

Aim 1

In adolescents, attachment insecurity has been identified as a correlate of suicide (Adam, Sheldon-Keller, & West, 1996) and psychopathology (Deklyen & Greenberg, 2008), making it an essential area for research and assessment. However, there is generally a lack of measures that acknowledge developmental differences in attachment between adolescents and adults (see Kobak et al., 2006). The Child Attachment Interview (CAI; Target et al., 2007) was developed to acknowledge this limitation in existing measures (Shmueli-Goetz, Target, Fonagy, & Datta, 2008) but has not been validated in adolescents nor among inpatients. **Therefore, the first aim of the current study was to validate the CAI among inpatient adolescents.**

Aim 2

The measurement of attachment has been complicated by disagreement regarding whether the construct is categorical or dimensional in nature. The developers of the CAI resolved this issue by using both dimensional subscales and overall categorical classifications in their coding scheme. However, the factor structure of the CAI has not been explored in order to determine whether using these subscales is appropriate. **Therefore, our second aim was to do so and compare the validity of the CAI when used both categorically and dimensionally.**

Sample

194 adolescents ($M_{age} = 16$, 59.3% female) were recruited from the inpatient unit of a private hospital. On the basis of the CAI (used categorically), 30.4% of the sample was classified as secure and 69.5% as insecure.

Measures

Concurrent: Security Scale, Inventory of Parent & Peer Attachment, Parental Bonding Instrument.

Convergent: Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment, Youth Self Report, Child Behavior Checklist.

Results: Concurrent Validity

Measure	Secure $M(SD)$	Insecure $M(SD)$	t -test (p)	Coherence (r)	Anger (r)	Idealizing (r)
SSM Total	3.20 (.588)	2.74 (.747)	< .001	.190**	.343***	-.161*
SSM Availability	3.13 (.609)	2.63 (.776)	< .001	.221**	.295***	-.137
SSM Depend	3.16 (.602)	2.68 (.763)	< .001	.199**	.309***	-.135
IPPAM Total	83.44 (13.361)	60.32 (36.027)	.014	.059	.180	-.148
IPPAM Trust	36.22 (5.563)	24.82 (16.197)	.007	.101	.256	-.188
IPPAM Communicate	29.00 (5.937)	19.95 (12.435)	.011	.076	.231	-.078
IPPAM Alienation	17.78 (4.410)	13.91 (8.837)	.117	-.052	-.152	.288
PBIM Care	29.58 (7.221)	24.31 (9.749)	.001	.040	.069	-.080
PBIM Overprotect	15.53 (7.551)	18.24 (8.308)	.077	.206*	-.057	-.015

Results: Convergent Validity

Measure	Secure $M(SD)$	t -test (p)	Coherence (r)	Anger (r)	Idealizing (r)
Peer Attachment	94.22 (10.21)	.825	-.127	-.100	.212
Peer Trust	40.56 (6.04)	.897	-.031	-.124	.252
Peer Communicate	31.89 (3.98)	.611	.069	-.081	.237
Peer Alienation	20.22 (3.83)	.196	.503**	.000	.066
YSR Affective	65.54 (11.42)	.049	-.051	-.148*	-.086
YSR Anxiety	60.48 (9.21)	.581	.055	.004	-.105
YSR Somatic	57.09 (9.34)	.813	.014	-.055	-.051
YSR ADHD	60.32 (8.75)	.422	-.049	-.083	.030
YSR ODD	59.04 (8.13)	.086	-.141	-.206**	.110
YSR Conduct	59.79 (8.21)	.012*	-.237**	-.150*	-.096
CBCL Affective	73.89 (9.20)	.148	-.083	-.107	-.047
CBCL Anxiety	66.72 (8.21)	.898	.023	-.042	-.006
CBCL Somatic	63.09 (9.18)	.641	.059	-.040	.034
CBCL ADHD	62.52 (7.27)	.127	-.155*	-.148*	-.071
CBCL ODD	61.41 (8.20)	.013*	-.282***	-.232**	.009
CBCL Conduct	63.00 (8.14)	.059	-.242**	-.147*	.057

Conclusions

Factor analysis identified three factors in the CAI: **coherence**, **anger**, and **idealizing**, used to create 3 subscales for dimensional analyses. Analyses revealed adequate interrater reliability and concurrent and convergent validity for the CAI when used both dimensionally and categorically.