

# THE RELATIONSHIPS QUESTIONNAIRE (RQ)

## Reference:

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.

## Description of Measure:

This is a 4-item questionnaire designed to measure adult attachment style. The RQ extends the original attachment Three-Category Measure (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) by rewording the descriptions of each of the attachment styles, and by adding a fourth style—dismissing-avoidant.

*Dismissing-avoidant* people are characterized as avoiding intimacy, being highly self-reliant and independent. (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

For more information on adult attachment, visit this website:

<http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/labs/Shaver/measures.htm>

## Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Scharfe, E., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Reliability and stability of adult attachment patterns. *Personal Relationships*, 1, 23-43.

A basic premise of attachment theory is that internal models of attachment remain relatively stable across the life span. We examined stability and change in adult attachment representations over 8 months in a sample of young adults (N = 144; Mean age = 24.5 years). Attachment patterns were assessed by categorical and continuous ratings across three methods—self-report ratings, expert ratings based on semi-structured interviews, and reports of romantic partners—and showed moderate stability. Interview ratings tended to show higher stability than self-report ratings. Changes in attachment ratings (across methods) were not consistently related to life events that had occurred in the intervening 8 months. The relationship between reliability and stability was discussed, and where the "true" stability could be estimated independent of unreliability, it was found to be very high (*r*'s ranging from .72 to .96). The results highlight the importance of using multiple indicators in assessing adult attachment and using continuous rather than categorical ratings in the assessment of stability.

Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of General Psychology*.

The authors review the theory of romantic, or pair-bond, attachment as it was originally formulated by C. Hazan and P. R. Shaver in 1987 and describe how it has evolved over more than a decade. In addition, they discuss 5 issues related to the theory that need further clarification: (a) the nature of attachment relationships, (b) the evolution and function of attachment in adulthood, (c) models of individual differences in attachment, (d) continuity and change in attachment security, and (e) the integration of attachment, sex, and caregiving. In discussing these issues, they provide leads for future research and outline a more complete theory of romantic attachment.



Bartholomew, K., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Methods of assessing adult attachment: Do they converge? In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 25–45). New York: Guilford Press.

In recent years, several streams of research have emerged from Bowlby's (1988) and Ainsworth's (1982) attachment theory. Originally, the theory was aimed at explaining child and adult psychopathology in terms of nonoptimal relationships between children and their caregivers, or "attachment figures." According to attachment theory, the long-term effects of early experiences with caregivers are due to the persistence of "internal working models" -- cognitive / affective schemas, or representations, of the self in relation to close relationship partners (Bartholomew, 1990; Shaver, Collins, & Clark, 1996). Theoretically, these representations influence a person's expectations, emotions, defenses, and relational behavior in all close relationships. Although the theory does not assume or require that internal working models persist without change across the life span, both theory and empirical evidence from longitudinal studies have led researchers to suspect that the effects of childhood attachment relationships extend into adulthood, where they can be seen in the domains of parenting and close peer relationships, including romantic relationships (e.g., Bartholomew, 1990, 1993; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985; Shaver, Hazan, & Bradshaw, 1988; Weiss, 1982).

**Scale:**

Following are four general relationship styles that people often report. Place a checkmark next to the letter corresponding to the style that best describes you or is closest to the way you are.

\_\_\_\_ A. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

\_\_\_\_ B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.

\_\_\_\_ C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.

\_\_\_\_ D. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

*Now please rate each of the relationship styles above to indicate how well or poorly each description corresponds to your general relationship style.*

**Style A**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

**Style B**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

**Style C**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

**Style D**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

