

<https://doi.org/10.34142/23129387.2022.67.14>

**UDC 159.9**

ORCID 0000-0003-2511-680

ORCID 0000-0002-5772-2931

## **STANDARDIZATION OF THE HOME ATTACHMENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Karyna I. Fomenko**<sup>1ABCD</sup>, **Erika Ye. Kovtun**<sup>2BCD</sup>,

*H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University,  
Kharkiv, Ukraine,*

*1- Doctor of Psychological Sciences,  
Email: karinafomenko1985@gmail.com*

*1- magister of Psychology Department,  
E-mail: kotamaimon@gmail.com*

*Relevance of research.* The relevance of the study is manifested in the need to develop psychodiagnostic tools aimed at determining the degree of satisfaction with the life of the individual, in which the peculiarities of his/her daily existence play a significant role, that is, the degree of satisfaction of basic vital needs in a certain environment. We consider attachment to home as a factor of psychological well-being of the individual in normal conditions of life and a factor that worsens the adaptability of the individual in crisis and difficult situations of life, in particular among internally displaced persons. Therefore, attachment to home is a resource for the development of personality subjectivity, integrity and harmony, the formation of which is influenced not only by the inner mental life of the individual, but also by socio-demographic and cultural factors.

The aim of the research is to standardize the Ukrainian version of the home attachment questionnaire.

*Results.* The test of one-step reliability of the questionnaire items demonstrated a Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value of 0.898. It was revealed 4 factors of home attachment questionnaire. A number of positive correlations ( $p < 0.0001$ ) were found between general attachment to home and indicators of home environment functionality

*Conclusions.* The research standardized the home attachment questionnaire in the Ukrainian language. Four scales of the questionnaire were identified: "General attachment to own home", "Identification with

*home and leisure at home", "Busyness at home", "Value attitude to own home". Was shown the high descriptive validity of the methodology.*

**Keywords:** *home attachment, home environment functionality, questionnaire, validity, reliability.*

**Стандартизація опитувальника прив'язаності до  
домівки**

**Карина І. Фоменко<sup>1ABCD</sup>, Еріка Є. Ковтун<sup>2ABE</sup>,**  
*Харківський національний педагогічний університет  
імені Г.С. Сковороди,*

*1 - доктор психологічних наук, професор кафедри  
психології,  
, Україна,*

*E-mail: karinafomenko1985@gmail.com*

*1 - магістранта кафедри психології,  
E-mail: kotataimon@gmail.com*

Актуальність дослідження проявляється в необхідності розробки психодіагностичного інструментарію, спрямованого на визначення ступеня задоволеності життям особистості, в якій суттєву роль відіграють особливості її повсякденного існування, тобто ступінь задоволеності базових життєвих потреб у певному середовищі. Ми розглядаємо прив'язаність до дому як чинник психологічного благополуччя особистості в звичайних умовах життя та фактор, що погіршує адаптивність особистості в кризових і складних ситуаціях життя, зокрема серед внутрішньо переміщених осіб. Тому прив'язаність до дому є ресурсом розвитку суб'єктності, цілісності та гармонійності особистості, на формування якої впливають не лише внутрішнє психічне життя особистості, а й соціально-демографічні та культурні фактори.

Мета дослідження – стандартизувати українську версію опитувальника привязаності до домівки.

Результати. Перевірка одномоментної надійності пунктів анкети показала значення  $\alpha$  Кронбаха 0,898. Виявлено 4 фактори опитувальника привязаності до домівки. Виявлено низку позитивних кореляцій ( $p < 0,0001$ ) між загальною привязаності до домівки та показниками функціональності домашнього середовища.

*Висновки.* У дослідженні стандартизовано опитувальник домашньої прихильності українською мовою. Визначено чотири шкали опитувальника: «Загальна прихильність до власного дому», «Ідентифікація з домом і дозвіллям вдома», «Зайнятість вдома», «Ціннісне ставлення до власного дому». Показано високу описову валідність методики.

**Ключові слова:** привязаність до домівки, функціональність домашнього середовища, опитувальник, валідність, надійність.

**Introduction.** The relevance of the study is manifested in the need to develop psychodiagnostic tools aimed at determining the degree of satisfaction with the life of the individual, in which the peculiarities of his/her daily existence play a significant role, that is, the degree of satisfaction of basic vital needs in a certain environment. We consider attachment to home as a factor of psychological well-being of the individual in normal conditions of life and a factor that worsens the adaptability of the individual in crisis and difficult situations of life, in particular among internally displaced persons.

Home attachment is a variant of the concept of place attachment, which has been widely used in environmental psychology and human geography since the early 1970s. Due to the interdisciplinarity and complexity of the subject, the concept of place attachment is interpreted very broadly and at different levels. For example, D. Williams defines place attachment as "a system of meanings, beliefs, symbols, values and feelings" associated in a person or group of people with a particular place (Williams et al., 1998, p. 18). At that, the place is most often understood as a real or recreated territorial unit in a person's memory - a country, a district, a recreational area, for example, a park or a house. Although "place" usually implies geographical space, it is infused with individual meanings for a person, which arise only through interaction and activity in that place: for example, one often hears kind words about "the place where I grew up" from another person, and this place may no longer exist physically or it may have changed beyond recognition over the years, yet one continues to operate with this familiar image (Kaltenborn et al., 2002).

D. Pruneau and colleagues describe place attachment through the conscious nature of one's relationship to the environment as a whole, in particular to the community, culture, nature, technosphere, where attachment is the result of "emotional, cognitive, social, cultural and behavioral processes and factors" (Pruneau et al., 1999, p. 27); E. Sharpe as "an individual's emotional relationship to the local environment and landscape" (Sharpe et al., 2000, p. 218). And, for example, B. Brown et al. as a resource function: "...a sense of pride in the living environment... and an experience of their own well-being in general" (Brown, 2003, p. 259).

Certainly, everything that characterizes "place" is also true for home, which is both a real physical space with its object-spatial characteristics, and a generalizing values, meanings and desires metaphor of personality, and a space of everyday social interaction, and a product of subject activity, and, finally, a crucial element of human life history (Nartova-Bochaver, 2016). One of the most influential researchers of subject-object attachment M. Lewicka writes "There is a consensus that the prototypical place of attachment is 'home'" (Lewicka, 2011, p. 211).

As the accumulated knowledge about place attachment has increased and become more structured, it has become more generalized, revealing, firstly, a positive attitude towards a place that is special to a person and, secondly, a desire to maintain and sustain proximity to a preferred place. In addition, most researchers agree about the motivations for being attached to a place. Therefore, it is repeatedly researched and logical in life that for attachment to form, a person must be satisfied with functional environmental characteristics (ability to perform certain activities, optimization of functional processes by means of the object-spatial environment), or otherwise functionally attached (place dependence) to the habitat. In addition, place dependence arises due to the satisfaction with its emotional content (friendly contacts, positive emotional atmosphere, etc.), and the measure of correspondence between the image of the environment and a person's perceptions and cognitive schemes and the ability of the environment to support identification processes

(environment fit into a person's world image, associations, continuity) (Nartova-Bochaver, 2016).

By generalizing the central characteristics of attachment to place and transferring them to our proposed term home attachment, we understand the term as a positive emotional connection between a person and a place (home) that manifests itself in a person's preference for that place over others and a desire to do different activities there, to be near that place and to return to it. Attachment arises if a person likes home, offers new opportunities and opens up meanings. Therefore, it is a rational-irrational phenomenon (Nartova-Bochaver, 2016).

Structurally, attachment to home is a complex composition of positive experiences and attitudes towards it as a comfortable and convenient, familiar and close, safe and life-guiding, or more broadly, a suitable (personally relevant) functionally, emotionally and symbolically place. This phenomenon has adaptive, regulative and facilitative meanings (Nartova-Bochaver, 2016).

Primarily, attachment to home represents a valueological resource: as attachment to the living environment is associated both with personal meanings and everyday socio-cultural and informational processes, and with each person's activities, it is reasonable that it affects the psychological health of the individual (Nartova-Bochaver, 2016). The literature predominantly considers the positive contribution of habitat attachment to psychological health, which we see as a positive functioning of the individual, which, on the one hand, allows a person to actualize his/her capabilities to the maximum and develop effectively personally, on the other hand, is accompanied by the "hedonic" emotions of happiness and satisfaction with life and one's own self (Kankotan, 2008). For example, it was researched that attachment to the living environment is positively related to satisfaction with quality of life (Azevedo et al., 2013), personal development (Morgan, 2010), and can also strengthen one's self-esteem (Twigger-Ross et al., 1996). In addition, it supports self-continuity and identity processes, which are the basis for personal well-being.

The emotional connection with home does not by itself supply a person with any resources that provide security or increase

adaptability, but our attitude to home as something familiar, well-known and pleasant on a psychological level 'promises' us its security. At that, the very feeling of security, stability and inviolability in the home is formed not only and not so much at the account of physical attributes (fences, doors, "surveillance stations"), but rather at the account of knowledge of properties of home space and its content (including social) and ability to anticipate and effectively manage positive and negative situations in the home (Nartova-Bochaver, 2016).

The orientation towards maintaining a close and inseparable connection to home or another special place is more likely to occur in people who need security and support (socially disadvantaged groups, pregnant women, the sick), which underlines the adaptive and compensatory potential of attachment to place (Fried, 2000). Moreover, a study by M. Billig shows that people who are satisfied with their place of living and feel close to their environment are more likely to feel secure, even when that environment is in a war zone, allowing them to adapt more quickly (Billig, 2006).

Like other types of attachment, being included in a person's dispositional system, home attachment has a regulatory function and helps in achieving goals (Nartova-Bochaver, 2016). Very often it occurs that a person is situated in the environment because it gives him/her the resources to achieve his/her goals and desires and makes it possible to carry out necessary activities; this connection to place is a form of attachment to place - functional attachment, or place dependence (Jorgensen et al., 2001). For example, a villager who earns his living by farming is functionally attached to his habitat because the conditions of that environment are congruent with his purpose and activity. Equally, an urban resident who chooses to live in the city centre is able to get to the office quickly and comfortably. Therefore, by settling down in an environment congruent with one's life and professional goals and tasks, one will have a better chance of successfully realizing oneself.

Research reveals that attachment to home models human behaviour, including social behaviour. Attachment and esteem to home determines a person's pro-ecological behaviour towards home and its inhabitants and a clearer understanding of the principles of sustainable territorial development and of anti-consumerism (Kyle et al., 2004). Obviously, attachment and esteem for the home space and the household set respectful, patronising and goal-conscious behaviour. Home is a refuge where a person can plan the realisation

of their goals and evaluate and/or predict the success of a task, to organise for tomorrow. International research also suggests that home attachment helps structure life experiences and events (Giuliani et al., 2003; Scannell, Gifford, 2010). Returning or staying at home is a kind of starting point or, conversely, the end point of a life milestone and organizes experiences, new knowledge, images and perceptions; this is especially true for mobile people who are often in other living environments.

Therefore, attachment to home is a resource for the development of personality subjectivity, integrity and harmony, the formation of which is influenced not only by the inner mental life of the individual, but also by socio-demographic and cultural factors (Nartova-Bochaver, 2016).

**The aim** of the research is to standardize the Ukrainian version of the home attachment questionnaire.

**Results.** The test of one-step reliability of the questionnaire items demonstrated a Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value of 0.898. Thus, all items have high level of reliability and can be included in the final version of the questionnaire (Table 1).

Table 1

**Descriptive statistics of the items of the home attachment questionnaire**

	Average	Variance	Std. Dev.	General value	Alpha
1	48,97872	83,93572	9,161644	0,737883	0,886139
2	48,97872	86,82933	9,318226	0,543251	0,893242
3	48,61702	85,89589	9,268003	0,689863	0,888675
4	49,06383	83,63422	9,145175	0,610735	0,890436
5	49,46809	82,88728	9,104245	0,720502	0,886059
6	48,87234	86,28158	9,288788	0,577221	0,891990
7	49,40425	82,41104	9,078053	0,720243	0,885859
8	50,04255	81,27479	9,015253	0,654035	0,888529
9	49,68085	83,57899	9,142155	0,539161	0,894135
10	49,02128	89,89316	9,481200	0,294438	0,903867
11	48,93617	83,67677	9,147501	0,700174	0,887088
12	49,82979	84,65188	9,200645	0,484569	0,896811
13	49,97872	81,72295	9,040074	0,571297	0,893210
14	48,68085	88,30240	9,396935	0,576321	0,892770

The original version of the methodology is a one-scale one, and the factors identified in the presented study allow us to characterize

in more detail the specifics of the individual's attachment to the home (Table 2).

Table 2

**Results of factorization of items of the home attachment questionnaire**

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
1	0,740041	0,260508	0,039807	0,401529
2	0,041015	0,152520	0,496246	0,673758
3	0,814487	0,101758	0,093758	0,307026
4	0,677419	0,107855	0,465906	0,055657
5	0,387501	0,705868	0,107715	0,325867
6	0,275704	0,007562	0,336107	0,691813
7	0,659063	0,355324	0,083011	0,337398
8	0,336475	0,451483	0,526526	0,204135
9	0,226590	0,841191	-0,042019	0,205017
10	-0,008450	0,649293	0,297539	-0,090052
11	0,775975	0,184467	0,367601	0,090608
12	0,203612	0,106838	0,822940	0,144268
13	0,263694	0,305879	-0,061524	0,725313
14	0,509545	0,008191	0,003844	0,623422
Total variance	3,469559	2,209767	1,788850	2,446740
Share of total	0,247826	0,157841	0,127775	0,174767

The first factor - (variance 24.7%, factor weight 3.47), contains the items: 1. "I feel that my home is a part of me" (0.74), 3. "My home is a special place for me" (0.81), 4. "No other place can be compared to my home" (0.68), 7. "I am very attached to my home" (0.66), 11. "My home means a lot to me" (0.78). It explains the emotional, value and cognitive components of attachment to home, so this factor was named "General attachment to own home".



The second factor - (variance 15.7%, factor weight 2.21), contains items: 5. "My home and I are very similar to each other" (0.70), 9. "People who see my home can learn a lot about me" (0.84), 10. "Doing my favourite things at home, I enjoy it no less than if I did it somewhere else" (0.65). This factor explains how a person identifies with home, it was named "Identification with home and leisure at home".

The third factor (variance 12.7%, factor weight 1.78) contains items: 8. "What I do at home is more important than what I do in other places" (0.52), 12. "I would not like to do in other places what I do at home" (0.82), explains the desire of a person to do important things at home, was named "Busyness at home".

The fourth factor (variance 17.4%, factor weight 2.44) contains the items: 2. "My home is the best place to do what I like" (0.67), 6. "I get more pleasure being in my own home than in other places" (0.69), 13. "I am similar in lifestyle and outlook to those who live in my house" (0.72), 14. "I am ready to put my energy and soul into the house where I live" (0.62) explains the emotional and value attachment to the home and was named "Value attitude to own home".

*Convergent and discriminant (divergent) validity.* A number of positive correlations ( $p < 0.0001$ ) were found between general attachment to home and indicators of home environment functionality (Table 3).

Table 3

**Descriptive validity of the home attachment methodology**

<b>Home environment functionality</b>	<b>Home attachment</b>
Security of a real home	0,52
Security of the ideal home	0,32
Pragmatism of a real home	0,41
Pragmatism of the ideal home	0,23
Development of a real home	0,45
Development of an ideal home	0,48
Stability of a real home	0,49
Stability of the ideal home	0,35

Therefore, the greater the degree of attachment to the home, the higher are the indicators of self-assessment of the functionality of the person's real home environment (according to the indicators of the description of the real home). The obtained results give reason to say that general attachment to home is interrelated with a positive image of home.

It was determined that the norm is the range of 44 - 62 points, when splitting into intervals of the general indicator of home attachment.

**Conclusions.** The research standardized the home attachment questionnaire in the Ukrainian language. Four scales of the questionnaire were identified: "General attachment to own home", "Identification with home and leisure at home", "Busyness at home", "Value attitude to own home". Was shown the high descriptive validity of the methodology.

### *References*

Azevedo A., Cust ó dio M., Perna F. (2013). "Are you happy here?": the relationship between quality of life and place attachment. *Journal of Place Management and Development*. 6. № 2. 102–119.

Brown B.B., Perkins D., Brown G. (2003). Place attachment in a revitalizing neighborhood: individual and block levels of analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 23. 259–271.

Billig M. (2006). Is my home my castle? Place attachment, risk perception, and religious faith. *Environment and Behavior*. 38. 2. 248–265.

Fried M. (2000). Continuities and discontinuities of place. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 20. 193–205.

Giuliani M.V., Ferrara F., Barabotti S.(2003). One attachment or more?. *People, Places, and Sustainability: 21st Century Metropolis* / G. Moser, E. Pol, Y. Bernard (Eds.). Ashland, OH: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers, 111–122.

Jorgensen B.S., Stedman R.(2001). Sense of place as an attitude: Lakeshore owners attitude towards their properties. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 21. 233–248.

Kaltenborn, B. P., & Bjerke, T. (2002). Associations between landscape preferences and place attachment: a study in Roros, Southern Norway. *Landscape Research*, 27(4), 381–396.

Kankotan Z. (2008). The Role of Attachment dimensions, relationship status and gender in the components of subjective well-being. *Graduate School of Social Sciences. Ankara: METU*.

Kyle G.T., Graefe A., Manning R., Bacon J. (2004). Effect of involvement and place attachment on recreationists' perceptions of setting density. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 36. 209–231.

Lewicka M. (2011). Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years? *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 2011. Vol. 31. 207–230.

Morgan P. (2010). Towards a developmental theory of place attachment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 30. 1. 11–22.

Nartova-Bochaver, S. K. (2016). The principle of complementarity in psychology: the interaction of the house and its inhabitants [Printsip dopolnitel'nosti v psikhologii: vzaimodeystviye doma i yego obitateley.]. In book. A. L. Zhuravlev, M. I. Volovikova, N. E. Kharlamenkova (eds.), Psychological studies of personality: history, current state, prospects - Psikhologicheskiye issledovaniya lichnosti: istoriya, sovremennoye sostoyaniye, perspektivy (p. 192–214). (in Russian).

Pruneau, D., Chouinard, O., Arsenault, C. & Breau, N. (1999). An intergenerational education project aiming at the improvement of people's relationship with their environment. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 8(1), 26–39.

Scannell L., Gifford R. (2010). Defining place attachment: A tripartite organizing framework. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 30. 1–10.

Sharpe E.K., Ewert A. (2000). Interferences in place attachment: implications for wilderness. *Wilderness science in a time of change conference: wilderness as a place for scientific inquiry / Missoula, MA*. 3. 218–222.

Twigger-Ross C.L., Uzzell D. (1996). Place and identity. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 16. 205–220.

Williams, D., & Stewart, S. I. (1998). Sense of place: An elusive concept that is finding a home in eco-system management. *Journal of Forestry*, 96(5), 18–23.

APPENDIX

**Опитувальник «Привязаність до дому»**

Інструкція: оцініть міру згоди з кожним твердженням за шкалою: повністю не згодний 1\_2\_3\_4\_5 повністю згодний.

1. Я відчуваю, що мій дім – це частина мене»
2. Мій дім – найкраще місце займатися тим, що мені подобається
3. Мій дім – це особливе місце для мене
4. Жодне інше місце не може зрівнятися з моїм домом
5. Мій дім і я дуже схожі один на одного
6. Я отримую більше задоволення, перебуваючи у власному будинку, ніж в інших місцях
7. Я дуже прив'язаний до своєї оселі.
8. Те, чим я займаюся вдома, важливіше за те, що я роблю в інших місцях
9. «Люди які бачать мій дім можуть багато дізнатися про мене.
10. Займаючись улюбленими справами вдома, я насолоджуюся ними не менше, ніж якби я це робив десь ще.
11. Мій дім значить дуже багато для мене.
12. Я не хотів би робити в інших місцях те, чим займаюся вдома.
13. За способом життя та світогляду я схожий на тих, хто живе в моєму домі
14. Я готовий вкладати сили і душу в дім, де я живу.

*Оригінальний рукопис отриманий 7 вересня 2022 року*

*Стаття прийнята до друку 21 вересня 2022 року*