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## Traditional AAI coding system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>Coherently discuss childhood caregiving experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>Idealization of caregiver(s), insistent lack of recall of attachment memories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>Anger toward caregiver(s), passivity of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>Lapses in monitoring speech or reasoning when discussing experiences of childhood abuse or loss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two embedded assumptions about the latent structure of the AAI

1. The number of latent constructs.
2. Variation in attachment states of mind is distributed categorically.

These are **distinct** questions.

These are **empirical** questions.
Prior evidence for a 2 dimension model

Haltigan, Roisman, & Haydon (2014)
Aims of the present study

1. Evaluate whether unresolved and preoccupied states of mind are distinct constructs

2. Test whether individual differences in attachment states of mind are categorical or dimensional using large-sample data
Collaboration on Attachment Transmission Synthesis (CATS)

- N = 3,218
- K = 40
- 10 countries
Question 1: How many constructs underlie the AAI state of mind ratings?

- We evaluated the 2-factor and 3-factor models with a set of confirmatory factor analyses.
The 2-factor measurement model

Dismissing
- Ideal M
- Ideal F
- Lack mem
- Anger M

Preoccupied
- Anger F
- Passivity
- U abuse
- U loss
The 3-factor measurement model

- Dismissing
  - Ideal M
  - Ideal F
  - Lack mem

- Preoccupied
  - Anger M
  - Anger F

- Unresolved
  - Passivity
  - U abuse
  - U loss
2-factor model was an acceptable fit: $\chi^2(17) = 44.74, p < .001, \text{RMSEA} = .032$
3-factor model *also* was an acceptable fit: \( \chi^2(15) = 37.70, p < .001, \text{ RMSEA} = .031 \)
Comparing the two models

• Results of the tests were not consistent
  – $\chi^2$ difference test favored the 3-factor model
  – BIC values favored the 2-factor model

• In the 3-factor model, the correlation between the preoccupied and unresolved factors was large ($r = .87$).
Question 2: Categories or dimensions?

- 3 taxometric techniques were used

- Each technique generated a CCFI value that could range from 0 to 1
  - Values between .00 – .40 indicate a dimensional model
  - Values between .60 – 1.00 indicate categorical model
  - Values between .40 – .60 are indeterminate
**Question 2: Taxometric results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CCFI</th>
<th>CCFI average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dismissing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXEIG</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-Mode</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMBAC</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preoccupied/Unresolved (2-factor CFA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXEIG</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-Mode</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMBAC</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preoccupied (3-factor CFA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXEIG</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-Mode</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMBA</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion: Two or three factors?

• Evidence for both

• 2-factor model is a parsimonious explanation for the AAI.

• Results did not rule out a 3-factor model.
  – The large correlation between the preoccupation and unresolved factors indicates substantial empirical overlap
Conclusion: Categories or dimensions?

- A dimensional model provides a more plausible explanation than a categorical one.
- Individual differences in attachment states of mind reflect differences in degree, not kind.
Directions for future research

• Examining unique developmental precursors of these dimensional measures

• Testing whether there are distinct clinical and interpersonal outcomes
  – Especially the ability to predict attachment security in the next generation
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