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>Imprisonment</td>
<td>Kidnapping/hostage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Witness death</td>
<td>Traumatic loss (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community violence</td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical trauma</td>
<td>War/combat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use with Diverse Populations

USE WITH DIVERSE POPULATIONS RATING SCALE
1. Measure is known (personal communication, conference presentation) to have been used with members of this group.
2=Studies in peer-reviewed journals have included members of this group who have completed the measure.
3=Measures have been found to be reliable with this group.
4=Psychometric properties well established with this group.
5=Norms are available for this group (or norms include a significant proportion of individuals from this group)
6=Measure was developed specifically for this group.

Population Type: 
Degree of Usage: (check all that apply)

1. Developmental disability
2. Disabilities
3. Lower socio-economic status Yes Yes
4. Rural populations
5.
6.

Notes (including other diverse populations):
English is also translated to and back-translated from Hebrew.

Pros and Cons/Qualitative Impression

Pros:
1. The measure is brief.
2. It taps a conceptually important domain for the field of child trauma.
3. In comparison to another measure of attachment (the Attachment Questionnaire for Children), which was also derived from the adult Attachment Questionnaire, this measure yields continuous scores on three scales, which might be useful for treatment outcome research.
4. The measure has been used with samples of abused and neglected children, with physically abused children typically showing higher pathology.

Cons:
1. While the psychometrics are promising, additional studies with more samples of children are needed. Research examining the sensitivity of the measure to change resulting from intervention would be helpful. In addition, if the measure is to be used with clinical populations, examination of its internal consistency and test-retest reliability in clinical populations would be important.
2. Children are classified into attachment categories based on their highest score on a
scale. Data are not provided regarding whether children tend to score high on only one category and whether children who score high on multiple categories constitute a different group.

3. Psychometrics appear to have been examined only with Hebrew-speaking populations. More research is needed examining its use with other language and ethnic/racial groups.
Published References:

A PsychInfo search (7/05) for “Attachment Style Classification Questionnaire” anywhere revealed the measure has been referenced in 2 peer-reviewed journal articles. While conducting the review we identified three additional published articles plus one in press. The articles are listed below.


OTHER RELATED VERSIONS


Unpublished References:

A PsychInfo search (7/05) for “Attachment Style Classification Questionnaire” anywhere revealed that the measure has been referenced in 0 conferences and 0 dissertations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Published References:</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Unpublished References:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author Comments:

The author reviewed this report and provided comments, which were integrated. The author also provided permission for the measure to be downloaded from nctsn.org.
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