Validity and reliability of the Thai version of the Experiences of Close Relationships-Revised questionnaire

Wongpakaran T, Wongpakaran N, Wannarit K

ABSTRACT

Introduction: This study aimed to investigate the psychometric properties of the Thai version of the Experiences of Close Relationships-Revised (Thai ECR-R) questionnaire.

<u>Methods</u>: 400 students from a university in northern Thailand were randomly selected to complete the Thai ECR-R, the extraversion scale for 16 personality factors, the self-esteem scale and the trait anxiety scale. A retest of the Thai ECR-R was conducted at four-week intervals. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were performed to test the validity of the construct.

<u>Results</u>: The Thai ECR-R showed good internal consistency and satisfactory test-retest reliability. The avoidance and anxiety subscales demonstrated a convergent validity with the extraversion, self-esteem and trait anxiety scales. An exploratory analysis yielded a two-factor structure. Confirmatory factor analysis also provided general support for the hypothesised two-factor model, although there was a slight lack-of-fit.

Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, A Muang, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand

Wongpakaran T, MD Associate Professor

Wongpakaran N, MD Assistant Professor

Wannarit K, MD Resident

Correspondence to: A/Prof Tinakon Wongpakaran Tel: (66) 53 945422 Fax: (66) 53 289219 Email: tchanob@ med.cmu.ac.th <u>Conclusion</u>: The overall psychometric properties of the Thai ECR-R were acceptable. In order to render it more congruent with Thai culture, a revision of some items was considered. Further research on other age groups should be conducted in future.

Keywords: adult, attachment, Experiences of Close Relationships, Thai

Singapore Med J 2011; 52(2): 100-106

INTRODUCTION

Attachment theory, which was first postulated by John Bowlby⁽¹⁻³⁾ in the 1960s, emphasises the importance of developing an early relationship between a child and

the primary caregivers, as the foundation for all-round personality development in later life. Attachment theory has contributed substantially to predicting the outcomes of psychotherapy as well as therapeutic relationships and treatment compliance.⁽⁴⁻⁶⁾

Bowlby established three essential components for attachment within a relationship: proximity, in terms of maintenance, to the caregiver; the provision of a safe haven for the infant(s) by the caregiver; and the provision of a secure zone within which the infant can explore the environment and engage in activities not associated with attachment.⁽⁷⁾ Ainsworth et al elucidated individual differences as a significant aspect of the theory, formulating three different attachment styles: secure, anxious and avoidant.⁽⁸⁾ Bartholomew and Horowitz⁽⁹⁾ added 'fearful' as the fourth style, in accordance with the two-dimensional model of anxiety and avoidance.

Research on adult attachment has been conducted exponentially over the past 20 years. The earlier selfreport measures commonly used, e.g. Relationship Questionnaire (RQ),⁽¹⁰⁾ lacked convergent validity. In 1998, Brennan et al developed the Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) measure, a 36-item questionnaire based on two dimensions: anxiety and avoidance.(11) Later, Fraley et al,⁽¹²⁾ using the item response theory, revised the ECR by re-analysing the original 323-item data set provided by Brennan et al.⁽¹¹⁾ This resulted in a new set of items, the revised ECR questionnaire, which contains 18 items that assess romantic attachment anxiety and 18 items that assess attachment avoidance. Item answers formed a 7-point Likert-type rating scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Sibley et al tested its psychometric properties, i.e. testretest reliability, convergence and discriminant validity, and found that it revealed an adequate model $\operatorname{fit.}^{\scriptscriptstyle (13,14)}$ In non-English speaking samples, Tsagarakis et al first investigated the translated ECR-R for a Greek sample and found the questionnaire to be suitable for measuring romantic relationships.(15)

Ehrenthal et al used the German version (ECR-RD) to evaluate psychometric properties in both large non-clinical (n = 1,006) and clinical (n = 225) samples.

Good results were obtained for the use of the ECR-RD (Cronbach's alpha = 0.91/0.92), and the study was also found to demonstrate construct validity.⁽¹⁶⁾ However, when Fairchild and Finney investigated the internal structural validity of the ECR-R using confirmatory factor analysis, they found that it supported the hypothesised two-factor model, but also revealed a minor model lack-of-fit and low communalities (R²), suggesting that some items may represent extraneous constructs.⁽¹⁷⁾ In Asia, Li and Kato developed the Chinese version of the ECR and tested it with 371 college students.⁽¹⁸⁾ Rosenberg self-esteem scale (RSES) and other-view scale were used to test for convergence validity. This Chinese version has been demonstrated to reveal adequate psychometric properties for both validity and reliability.

In this study, we aimed to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Thai ECR-R by testing it with non-clinical samples, as well as study the romantic attachment styles of Chiang Mai University undergraduates. As the ECR-R was constructed based on the two-factor model theory, we aimed to test the level of fit of the two-factor model using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) scale and RSES were used to examine the convergence validity. We hypothesised that the anxiety sub-scale would be positively correlated with the anxiety scale, and negatively correlated with the self-esteem scales. Although anxiety, as measured by the STAI, and self-esteem should be reflected more through intrapersonal frustration or calm feelings rather than interpersonal behaviours like attachment anxiety, evidence of its correlation was found.⁽¹⁵⁾ For attachment avoidance, we adopted the extraversion scale to test for convergence validity. We expected to find a negative correlation between extraversion and the avoidance subscale, although extraversion measures a more general social expression than an individual relationship.⁽¹⁹⁾ Finally, in order to ascertain the individual attachment style, anxiety and avoidance scores were plotted on a graph with two axes: anxiety and avoidance, thus creating four quadrants: secure (low anxiety, low avoidance), preoccupied (high anxiety, low avoidance), fearfulavoidant (high anxiety, high avoidance) and dismissing (low anxiety, high avoidance).(11)

METHODS

A total of 400 undergraduate students from seven departments of Chiang Mai University, Thailand, were randomly selected to participate in the study. The sample size calculation was determined using the formula below, where d = 0.1 and N = 22,922 (2007). The calculated sample size of 328 was expanded to 400 in order to ensure

an appropriate size for factor analysis, as suggested by Comrey and Lee.⁽²⁰⁾

$$\mathbf{n} = \frac{Z^2 N \delta^2}{Z^2 \delta^2 + Z^2 N d^2}$$

The following questionnaires were used: demographic data, the Thai ECR-R, Thai STAI, Thai RSES and the extraversion scale of Thai 16 Personality Factor (16PF). STAI is a commonly used trait-anxiety scale developed by Spielberger et al,⁽²¹⁾ with a 20-item instrument used to reveal trait-anxiety. Respondents use a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 4 (mostly), with higher scores associated with greater feelings of anxiety. An example of a response is "I feel secure". The Thai version of STAI used in this study showed concurrent validity with the revised Anxiety Sensitivity Index (r = 0.44, p < 0.01), and good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.90).⁽²²⁾ We used this scale to examine the convergent validity for the anxiety dimension of the Thai ECR-R. In this study, the Thai STAI had a satisfactory internal consistency ($\alpha =$ 0.89).

The RSES ⁽²³⁾ was also used to examine convergent validity. It is a 10-item questionnaire that uses a 4-point Likert scale, with answers ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. Higher scores were associated with higher levels of self-esteem. An example is "On the whole, I am satisfied with myself". This measurement has been validated and found to demonstrate acceptable reliability and validity.⁽²⁴⁾ In this study sample, the Thai RSES revealed good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.87$).

The 16PF questionnaire was developed by Cattell et al⁽²⁵⁾ to discriminate among eight dimensions of personality. Three rating scales indicate the type of personality, where 0 means neutral, and where 1 and 2 are opposite attributes; for example, trusting/paranoid. The 16PF is widely used to measure personality traits. The Thai version was evaluated here for its content validity, which was acceptable, and also tested for its internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.61 - 0.88$).⁽²⁶⁾ In this study, a second order extraversion containing 46 items was drawn in order to assess concurrent validity of the avoidance subscale of the Thai ECR-R. The Thai version of the ECR-R was translated from the original English version, and is a 36-item, self-reporting instrument for measuring adult romantic attachment. The ECR-R has two dimensions: anxiety and avoidance. 18 items assess the anxiety subscale and another 18 items assess the avoidance subscale. Respondents were measured using a 7-point scale that ranged from 1 ('strongly disagree') to 7 ('strongly agree'), such that higher scores were associated with higher levels of anxiety or avoidance.

The original ECR-R was translated into Thai via

Table I. Factor structure of the Thai ECR-R.

autururufuktionaninganinganinganasia 0.754 0.978 0.978 autgainaururufuktioninganinganinganinganinganinganinganin	Avo	idance subscale Cronbach's alpha = 0.91	Factor I	Factor 2	R ²
31. Ideal constructive base design of the property of	34.		0.755	0.117	0.480
30. Legin paperson law unique one-product automitation of variant disposition unique o	33.	l feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.	0.754	0.098	0.579
22. はrung difficult for maje get close to my partner. United built for my partner. Call things year with my partner.<td>30.</td><td>l tell my partner just about everything.</td><td>0.735</td><td>0.036</td><td>0.540</td>	30.	l tell my partner just about everything.	0.735	0.036	0.540
31. Italk hings over with my partner. 0.713 0.033 0.504 31. Italk hings over with my partner. 0.707 0.103 0.470 41. Itel control by the hings over with With my partner. 0.704 0.668 0.441 41. Itel control by the hings over with With my partner. 0.703 0.001 0.480 41. Itel control by the hings over with my partner. 0.660 0.01 0.421 41. Itel control by the hings over with my partner. 0.660 0.01 0.421 41. Itel control by the hings over with my partner. 0.660 0.01 0.421 41. Itel control by the get closes to my partner. 0.660 0.01 0.421 41. Itel control by the get closes to my partner. 0.660 0.01 0.421 42. Itel control by the get closes to meantic partner my south and the south my partner. 0.634 0.135 0.113 0.444 43. Itel control by the south my meantic partner. 0.500 0.227 0.213 44. Itel control by the south my meantic partner. 0.500 0.227 0.213 45. I	32.	It's not difficult for me to get close to my partner.	0.715	0.049	0.525
15. If find it easy: or description, nonarity partners. 0.707 0.103 0.470 4. If eld confortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner. 0.704 0.668 0.461 4. It get confortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner. 0.703 0.001 0.480 4. It get confortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner. 0.637 0.031 0.480 5. It's gay for me to be affectionate with my partner. 0.660 0.01 0.421 1. Units with With With With With Mithan Mi	31.	I talk things over with my partner.	0.713	0.033	0.504
4. If equic conformable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner. 0.704 0.068 0.461 4. Justally discuss my problems and concerns with my partner. 0.703 0.001 0.480 3. Hig says for me to be affectionate with my partner. 0.697 -0.034 0.480 3. Hig says for me to be affectionate with my partner. 0.660 0.01 0.421 All relation with with with an anon monotonic strain with with a strain with sign and my needs. 0.634 0.136 0.440 3. Hig a partner really understagts me and my needs. 0.634 0.136 0.411 9. India treatively asy to get close to promotive strain with sign with my partner. 0.532 0.157 0.251 3. Hyp partner really understagts me and my needs. 0.619 -0.016 0.375 3. Just my to be too close to remain to partner strain with with a strain with my partner. 0.500 0.227 0.213 3. Just method with a strain with with a strain	15.	l find it, easy to depend on romantic partners.	0.707	0.103	0.470
14. Lunglly discuss my problems and concerns with my partner. 0.703 0.001 0.480 35. K5 gay for me to be affectionate with my partner. 0.697 -0.034 0.480 37. K5 gay for me to be affectionate with my partner. 0.660 0.01 0.421 All the bes to turn to my partner in tings of need. 0.660 0.01 0.421 All trial treatively asy to get closes to my partner. 0.634 0.136 0.411 grinter my close to partner how [feel deep down, during the sum than the sum tha	4.	I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.	0.704	0.068	0.46
55. tig say for me to be affectionate with measures. 0.697 -0.034 0.480 25. tig say for me to be affectionate with measures. 0.660 0.01 0.421 28. thelps to turn to my torganic particip. It mass of need. 0.660 0.01 0.421 28. thelps to turn to my torganic particip. It mass of need. 0.644 0.136 0.441 36. My partice really understands meand my needs. 0.619 -0.016 0.375 21. I prefer to to show a partner how lifed leap down. 0.619 -0.016 0.375 21. I prefer to to be too close to romanic partners. 0.510 0.470 0.226 21. I get unconfortable oneganic go to romanic partners. 0.510 0.470 0.226 21. I don't fel confortable oneganic go to romanic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 21. I don't fel confortable oneganic go to romanic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 21. I don't fel confortable oneganic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 22. When j show my felings for romanic partners. <td>14.</td> <td>l usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.</td> <td>0.703</td> <td>0.001</td> <td>0.480</td>	14.	l usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.	0.703	0.001	0.480
29. It helps to turn to my comparing partners in times of need. 0.660 0.01 0.421 11 burd to the time burders and my needs. 0.650 0.138 0.404 30. My partner regly understands me and my needs. 0.631 0.160 0.375 31. I prefer to be too close to romantic partners. 0.523 0.157 0.251 31. I prefer to be too close to romantic partners. 0.523 0.157 0.251 31. I prefer to be too close to romantic partners. 0.500 0.272 0.213 31. I on't feel too close to romantic partners. 0.510 0.470 0.226 31. I don't feel comforstble open gir to go romantic partners. 0.510 0.470 0.226 31. I don't feel comforstble open gir to go romantic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 0.135 31. I don't feel top so close to me. 0.399 0.298 0.135 31. I on't feel top so close to me. 0.399 0.297 0.135 31. I on't feel top so close to me. 0.190 0.771 0.58	35.	It's easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.	0.697	-0.034	0.480
8. India trebatively says to get close pro yp partner: 0.650 0.138 0.404 36. My partner really understands me and my needs, grinhou du tars l'adultation l'ensurin transadularity in the same and my needs, grinhou du tars l'adultation l'ensuring the sadularity in the same and my needs, grinhou du tars l'adultation l'ensuring the power like of the same and my needs, grinhou du tars l'adultation l'ensuring the power like of the same and my needs, grinhou du tars l'adultation l'ensuring the power like of the same and my needs, grinhou du tars l'adultation de transaction	29.	It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.	0.660	0.01	0.421
36. Mynarther really understands me and my needs. 0.634 0.135 0.411 27 Derfer net to show a partner how i field deep down. 0.619 -0.016 0.375 311. I prefer net to show a partner how i field deep down. 0.523 0.157 0.251 41.1. I prefer net to show a partner how i field deep down. 0.500 0.272 0.213 31. I prefer net to show a partner how i field deep down. 0.500 0.272 0.213 31. I prefer not to be too close to romanic partners. 0.510 0.470 0.226 31. I don't field confortable ownen aromatic partners. 0.450 0.321 0.227 31. I don't field to sallow myself to depend or oromantic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 31. I and net owner sget too close to me. 0.399 0.298 0.135 31. I and net owner sget too close to me. 0.399 0.298 0.135 31. I and net owner sget too close to me. 0.199 0.298 0.135 31. I and net owner sget too close to me. 0.190 0.771 0.584 31. I and net owner sget too	8.	l find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.	0.650	0.138	0.404
2. Under not to, be now 1 partner how 1 feel deep down, úuliaannäe: Luiaanijäänän 1 usei vaeva uuliavaevauu 0.619 -0.016 0.375 11. I prefer not to, be noo close to romanic partners. úuliaannäe: Luinaänijäänijääni avanuuliuli 0.523 0.157 0.251 13. I opt (feel comforable open a romanic partners. úuliaannäe: Luinaänijäänijäänijäänijäänijääni 0.510 0.470 0.226 13. I opt (feel comforable open anjet partners. úuliaannäe: Luinaänijäänijäänijäänijääni 0.465 0.321 0.227 14. I net norvos when partners get to open on oromanic partners. úuliääninääninääninäänäänäänäänäänäänäänään	36.	My partner really understands me and my needs,	0.634	0.136	0.411
11. Iprefer not to be to close to remantic partners. 0.523 0.157 0.251 3uitiannise: Iul na®minumäusinautikuli 0.500 0.272 0.213 3uitiannise: Iul na®minumäusinautikuli 0.500 0.272 0.213 3uitiannise: Iul na®minumäusinautikain mämitiä 0.510 0.470 0.226 3uitiannise: Iul name on manitic partners. 0.510 0.465 0.321 0.227 3uitiannise: Iul name on manitic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 3uitiannise: Iul name on manitic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 3uitiannise: Iul name on manitic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 3uitiannise: Subscience within set was a subscience. 0.399 0.298 0.135 3uitiannise: Subscience manitic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 22. When I show my feelings for romantic partners. 0.192 0.771 0.584 21. Vory of that romantic partners. 0.192 0.755 0.546 3uitiannishistan romanti was to say mith matitiannus and that subscience manitistan romantic partners. 0.192 0.735 0.546 3. Offen worry that my partner is out	2.	l prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.	0.619	-0.016	0.375
24. Legt uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close. 0.500 0.272 0.213 31. Idon't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners. 0.510 0.470 0.226 31. Idon't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 31. Idon't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 31. Idon't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 31. Idin't field to allow myself to depend on romantic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 31. Idin't field to allow myself to depend on romantic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 Anxiety subscale Cronbach's alpha = 0.89 Factor I Factor I </td <td>11.</td> <td>l prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.</td> <td>0.523</td> <td>0.157</td> <td>0.25 </td>	11.	l prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.	0.523	0.157	0.25
13. Idon't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners. 0.510 0.470 0.226 มันรู้สึกไม่สมายใจพระเป็ดแขตรงคนกับคมกับรัก 0.465 0.321 0.227 เป็นหนามามินเป็นรับระกาศสำหรับอนพระมะหนามกับรัก 0.465 0.321 0.227 เป็นหนามามินเป็นรับระกาศสำหรับอนพระมะหนามกับรัก 0.465 0.321 0.228 Anxiety subscale Cronbach's alpha = 0.89 Factor I Factor I Factor Z R ² 22. When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I'm afraid shey will not feel the same about me. 0.059 0.771 0.584 11. I offen worry that my partners wort to care about me as much as I care about me as much as I care about me. 0.102 0.760 0.582 เป็นการายาสามารูสิกที่มีตอคนที่มีหามามีหนามหนากเป็นหนา wait to say with me. 0.116 0.689 0.485 เป็นการายาสามารูสิกที่มีหนามากเป็นหนา wait to say with me. 0.116 0.689 0.481 เป็นการายาสามารูสิกที่มีหนามามากเป็นหนามามามีหนามามามีหนามามากเป็นหนามามามากเป็นหนามามามารูสิกที่มีหนามามากเป็นหนามามามากเป็นหนามามามารูสิกที่มีหนามามามามามารูสิกที่มีหนามามามามามามามามามามามามามามีหนามามามามามามามามามามามามามามามามามามาม	24.	l get uncomfortable, when a romantic partner wants to be very close.	0.500	0.272	0.2 3
6. ได้แต่ it difficult to allow myself to depend on promantic partners. 0.465 0.321 0.227 1. Iam, nervous when partners set too, close to me. 0.399 0.298 0.135 Anxiety subscale Cronbach's alpha = 0.89 Factor I Factor I Factor Z R ² 22. When J show my feelings for companic partners. I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me. Ioannous and an about me and an about them. 0.059 0.771 0.584 23. When J show my feelings for companic partners. I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me. Ioannous and an about them. 0.102 0.760 0.582 24. Worry that romanic partners wort (are about me as much as I are about them. 0.112 0.760 0.582 31. Ioften worry that my partner will not want to stay with me. 0.116 0.689 0.485 31. Ioften worry that my partner sector to the same they are the same about them. 0.116 0.689 0.485 31. Ioften wort measure up to other people. 0.116 0.689 0.485 31. That and that my partners) on the same shout myself. 0.307 0.643 0.424 32. Infind that.my partners) on the gas also say is would like. 0.307 0.643 0.424 32. Infind that.my partners) on the gas also say is would like.	13.	l don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.	0.510	0.470	0.226
17. ไม่การการบระเบาง 0.399 0.298 0.135 Anxiety subscale Cronbach's alpha = 0.89 Factor I factor 2 R ² 22. When I show my feelings for romanic partners. I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me. I'mannauuanasaanin i'manavayaanin'i'manna'ma'ma'ma'ma'ma'ma'ma'ma'ma'ma'ma'ma'ma	6.	l find it, difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.	0.465	0.321	0.227
2. When I show my feelings for romantic partners. I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me. I วลาพี่ฉันแสดงออกถึงความรูสึกที่มีตอนที่ดันรัก ฉันก็กลัววาเขาจะไม่มีความรูสึกเหมือนกับก็ฉันมี 0.059 0.771 0.584 26. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them. ฉันกังวลากฐิตภอขลังนับแห่งอะไม่ทวงไปที่มีหมางไขเขา 0.102 0.760 0.582 21. I often worry that my partner, doesn't really low me. ฉันมักจะกังวลาวศูของฉันไม่ได้รักฉันจรีง 0.116 0.689 0.485 31. I often worry that my partner, doesn't really low me. ฉันมักจะกังวลาวศูของฉันไม่ได้รักฉันจรีง 0.116 0.689 0.461 11. Upden my partner, doesn't really low me. ฉันมักจะกังวลาวศูของฉันไม่ได้รักฉันจรีง 0.116 0.689 0.461 11. Worry that I won't measure up to other people. 0.106 0.677 0.434 27. I worry that I won't measure up to other people. 0.106 0.677 0.434 20. I find that.my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like. 0.307 0.643 0.424 ฉันทั่งวลามันเสียงกานเรื่องอาน และส่งเป็นต่างอาน สี่งเสียงกานเรื่องอาน และส่งเสียงกานเรื่องอาน สี่งเสียงกานเรื่องอาน สี่งเสียงกานเรื่องอาน สี่งเสียงกานเรื่องอาน สี่งเสียงกานเรื่องอาน สี่งเสียงกานเรื่องอาน สี่งเสียงกานเรื่องอาน สี่งเสียงกานเรื่องอาน สี่	17.	l am nervous when partners get too close to me. ฉันรูสึกวิตกกังวลเวลาที่คูของฉันมาใกลชิตสนิมสนมมากเกินไป	0.399	0.298	0.135
เวลาที่ฉันแสดงอ่อกถึงความรู้สึกที่มีต่อค่นที่ฉันรัก ฉันก็กลัววาเข่าจะไม่มีความรู้สึกเหมือนกับที่ฉันมี 0.102 0.760 0.582 26. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them. 0.102 0.760 0.582 ฉันกังวลาวกลู้หองฉันข่ายะไม่หว่าใยที่สานหว่าใยเขา 0.192 0.735 0.546 ฉันมักจะกิ่งวลวากลู้ของฉันไม่ได้รักฉันจริง 0.116 0.689 0.485 ฉันมักจะกิ่งวลวาลูของฉันไม่ได้รักฉันจริง 0.116 0.689 0.461 เมื่อถัน worry that my partner.doesn't really love me. 0.116 0.688 0.461 เมื่อฉันไม่เห็นสู่ของฉันไม่ได้รักว่าเขาองละไปสนใจคนอื่น 0.020 0.688 0.461 เมื่อฉันไม่เห็นสู่ของฉันไม่เห็จกู้การสนใจฉันจริง 0.106 0.677 0.434 ฉันทั่งวลวาฉันจะไม่เกี่ยนไปเห็น อุปางสาน to get as close as I would like. 0.307 0.643 0.424 ฉันทบวาดูของฉันไม่ต่องการกละสัดกับฉันอยางที่ฉันตองการ 0.210 0.609 0.347 ดินที่ห้อนส่งสัยในด้ายงานการกละสัดกับฉันอยางการสัดคามกับสัดฉันสัยในด้ายงองการ 0.212 0.605 0.344 เม้าการกละโดงตาม แต่สัดนับตัวเขา 0.210 0.597 0.335 ฉันกังวละการสัญญาสองฉัน 0.160 0.577 0.297 1. I don two partners () don	Anxiety subscale Cronbach's alpha = 0.89		Factor I	Factor 2	2 R ²
26. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them. 0.102 0.760 0.582 3. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me. 0.192 0.735 0.546 3. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me. 0.116 0.689 0.485 3. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me. 0.116 0.689 0.485 3. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me. 0.116 0.669 0.485 3. I often worry that won't measure up to other people. 0.106 0.677 0.434 3. I won't measure up to other people. 0.106 0.677 0.434 3. I find that.my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like. 0.307 0.643 0.424 3. I worry a lot about.my relationships. 0.212 0.605 0.347 3. I worry a lot about.my relationships. 0.212 0.605 0.344 3. I worry a lot about.my relationships. 0.212 0.605 0.344 3. I worry a lot about.my relationships. 0.212 0.605 0.344 3. </td <td>22.</td> <td>When I show my feelings for, romantic partners, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me. เวลาที่ฉันแสดงออกถึงความรสึกที่มีตอคนที่ฉันรัก ฉันก็กลัววาเขาจะไม่มีความรสึกเหมือนกับที่ฉันมี</td> <td>0.059</td> <td>0.771</td> <td>0.584</td>	22.	When I show my feelings for, romantic partners, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me. เวลาที่ฉันแสดงออกถึงความรสึกที่มีตอคนที่ฉันรัก ฉันก็กลัววาเขาจะไม่มีความรสึกเหมือนกับที่ฉันมี	0.059	0.771	0.584
19. l often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me. 0.192 0.735 0.546 ฉันมีการะกังวลวาดของฉันไม่ตองการที่จะอยู่กับฉัน 0.116 0.689 0.485 วันมีการะกังวลวาดของฉันไม่ตรักฉันจริง 0.116 0.689 0.485 7. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else. 0.000 0.688 0.461 10. I worry that I wort measure up to other people. 0.106 0.677 0.434 20. I find that.my partner is out of sight, I worry that all and all wors in the some interested in someone else. 0.307 0.643 0.424 21. I worry a lot about, my relationships. 0.307 0.643 0.424 21. I worry a lot about, my relationships. 0.212 0.605 0.344 21. I worry a lot about, my relationships. 0.212 0.605 0.344 23. Sometimes romantic partner's love. -0.201 0.597 0.335 25. Sometimes romantic partner's love. -0.201 0.597 0.297 25. Sometimes romantic partner's love. -0.186 0.562 0.311 26. Sometimes roman	26.	I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.	0.102	0.760	0.582
3. l often worry that my partner, doesn't really love me. 0.116 0.689 0.485 สับมักจะที่งาลวาดุของสับไม่ได้รักสับสรีง 0.020 0.688 0.461 เมื่อสับไม่เห็น geosatu สับก็กร้างสโรวาเขาอาจจะไปสนโจคนอื่น 0.106 0.677 0.434 สับกังาลวาลับจะไม่เทียบเทาคนอื่น 0.106 0.677 0.434 สับกังาลวาลับจะไม่เทียบเทาคนอื่น 0.106 0.677 0.434 20. I find that, my partner is out of sight, want to get as close as I would like. 0.307 0.643 0.424 10. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself. 0.250 0.609 0.347 11. Iworry a lot about, my relationships, 0.212 0.605 0.344 11. Iworry alot about, my relationships, 0.212 0.605 0.344 12. Iworry alot about, my relationships, 0.212 0.605 0.344 13. Iworry alot about, my relationships, 0.212 0.605 0.344 14. Iwi ariad that I will lose my partner's love, -0.201 0.597 0.335 14. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people, away, 0.160 0.579 0.297	19.	l often worry that my partner will ngt want to stay with me.	0.192	0.735	0.546
7. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else. 0.020 0.688 0.461 เมื่อฉันไม่เห็นชูของฉัน ฉันก็กังวิลโจวาเขาอาจจะโปลนใจคนอื่น 0.106 0.677 0.434 27. I worry that I won't measure up to other people. 0.106 0.677 0.434 20. I find that, my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like. 0.307 0.643 0.424 20. I find that, my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like. 0.307 0.643 0.424 21. I worry a lot about, my relationships, 0.212 0.605 0.344 21. I worry al lot about, my relationships, 0.212 0.605 0.344 21. I worry al lot about, my relationships, 0.212 0.605 0.344 21. I worry and that will lose my partner's love. -0.201 0.597 0.335 22. Sometimes romantic partner schange their feelings about me for no apparent reason. 0.160 0.579 0.297 21. I worry and that a light avan avain	3.	l often worry that my partner, doesn't really love me. ฉันมักจะกังวลวาคุของฉันไม่ไดรักฉันจริง	0.116	0.689	0.485
27. I worry that I won't measure up to other people. 0.106 0.677 0.434 ฉันกังวลวาฉันจะไม่เทียบเทาคนอื่น 0.106 0.677 0.434 20. I find that.my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like. 0.307 0.643 0.424 ฉันทบวาคูของฉันไม่ตองการโกลชิดกับฉันอยางที่ฉันดองการ 0.250 0.609 0.347 10. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself. 0.212 0.605 0.344 ฉันกังวลโลงมากในเรื่องความสมพันธ์กับคนอื่น 0.212 0.605 0.344 11. I worry a lot about my relationships. 0.212 0.605 0.344 ฉันกังวลโลงมากในเรื่องความสังพันธ์กับคนอื่น 0.106 0.577 0.335 ฉันกลัววาฉันจะสูญเสียความรักจากคู่ตองฉัน -0.201 0.597 0.335 นางครั้งคู่รักของฉันก็เปลี่ยนปลงความรู้สึกของแขาที่มีต่อนั่นไปเดียไม่มีเหตุผลเด่นชัด 0.160 0.579 0.297 28. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away. 0.160 0.579 0.297 ฉันกลัววาเมื่อคนที่ฉันรักรู้จักติวฉันปนที่ก็จะจะมันแล้วงกลู้จักเติมที่ก็เจ้าสู่สีกต้อนของฉัน แล้วจักเต็นที่ก็จะจะมันก็จะจะมันก็จะจะมันก็จะจะมันก็จะจะมันก็จะจะมันก็จะจะมันก็จะจะมันแล้วจะมันไปสู้ก่านจะจะจะมันแล้วจะมันแล้วจะจะมันก็จะจะมันก็จะจะมีนองจะจะมันก็จะจะมันก็จะจะมันไปสู้จะจะมันก็จะจะมีนองจ	7.	When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.	0.020	0.688	0.461
ฉันพบว่าอู่ของ่ฉันไม่ต้องการใกลชิดกับฉิ้นอย่างที่ฉันต่องการ 0.250 0.609 0.347 คนรักของฉันทำใหฉันสงสัยในตัวเอง 0.212 0.605 0.347 คนรักของฉันทำใหฉันสงสัยในตัวเอง 0.212 0.605 0.347 21. I worry a lot about my relationships. 0.212 0.605 0.344 ฉันกังวลใจมากในเรื่องความสัมพันธกับคนอื่น -0.201 0.597 0.335 1. I'm afraid that I will lose my partner's love. -0.201 0.597 0.335 บางครังคูรักของฉันก็เปลี่ยนแปลงความรูสึกของเขาที่มีตอฉันโดยไมมีเหตุผลเดนชัด 0.160 0.579 0.297 25. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason. 0.160 0.579 0.297 ความปรารถนาที่จะไกลชิดกับบุคคลอี่ของฉัน บางครังกลับทำใหบุคลฉันกลัว 0.160 0.579 0.297 ความปรารถนาที่จะไกลชิดกับบุคคลอี่ของฉัน บางครังกลับทำใหบุคคลนั้นกลัว 0.160 0.562 0.311 12. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner sets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. 0.415 0.562 0.311 13. It makes me mad that I don't set the affection and support I need from my partner. -0.199 0.531 0.224 มันคล้าราธงนิมเมืองจนันมีความ	27.	l worry that I won't measure up to other people.	0.106	0.677	0.434
10. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself. 0.250 0.609 0.347 คนรักของฉันทำใหฉันสงสัยในตัวเอง 0.212 0.605 0.344 ฉันกังวิลใจมากในเรื่องความสมพันธ์กับคนอื่น -0.201 0.597 0.335 1. I'm afraid that I will lose my partner's love. -0.201 0.597 0.335 25. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason. 0.185 0.586 0.335 28. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away. 0.160 0.579 0.297 ความปราธถินาที่จะ กลขึดกับบุคคลอื่นของฉัน บางครั้งกลับทำให้บุคคลนั้นกลัว 0.160 0.579 0.297 10. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. 0.415 0.562 0.311 11. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. 0.415 0.562 0.311 12. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. 0.415 0.562 0.311 14. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner. -0.199 0.531 0.224 มันคลับมารจังจันมีเมื่องจามรักเล้าและกามรักเล้าเล้าเล้าระอากาลังสัสกออนฉันเล้าระอากาลังสัสกออนจันเล้าระอางฉันเหลืออนจันเม็องจอนจันเล้าระอางจัน เล้าะอางรักเล้าเล้าระอาง	20.		0.307	0.643	0.424
ฉนกงวลโจมากในเรื่องความสมพนธกบคนอน -0.201 0.597 0.335 ม้ กล้าววาฉันจะสูญเสียความรักจากคูของฉัน -0.201 0.597 0.335 25. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason. 0.185 0.586 0.335 บางครั้งคูรักของฉันก็เปลี่ยนแปลงความรูสึกของเขาที่มีตอฉันโดยไม่มีเหตุผลเดนขัด 0.160 0.579 0.297 28. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away. 0.160 0.579 0.297 ความปรารถนาที่จะไกลชิดกับบุคคลอินของฉัน บางครั้งกลับทำให้บุคคลนั้นกลัว 0.160 0.579 0.297 12. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, ho roshe won't like who I really am. 0.415 0.562 0.311 ฉันกลัววาเมือคนที่จะนี้จักรูจักตัวตนที่แทจริงของฉันแล้ว เขาจะไม่ขอบฉัน 1.18 0.579 0.224 มันกลัววาเมือคนที่จะ the affection and support I need from my partner. -0.199 0.531 0.224 มันจะทำใหฉันโกรธ ถาฉันไม่ได้ความรักและกำลังใจจากคูรักเวลาที่ฉันต่องการ 0.307 0.453 0.208 18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry. 0.307 0.453 0.208 ดูของฉันเหมือนจะสังเกตเห็นฉัน ก็เมือตอนฉันโกรธเทานั้น -0.028 0.384 0.144 ฉันมักจะปรารถนาไหน่ ถึงเล็กตองฉันมีความรูสึกตอฉันเทากั	10.	•	0.250	0.609	0.347
ฉันกลัวว่าฉันจะสูญเสียความรักจากคู่ของฉัน 25. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason. 0.185 0.586 0.335 บางครั้งคูรักของฉันก็ไปลี่ยนแปลงความรูสึกของเข้าที่มีตอฉันโดยไม่มีเหตุผลเดนชัด 0.160 0.579 0.297 28. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away. 0.160 0.579 0.297 ความปรารถนาที่จะไกลชิดกับบุคคลอินของฉัน บางครั้งกลับทำให้บุคคลนั้นกลัว 0.415 0.562 0.311 12. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. 0.415 0.562 0.311 ฉันกลัววาเมื่อคนที่ฉนัรกรูจักตัวตนที่แทจริงของฉันแลว เขาจะไมชอบฉัน 1 1 0.415 0.562 0.311 16. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner. -0.199 0.531 0.224 มันจะทำใหฉันโกรธ ถาฉันไม่ได้ความรักและกำลังใจจากคูรักเวลาที่ฉันต่องการ 0.307 0.453 0.208 18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry. 0.307 0.453 0.208 จุของฉันเหมือบจะสังเกตเห็นฉัน ก็เมื่อตอนฉันโกรธ์เทานั้น 5. I often wish that my.partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her. -0.323 0.384 0.144 <t< td=""><td>21.</td><td>l worry a lot about my relationships. ฉันกังวลใจมากในเรื่องความสัมพันธ์กับคนอื่น</td><td>0.212</td><td>0.605</td><td>0.344</td></t<>	21.	l worry a lot about my relationships. ฉันกังวลใจมากในเรื่องความสัมพันธ์กับคนอื่น	0.212	0.605	0.344
25. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason. บางครั้งดูรักของฉันก็ไปลี่ยนแปลงความรูสึกของเข้าที่มีต่อฉันโดยไม่มีเหตุผลเดนชัด 0.185 0.586 0.335 28. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away. ความปรารถนาที่จะไกลชีดกับบุคคลอื่นของฉัน บางครั้งกลับทำให้บุคคลนั้นกลัว 0.160 0.579 0.297 12. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. ฉันกลัววาเมื่อคนที่ฉันรักรูจักตัวตนที่แทจริงของฉันแล้ว เขาจะไม่ชอบฉัน 0.415 0.562 0.311 14. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner. มันจะทำใหฉันโกรธ ถาฉันไม่ได้ความรักและกำลังใจจากดูรักเวลาที่ฉันต่องการ -0.199 0.531 0.224 18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry. ดูของฉันเหมือนจะสังเกตเห็นฉัน ก็เมื่อตอนฉันโกรธโท่านั้น 0.307 0.453 0.208 5. I often wish that my.partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her. ฉันมักจะปรารถนาไหดูรักของฉันมีความรูสึกตอฉันเท่ากับที่ฉันรูสึกตอเขา -0.028 0.354 0.154 9. I.do not often worty about being abandoned. ส่วนใหญแล้ว ฉันไม่ได้งอลกับการถูกทอดทิ้ง -0.050 0.322 0.123 23. I.rarely, worry about my partner leaving me. -0.050 0.322 0.124	١.		-0.201	0.597	0.335
28. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away. ความปรารถนาที่จะไกลซิดกับบุคคลอินของฉัน บางครั้งกลับทำให้บุคคลนั้นกลัว 0.160 0.579 0.297 12. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. ฉันกลัววาเมื่อคนที่ฉันรักรูจักตัวตนที่แทจริงของฉันแล้ว เขาจะไม่ชอบฉัน 0.415 0.562 0.311 14. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner. มันจะทำใหฉันโกรธ ถาฉันไม่ได้ความรักและกำลังใจจากคูรักเวลาที่ฉันต่องการ -0.199 0.531 0.224 18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry. คูของฉันเหมือนจะสังเกตเห็นฉัน ก็เมื่อตอนฉันโกรธเทานั้น 0.307 0.453 0.208 5. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her. ฉันมักจะปรารถนาไหคูรักของฉันมีความรูสึกตอฉันเทากับที่ฉันรูสึกตอเขา -0.028 0.354 0.154 9. I do not often worty about being abandoned. ส่วนใหญแลว ฉันไม่กังวลกับการถูกทอดทิ้ง -0.050 0.322 0.123	25.	Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.	0.185	0.586	0.335
12. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. 0.415 0.562 0.311 12. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. 0.415 0.562 0.311 14. aunazziniaoaumatic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. 0.415 0.562 0.311 16. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner. -0.199 0.531 0.224 16. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner. -0.199 0.531 0.224 18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry. 0.307 0.453 0.208 9. loften wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her. -0.323 0.384 0.144 30. I often worry about being abandoned. -0.028 0.354 0.154 420. I ont often worry about being abandoned. -0.050 0.322 0.123 23. I rarely, worry about my partner leaving me. -0.050 0.322 0.123	28.	My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.	0.160	0.579	0.297
16. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner. มันจะทำใหฉันโกรธ ถ้าฉันไม่ได้ความรักและกำลังใจจากคูรักเวลาที่ฉันต่องการ -0.199 0.531 0.224 18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry. คูของฉันเหมือนจะสังเกตเห็นฉัน ก็เมื่อตอนฉันโกรธเทานั้น 0.307 0.453 0.208 5. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her. ฉันมักจะปรารถนาให้คู่รักของฉันมีความรูสึกตอฉันเทากับที่ฉันรูสึกตอเขา -0.028 0.384 0.144 9. I.do not often worty about being abandoned. สวนใหญแล้ว ฉันไม่กังวลกับการถูกทอดทิ้ง -0.028 0.354 0.154 23. I rarely, worry about my partner leaving me. -0.050 0.322 0.123	12.		0.415	0.562	0.311
18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry. 0.307 0.453 0.208 ดูของฉันเหมือนจะสังเกตเห็นฉัน ก็เมื่อตอนฉันโกรธเทานั้น 0.307 0.453 0.208 5. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her. -0.323 0.384 0.144 ฉันมักจะปรารถนาให้ดูรักของฉันมีความรูสึกตอฉันเทากับที่ฉันรูสึกตอเขา -0.028 0.354 0.154 9. I.do not often worry about being abandoned. -0.028 0.354 0.154 สวนใหญแลว ฉันไม่กังวลกับการถูกทอดทิ้ง -0.050 0.322 0.123	16.		-0.199	0.531	0.224
 5. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her. −0.323 0.384 0.144 ฉันมักจะปรารถนาใหคู่รักของฉันมีความรูสึกตอฉันเทากับที่ฉันรูสึกต่อเขา 9. I do not often worry about being abandoned. −0.028 0.354 0.154 สวนใหญแลว ฉันไม่กังวลกับการถูกทอดทิ้ง 23. I rarely, worry about my partner leaving me. −0.050 0.322 0.123 	18.	My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry.	0.307	0.453	0.208
9. I do not often worry about being abandoned. -0.028 0.354 0.154 สวนใหญ่แล้ว ฉันไม่กังวลกับการถูกทอดทิ้ง 23. I rarely, worry about ny partner leaving me. -0.050 0.322 0.123	5.	often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.	-0.323	0.384	0.144
23. I rarely, worry about my partner leaving me0.050 0.322 0.123	9.	l,do not often worry about being abandoned.	-0.028	0.354	0.154
	23.		-0.050	0.322	0.123

the following steps: (a) The first author translated the original English version of the ECR-R into Thai, followed by an item-by-item comparison; (b) A bilingual person (an English-Thai school teacher), who had not been exposed to the original ECR-R, did the back-translation into English. Cultural adaptations and comparisons of reading difficulty were checked; (c) The original and the new English versions were compared and reviewed by consensus (comprising a bilingual psychologist and the authors). A few disagreements were found, so the process outlined above was repeated with these items. All 36 translated items were accepted by consensus in the second revision. A field trial was then carried out with 30 students; and (d) Anomalies in the results were flagged, and a final revision was made to make minor changes or correct printing errors.

All instruments were completed by randomly selected student participants who gave their written consent. Six weeks later, the Thai ECR-R was administered and completed by 136 participants. We investigated the factor structure by exploratory factor analysis and principal component with oblique rotation. During the sixweek retest period, to assess the model fit, we adopted confirmatory factor analysis with the retest group using the criteria recommended by Hu and Bentler.⁽²⁷⁾

RESULTS

The mean age of the samples was 20.36 ± 2.0 (range 18-34) years. The male:female ratio was 143 (36%): 257 (64%). 33% of participants were in a relationship at the time of the study, with the period of relationship ranging from 1-133 (mean 28.38 ± 25.09, mode 24.50) months. The mean anxiety subscale for the Thai ECR-R was 3.46 ± 0.99 , and avoidance was 2.89 ± 0.95 . There was no significant gender difference in the avoidance or anxiety scores, no correlation between age and the Thai ECR-R score and no gender difference in the distribution of the attachment style. The distribution of the romantic attachment style of the Chiang Mai University sample was as follows: secure 57.6%, preoccupied 14.4%, fearful 4.3% and dismissing 23.7%. The fearful style was more prevalent in male participants, while a preoccupied style was more prevalent in female participants.

The mean and standard deviation of each item ranged from 2.27 \pm 1.25 to 5.34 \pm 1.55. To ensure univariate normality, Kline⁽²⁸⁾ suggested cut-off points of the absolute values of 3.0 and 8.0 for skew and kurtosis, respectively. The skew of the Thai ECR-R for the 36 items ranged from -0.839 to 0.757, while the values for kurtosis ranged from -0.051 to 0.513, indicating that the responses followed a normal distribution. Factor analysis, using unrotated principal component analysis, extracted six components that explained 57.25% of the variance (Eigenvalues > 1), while 41% was accounted for by two components. Oblique rotation (delta = 0) was applied, and each factor explained the same cumulative percentage of variances. Although six factors with Eigenvalues > 1 were extracted, there was a steeply decreasing trend after the second factor. This suggested a tendency to favour a two-factor model. Items 12 and 18 in the anxiety subscale were found to be outliers.

The second principal component analysis, forcing two factors with oblique rotation (delta = 0) and Kaiser normalisation, was performed. This resulted in all items being loaded on the designated scales. However, items 13 and 6 of the avoidance subscale, as well as items 20, 12, 18 and 5 of the anxiety subscale, had loadings greater than 0.30 above other factors. The loading was 0.31-0.77 for the anxiety subscale and 0.38-0.77 for the avoidance subscale. (Table I). Table I shows the original version and the Thai version of the ECR-R. All items had higher loading on their intended factor; however, item 17 on the avoidance factor, and items 12, 18 and 5 on the anxiety factor had a high loading of other factors as well. Some items were assumed to be loaded on the third factor, i.e. items 10, 12, 18, 20, 21, 25 and 28. Interestingly, all seven of these items seemed to address extraneous content such as anger, closeness and self-doubt.

During the six-week retest period, 136 participants completed the questionnaire. The mean age of the participants was 19.69 ± 0.72 (range 18-25) years. The male:female ratio was equal, at 68 each. The mean anxiety subscale of the retest group was 3.29 ± 1.02 and the avoidance was 2.89 ± 0.80 . There were no significant gender differences in terms of the avoidance or anxiety scores. To explore the model fit of the structural equation by confirmatory factor analysis, data collected during this period was analysed. The raw data was used to create a covariance matrix, and maximum likelihood estimation was employed to estimate the parameters of the model and fit indices. Maximum likelihood was used because it produces more accurate fit indices and less biased parameters than the generalised least squares estimation. (29) The standardised path coefficients in the two-factor solution was 0.14-0.82 for items assessing avoidance, and 0.27-0.83 for those assessing anxiety. These two latent factors correlated at 0.27, and R² was 0.07-0.70 (see Table ID.

The level of fit of the model was examined using several fit indices. A lack-of-fit or poor fit indicates misspecification. Based on our investigation of the sensitivity of various fit indices, the following absolute fit

29 0.82	R ²
	0.67
4 0.7	0.51
33 0.67	0.45
15 0.64	0.41
8 0.64	0.41
30 0.59	0.35
2 0.58	0.34
4 0.57	0.32
3 0.55	0.30
35 0.54	0.29
6 0.50	0.25
32 0.49	0.24
34 0.49	0.24
36 0.48	0.23
17 0.29	0.08
24 0.28	0.08
13 0.23	0.05
11 0.14	0.02
ltem Anxiety	R ²
22 0.83	0.70
23 0.80	0.64
26 0.77	0.59
9 0.73	0.54
· 0.75	
l9 0.71	0.50
	0.50 0.50
0.71	
19 0.71 7 0.71	0.50
19 0.71 7 0.71 27 0.69	0.50 0.48
19 0.71 7 0.71 27 0.69 21 0.69	0.50 0.48 0.47
19 0.71 7 0.71 27 0.69 21 0.69 18 0.68	0.50 0.48 0.47 0.46
19 0.71 7 0.71 27 0.69 21 0.69 18 0.68 3 0.65	0.50 0.48 0.47 0.46 0.42
19 0.71 7 0.71 27 0.69 21 0.69 18 0.68 3 0.65 28 0.61	0.50 0.48 0.47 0.46 0.42 0.38
19 0.71 7 0.71 27 0.69 21 0.69 18 0.68 3 0.65 28 0.61 20 0.60	0.50 0.48 0.47 0.46 0.42 0.38 0.36
19 0.71 7 0.71 27 0.69 21 0.69 18 0.68 3 0.65 28 0.61 20 0.60 10 0.57	0.50 0.48 0.47 0.46 0.42 0.38 0.36 0.32
19 0.71 7 0.71 27 0.69 21 0.69 18 0.68 3 0.65 28 0.61 20 0.60 10 0.57 1 0.56	0.50 0.48 0.47 0.46 0.42 0.38 0.36 0.32 0.31
19 0.71 7 0.71 27 0.69 21 0.69 18 0.68 3 0.65 28 0.61 20 0.60 10 0.57 1 0.56 16 0.52	0.50 0.48 0.47 0.46 0.42 0.38 0.36 0.32 0.31 0.27

indices were used to identify the model misspecification: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and the standardised root mean square residual (SRMR). Chi-square statistics was used to evaluate the difference between the sample covariance matrix and the implied covariance matrix from the hypothesised model.(32) As suggested by Hu and Bentler, $^{(27,30,31)}$ CFI ≥ 0.95 , normed fit index (NFI) ≥ 0.9 , RMSEA ≤ 0.6 and the standardised SRMR ≤ 0.08 were indicative of the level of fit of the model. Our results demonstrated that the two-factor model of the Thai ECR-R demonstrated a fair level of fit (CFI = 0.95, NFI = 0.81, RMSEA = 0.04 and SRMR = 0.10). The chi-square difference supported the hypothesis that the two-factor solution was significantly better than the onefactor solution ($\Delta \chi^2(1) = 433.6$, p < 0.001)

There were large standardised residuals for items 22

and 13 (4.89), items 13 and 26 (4.12), items 19 and 13 (5.04), and items 24 and 10 (4.5). With a correct model, most standardised residuals should be less than two in terms of absolute value.(33) All pairs were intended to measure the same factor, except for items 20 and 13. Therefore, modification indices were used to investigate a lack-of-fit. The modification indices suggested that there were correlated error terms between items 24 and 17 (decrease in $\chi^2 = 22.8$), both of which addressed the response "Feel uncomfortable when close to a partner", and items 19 and 20 (decrease in $\chi^2 = 34.06$), both of which addressed the response "Feel worried about being rejected". In terms of item cross-loadings, modification indices also suggested that adding a path from the avoidance factor to items 1, 5 and 9 and adding a path from the anxiety factor to items 2, 6, 11, 13, 14, 17 and 24 would decrease the sum of χ^2 by 115.61. This indicated that the items contained variances explained by both the anxiety and avoidance factors. It was also found that items 5, 9 and 23 on the anxiety factor scale and items 36, 11, 13, 17 and 24 on the avoidance factor scale had less than 0.2 on the \mathbb{R}^2 values.

Regarding convergent validity, we investigated the correlation between the Thai ECR-R and external measurements. We analysed the relationship between the anxiety subscale of the Thai ECR-R and the trait anxiety and self-esteem scores, as well as between the avoidance subscale and the extraversion score of the 16 PF. The results were as expected. The anxiety subscale correlated positively with trait anxiety (r = 0.42, p < 0.01) and negatively with the self-esteem score (r = -0.23, p < 0.01). Similarly, the avoidance subscale correlated negatively with the extraversion score (r = -0.16, p < 0.01) In the reliability study, we found that the Thai ECR-R had good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.90$). The avoidance subscale yielded $\alpha = 0.91$, whereas the anxiety subscale yielded $\alpha = 0.89$ (Table I). Test-retest reliability was assessed by the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) during the six-week retest period. The means of the summed scores during the first and second period were 2.97 ± 0.82 and 3.09 ± 0.75 (r = 0.80, p < 0.001), respectively. The mean difference was -0.11 ± 0.51 (95% confidence interval [CI] -0.2 to -0.03). The ICC of the total score was 0.80 (95%)CI 0.73-0.85). In terms of test-retest correlation of the subscales, the correlation coefficient was 0.72 (95% CI 0.62-0.79) for the anxiety scale and 0.77 (95% CI 0.69-0.83) for the avoidance scale.

DISCUSSION

Regarding the attachment style distribution, our study found that a secure attachment style was predominant, similar to that previously reported by Ciechanowski et al.⁽³³⁾ The Thai ECR-R showed acceptable internal consistency, test-retest reliability, construct and convergent validity. The factors extracted in our study coincided with the study of Tsagarakis et al,(15) where seven factors initially accounted for 60% of the variance. Their study was the first investigation in a non-Anglo-Saxon language and cultural context, and it was found to be suitable in terms of psychometric properties. Our study yielded similar results, confirming that the translated ECR-R still possesses acceptable reliability and validity within a different culture. The mean figures for the Thai ECR-R were avoidance 2.89 \pm 0.95 and anxiety 3.46 \pm 0.99, while in the original study by Tsagarakis et al, the avoidance score was 3.02 ± 0.93 and the mean score G-ECR-R for anxiety was 3.60 ± 1.04 .⁽¹⁵⁾

With regard to the model's fit, we found both good and poor indices. Besides a relatively small sample size, a model's lack-of-fit may be attributed to some items that addressed extraneous content, which do not effectively represent the latent construct for which they were written. However, the two-factor model was significantly more appropriate than the single-factor model, while there was no difference between models with two factors and those with more than two factors. Thus, it could be concluded that the two-factor model was the most relevant to the hypothesised model. Although the model fit did not yield a satisfactory result, and thus requires further investigation, we discuss some hypotheses for the lack-of-fit here.

The inappropriate values of SRMR and NFI indicated both simple and complex model misfits, and these may be explained by large, standardised residuals, which led to item sharing (i.e. items 12 and 3) or low R² values (e.g. items 5, 9, and 23 for the anxiety factor and items 11, 13, 17 and 24 for the avoidance factor). These items were poorly associated with the underlying dimension and failed to contribute to the scale. In addition, some multidimensional items also had an impact on the level of fit.

Interestingly, our results support the recent study carried out by Lo et al,⁽³⁴⁾ in which they found that the items that caused the model's lack-of-fit were similar. In Lo et al's study, a higher-order factor analysis of a modified ECR was used. They found that the 'discomfort with closeness' factor, which should represent an avoidance orientation, had a double-loading. This factor comprised the items corresponding to our problematic items, i.e. items 2, 3, 11, 17 and 24. In addition, the item addressed as extraneous content in Fairchild and Finney's study⁽¹⁷⁾ was found to play the same role in our study, i.e. item 12 ("I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am"). Finally,

a new set of 28-item questionnaire, as recommended by modification indices, was re-analysed. Some items were removed from the new set to ease administration. These were items 24, 17, 13 and 11 on the avoidance factor and items 23, 12, 9 and 5 on the anxiety factor. The results turned out an adequate model fit, as follows: CFI = 0.99, NFI = 0.86, RMSEA = 0.021, SRMR = 0.07.

In summary, the Thai ECR-R demonstrates good internal consistency and fair-to-good test-retest reliability. The lack of fitness of the model suggests that some items on the scale were inappropriate in the representation of the constructs of anxiety and avoidance. Deleting some items provided a better construct validity. A stand-alone examination of the 28-item ECR-R (or less items) should be conducted, particularly with a more general sample of the population.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by the Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Thailand. The authors wish to thank Assistant Prof Dr Ruetinan Samuttai, Faculty of Education, Chiang Mai University and Dr Numchai Suppareakchaisakul, Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok for their suggestions regarding the confirmatory factor analysis and Lisrel programme.

REFERENCES

- Bowlby J. Attachment and loss. Volume 2. Separation: Anxiety and anger. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Bowlby J. Attachment and loss. Volume 3. Loss: Sadness and depression. New York: Basic Books, 1980.
- 3. Bowlby J. Attachment and loss. Volume 1. Attachment. 2nd edition. New York: Basic Books, 1982.
- Johnson LN, Ketring SA, Rohaes J, Brewer AL. Attachment and the therapeutic alliance in family therapy. Am J Fam Ther 2006: 34:205-18.
- Naaman S, Pappas JD, Makinen J, Zuccarini D, Johnson-Douglas S. Treating attachment injured couples with emotionally focused therapy: a case study approach. Psychiatry 2005; 68:55-77.
- Parish M, Eagle MN. Attachment to the therapist. Psychoanal Psychol 2003, 20:271-286.
- 7. Bowlby J. The making and breaking of affectional bonds. London: Tavistock, 1979.
- Ainsworth MDS, Blehar MC, Waters E, Wall S: Patterns of Attachment: A Psychological Study of the Strange Situation. New Jersey: Hilldales, 1978.
- Bartholomew K, Horowitz LM. Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four-category model. J Pers Soc Psychol 1991; 61:226-244.
- Bartholomew K, Griffin DW. The metaphysics of measurement: the case of adult attachment. In: Bartholomew, K and Perlman, D (Eds). Advances in Personal Relationships. London: Jessica Kingsley, 1994;5:17-52.
- Brennan KA, Clark CL, Shaver PR. Self-report measures of adult romantic attachment. In: Attachment Theory and Close Relationships J.A Simpson JA, Rholes WS, eds. New York: Guilford, 1998: 46-76.
- 12. Fraley RC, Waller NG, Brennan KA. An item response theory

analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. J Pers Soc Psychol 2000; 78:350-65.

- Sibley CG, Fisher R, Liu JH. Reliability and validity of the revised experiences in close relationships (ECR-R) self-report measure of adult romantic attachment. Pers Soc Psychol Bull 2005; 31:1524-36.
- Sibley CG, Liu JH. Short-term temporal stability and factor structure of the revised experiences in close relationships (ECR-R) measure of adult attachment. Pers Individ Dif 2004; 36:969-75.
- Tsagarakis M, Kafetsios K, Stalikas A. Reliability and validity of the Greek version of the revised experiences in close relationships (ECR-R) measure of adult attachment. Eur J Psychol Assess 2007; 23:47-55.
- Ehrenthal JC, Dinger U, Lamla A, Funken B, Schauenburg H. [Evaluation of the German version of the attachment questionnaire "Experiences in Close Relationships--Revised" (ECR-RD)]. Psychother Psychosom Med Psychol 2009; 59:215-23. German.
- Fairchild A, Finney SJ. Investigating validity evidence for the experience in close relationships-revised questionnaire. Educ Psychol Meas 2006; 66:116-35.
- Li T, Kato K. [Measuring adult attachment: Chinese adaptation of the ECR scale]. Acta Psychologica Sinica. 2006; 38:399-406. Chinese.
- Earls L, Huth-Bocks A. The Relationship between Personality and Adult Attachment. Available at: www.gradschool.emich. edu/downloads/downloads_subdir/resfair/2008_awrd_papers/ earls, psychology.pdf. Accessed September 3, 2010.
- 20. Comrey AL, Lee HB. A First Course in Factor Analysis. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992.
- Spielberger CD, Gorsuch RC, Lushene RE. Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1970.
- 22. Iamsupasit S, Phumivuthisarn P. A study of cognitive factors related to anxiety sensitivity. In: Iamsupasit S, ed. Proceedings of the East-West Psychology Science Research Center. Bangkok,

Thailand, November 24-25, 2005. Available at: www.psy.chula. ac.th/east-west/proceeding/proceeding2005.pdf]. Accessed September 4, 2010.

- 23. Rosenberg M. Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- 24. Beeber LB, Seeherunwong A, Schwartz T, Funk SG, Vongsirimas N. Validity of the Rosenberg self-esteem scale in young women from Thailand and the USA. Thai J Nurs Res 2007; 11:240-50.
- 25. Cattell RB, Eber HW, Tatsuoka MM. The Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality Ability Testing, 1970.
- 26. Chaupukdee P. The relationship between personality factor and practice outcome among nurses in Siriraj Hospital. Dissertation. Mahidol University, Graduate School, 1983.
- Hu L, Bentler PM. Cut off criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Struct Equ Modeling 1999, 6:1-55.
- Kline RB. Principles and practice of structural equation modeling. New York: Guilford, 1998.
- Jöreskog KG, Sörbom D. LISREL 8 User's Reference Guide. Chicago: Scientific Software International, 1993.
- Hu L, Bentler PM. Evaluating model fit. In: Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues and Applications. Edited by Hoyle RH. California: Sage, 1995:76-99.
- Hu L, Bentler PM. Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to under-parameterized model misspecification. Psychol Methods 1998, 3:424-53.
- Jöreskog KG, Sörbom D. 3rd ed. LISREL VI User's Guide. Mooresville: Scientific Software, 1984.
- Ciechanowski PS, Walker EA, Katon WJ, Russo JE. Attachment theory: a model for health care utilization and somatization. Psychosom Med 2002; 64:660-7.
- 34. Lo C, Walsh A, Mikulincer M, et al. Measuring attachment security in patients with advanced cancer: psychometric properties of a modified and brief Experiences in Close Relationships scale. Psychooncology 2009; 18:490-9.