

Advisory Editorial Board

H. RUSSELL BERNARD
Anthropology
University of Florida

RAYMOND B. CATTELL
Personality Measurement
Honolulu, Hawaii

AMITAI ETZIONI
Sociology
George Washington Univ.

H.J. EYSENCK
Personality
London, England

KENNETH C. LAND
Sociology
Duke University

JAMES C. McCROSKEY
Speech Communication
West Virginia University

ROBERT PERLOFF
Business Administration
University of Pittsburgh

CHARLES D. SPIELBERGER
Psychology
University of South Florida

ALVIN ZANDER
Group Dynamics
U. of Michigan, Emeritus

ROBERT ZILLER
Psychology
University of Florida

PHILIP ZIMBARDO
Psychology
Stanford University

Summary of Our Unique Approach

We are mounting a crusade to improve editorial and review procedures. Existing procedures of current journals have been shown to have an unethical lack of reliability and validity. We are using an unusual set of procedures to promise editorial decisions in five weeks and publication in an average of four months with courteous and tested procedures. In return, accepted papers share some of the costs of publication—but this is independent of editorial decisions!

"Reluctantly, one must conclude that the contents of prestigious behavioral science journals are largely chance determined...which raises questions as to what fails, in such a system, ever to see the light of day."

Belver C. Griffith,

School of Library Science, Drexel University

I think that what has been demonstrated by this study [of psychology journals] is...reviewer and editorial incompetence..."

Rosalyn S. Yalow

Nobel Laureate in physiology/medicine

JOURNAL OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND PERSONALITY
Vol. 10 No. 1 1995

pp. 1-280

ISSN: 0886-1641

CODEN: JSBPE9

JOURNAL of SOCIAL BEHAVIOR and PERSONALITY

An Interdisciplinary Journal

Vol. 10, No. 1

1995

Invited Article:

Publication Practices and the File Drawer Problem: A Survey of Published Authors
James Rotton, Paul W. Foos, Luz Van Meek, and Mary Levitt

Articles:

Love Schemas and Romantic Love
Theodore Singelis, Patricia Choo, and Elaine Hatfield

Self-Actualization, Diversity, and Meaning in Life
Peter Ebersole and Greg DeVore

Perceptions of a Principled Personality: An Interpretive Examination of the Defining Issues Test
Steven A. Wygant and Richard N. Williams

The Effects of Age, Gender, and Ethnic/Cultural Background on Moral Reasoning
Feleta L. Wilson

Judgments of Consent in Simulated Rape Cases
Lisa R. Harris and David J. Weiss

A Comparison of the Opinions of Black and White Males and Females Concerning the Occurrence of Rape
Delwin D. Cahoon, Ed M. Edmonds, Robert M. Spaulding II, and John C. Dickens

Preattributional Dimensions in Self-Esteem and Depressive Symptomatology
Gordon L. Flett, Patricia Pliner, and Kirk R. Blankstein

Under- or Overestimation of Self? Person Variables and Self-Assessment Accuracy in Work Settings
Marjaana Lindeman, Lilli Sundvik, and Pia Rouhiainen

Methods of Procrastination and their Relation to Self-Control and Self-Reinforcement: An Exploratory Study
Joseph R. Ferrari and Robert A. Emmons

Perfectionism Cognitions with Nonclinical and Clinical Samples
Joseph R. Ferrari

Optimism, Pessimism and Worry in Russian and American Children and Adolescents
Howard Kassonov and Denis G. Sukhodolsky

"Chaining" the Use of Influence Strategies for Producing Compliance Behavior
Daniel J. Howard

Extending the Machiavellianism Construct: A Brief Measure and Some Unexplored Relationships
Peter E. Mudrack and E. Sharon Mason

Personal Control: Effects of Reward Contingency and Locus of Control
Michael L. Trusty and Therese Hoff Macan

An Intergenerational Perspective on Marital Interaction Styles
Krista I. Winn, Duane W. Crawford, and Karen S. Wampler

Personality Correlates of Conceptual Complexity
Stanley Coren and Peter Suedfeld

Psychological Correlates of the Materialism Construct
Jonathan E. Schroeder and Sanjiv S. Dugal

Method of Psychological Assessment, Self-Disclosure, and Experiential Differences: A Study of Computer, Questionnaire, and Interview Assessment Formats
Shellie D. Locke and Brenda O. Gilbert

Anonymity and Aggressive Driving Behavior: A Field Study
Patricia A. Ellison, John M. Govern, Herbert L. Petri, and Michael H. Figler

Prevalence Rates of Emotional and Behavioural Disorder Among Nursery Class Children in St. Helena, South Atlantic: An Epidemiological Study
Tony Charlton, Mick Abrahams, and Kevin Jones

How to Submit Papers

The submission of good papers is very important to us as a new Journal. We promise to mail a decision on your paper within 5 weeks of receipt by us. We promise to publish your paper within an average of 4 months of receipt of a final accepted version. Our submission and publication requirements are rather unusual, so please inquire about details *before* submitting to the editor, Dr. Rick Crandall, Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, P.O. Box 37, Corte Madera, CA 94976-0037, 415/924-1612.

Because of our ongoing research on the review process, new reviewers and articles on the publication process are always wanted. Consulting editors are selected on the amount and quality of editorial work done.

Subscriptions

All subscriptions are on a calendar year basis only. If you order late in the year, the earlier issues will be sent to you. Institutional rates, \$65. Individual rates, paid by personal check only, \$30. Add \$8 for subscriptions outside the United States. A 1995 subscription includes four regular issues *plus* any special issues published during the year.

Order Form

	<i>Amount</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes! Start/renew my subscription for 1995. Four regular issues and one special issue (\$30 individuals; \$65 institutions)	\$
Please send me the following back issues: (Special issues are included)	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1994 (4 regular issues, 1 special issue) (\$30 individuals, \$65 institutions)	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1993 (4 regular issues, 2 special issues) (\$30 individuals, \$65 institutions)	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1992 (4 regular issues) (\$30 individuals, \$65 institutions) 1986 - 1991 also available at the same price.	
Special issues are included in yearly subscriptions. They may also be purchased individually:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Psychosocial Perspectives on Disability (1994, 424 pp., \$30)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Replication Research in the Social Sciences (1993, 196 pp., \$20)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Handbook of Post-Disaster Interventions (1993, 488 pp., \$30)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Handbook of Self-Actualization (1991, 362 pp., \$20)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Handbook on Job Stress (1991, 470 pp., \$20)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Type A Behavior (1990, 460 pp., \$20)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Communication, Cognition, and Anxiety (1990, 225 pp., \$20)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Handbook of Replication Research (1990, 530 pp., \$20)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Mood and Memory (1989, 190 pp., \$15)	
<input type="checkbox"/> The State of Social Psychology (1988, 145 pp., \$15)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Work & Family: Theory, Research and Applications (1988, 440 pp., \$20)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Loneliness: Theory, Applications, and Research (1987, 302 pp., \$20)	
<i>Shipping: Included for all U.S. orders • For shipments outside the U.S., add \$8 for each yearly subscription, add \$3 for each special issue ordered individually.</i>	
TOTAL (Canadian checks accepted. All other payments must be in U.S. dollars, drawn on a U.S. bank. Visa / Master Card and AMEX orders accepted—include card number, signature, and expiration date.)	\$
<i>Thank you for your order.</i>	

Name _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

Mail to: Select Press • P.O. Box 37 • Corte Madera, CA 94976-0037 • 415/924-1612

Attachment theorists have argued that infants form different kinds of bonds with their caretakers—that is, they may be secure, anxious/resistant, avoidant, or disorganized/disoriented in their patterns of attachment (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bowlby, 1979; Main & Solomon, 1990). Some attachment theorists contend that these infantile patterns of attachment have a powerful impact on adults' romantic attachments (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). They have amassed considerable evidence in support of this contention (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Collins & Read, 1990; Daniels & Shaver, 1991; Doherty, Hatfield, Thompson, & Choo, 1994; Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hindy, Schwarz, & Brodsky, 1989; Keelan, Dion, & Dion, 1994; Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994; Kuncz & Shaver, 1991; Levy & Davis, 1988; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991; Shaver & Hazan, 1993; Simpson, 1990).

Stage theorists (such as Erikson, 1982), on the other hand, point out infancy is only one stage in the life cycle. Throughout their lives, children, adolescents, and adults face a continuing series of developmental tasks. In adolescence, for example, teenagers must confront two tasks—they must develop a relatively stable, independent identity and they must learn how to participate in loving, committed, intimate relationships.

Building on the work of the preceding theorists, Hatfield and Rapson (1993b, 1995) proposed that people's love schemas depend on 1. how comfortable they are with closeness and/or independence, and 2. how eager they are to be involved in romantic relationships. Those who are interested in romantic relationships were said to fall into one of four types: *The secure*, who are comfortable with closeness and independence; *the clingy*, who are comfortable with closeness but fearful of too much independence (of being "abandoned"); *the skittish*, who are fearful of too much closeness ("being smothered") but comfortable with independence; and *the fickle*, who are uneasy with either closeness or independence. Those who were relatively uninterested in relationships were said to fall into one of two categories: *the casual*, who are interested in relationships only if they are almost problem free, and *the uninterested*, who are not at all interested in relationships, problem free or not.

Hatfield and Rapson (1993b) also pointed out that people's love schemas may have multiple determinants. In part (as attachment theorists have proposed), schemas are shaped by children's early experiences and thus are relatively permanent. To some extent, love schemas change as people progress through the various developmental stages. As adolescents mature, for example, they normally become more secure in their ability to integrate closeness and independence (Erikson, 1982). In part, love schemas change with experience. Depending on their romantic

experiences, people may become better (or less) able to deal with the vicissitudes of love relationships. Finally, of course, people may react differently in different kinds of relationships. The same person, for example, may cling to a cool and aloof mate but become skittish with a smothering one (Napier, 1977).

We designed the following study in an attempt to determine whether men and women possess similar or very different love schemas, and whether or not people's love schemas are related to their vulnerability to passionate love and other related emotions (such as joy, anxiety, sadness, and anger) and to their ability to sustain a companionate love affair. Specifically, we planned to examine the following questions:

Question 1: Do women judge themselves to be *more* secure and clingy and *less* skittish, casual, and uninterested in relationships than do men?

Hypothesis 1: Do those who endorse the various love schemas (to a greater or lesser extent) differ in their susceptibility to passionate love? We would predict that the more strongly people endorse a clingy schema, the more vulnerable they will be to passionate love. Endorsement of the secure and fickle schemas will be less strongly related to passionate love. The more they endorsed the skittish, casual, and uninterested schemas the less vulnerable they will be to passionate love.

Hypothesis 2: Do those who endorse the various love schemas differ in how much pleasure versus pain they experience in passionate relationships? We would predict that those who endorse the various schemas will differ in how much joy, anger, sadness, and anxiety/fear they experience in their love relationships.

Hypothesis 3: Do those who endorse the various love schemas differ in their ability to sustain a companionate love relationship? We would predict that the more strongly people endorse a secure schema, the more capable they will be of companionate love (which requires both commitment and intimacy). Endorsement of a clingy schema will be less strongly related to companionate love. The more strongly they endorse a skittish, fickle, casual, or uninterested schema, they less capable they will be of companionate love.

What leads us to these questions and predictions? In Question 1, we asked whether men and women differ in their tendency to endorse the six love schemas. Many theorists have argued that gender differences are all-pervasive. According to prevailing gender stereotypes, men and women possess very different views of almost everything, including love. A slew of popular books insist that *You Just Don't Understand* (Tannen, 1991) or *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* (Gray, 1993). Scientists have assembled some evidence in support of the contention that gender differences in people's views of love may, in fact, exist.

Some developmental psychologists have argued that young women mature socially earlier than do young men. Others have argued that men and women differ in how early they develop intimacy and independence skills. Gilligan (1982), for example, pointed out that men are taught to take pride in being independent while women are taught to take pride in being close and nurturant. Erikson (1982) contended that as men mature, they find it easy to achieve an independent identity; they experience more difficulty in learning to be intimate with those they love. Women have an easy time learning to be close to others; they have more trouble learning how to be independent.

If men and women do differ in their romantic perceptions, desires, and behaviors, we might predict that young men would be less secure in love relationships than are young women. We might also expect young men and women to confront somewhat different *kinds* of difficulties in problematic love relationships. Young women might be expected to be more clingy than are men, while young men might be more skittish than are women (see Pietromonaco & Carnelley, 1994, for a further discussion of this point). Finally, men should tend to be less interested in personal love relationships than are women (Cimbalo & Novell, 1993). As a consequence, men might be more likely than women to classify themselves as casual or uninterested in love relations.

Many critics (ourselves included), however, have sharply criticized the contention that men and women differ markedly in their views of love and sex. They argue that theorists have grossly exaggerated existing gender differences. In the United States, in the realms of love and sex, they point out, gender differences are rapidly disappearing (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993a, 1995; Oliver & Hyde, 1993). Attachment theorists, for example, have found few (if any) gender differences in the endorsement of the secure, clingy, and skittish love schemas (see Shaver & Hazan, 1993, for a summary of this research). This logic would lead us to predict that we should secure few if any gender differences in the endorsement of various love schemas.

In Hypothesis 1, we proposed that people's love schemas should have an impact on their susceptibility to passionate love. Hatfield and Rapson (1993a) defined passionate love as:

A state of intense longing for union with another. Passionate love is a complex functional whole including appraisals or appreciations, subjective feelings, expressions, patterned physiological processes, action tendencies, and instrumental behaviors. Reciprocated love (union with the other) is associated with fulfillment and ecstasy; unrequited love (separation) with emptiness, anxiety, or despair (p. 5).

(For other definitions of passionate love and related constructs, see Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Rubin, 1970; Sternberg, 1988.) Our predic-

tions as to how the various love schemas should be related to passionate love follow directly from our earlier discussion of what it means to be clingy, skittish, and so forth.

Previous theorists, working with the three-schema model, have found that people possessing three of the love schemas (i.e., the clingy, secure, and skittish) do vary in susceptibility to passionate love (Doherty et al., 1994). No research exists, however, to indicate how receptive people who possess the three other types (fickle, casual, and uninterested) are to passionate love.

Let us now turn to Hypothesis 2. Fischer, Shaver, and Carnochan (1990) argued that there are five basic emotions—joy, love, anger, fear, and sadness. Thus, in Hypothesis 2 we proposed that people's love schemas should be related to both love and to how much joy, anxiety/fear, sadness, and anger they experience in their passionate encounters. Specifically, the secure should tend to experience more pleasure (joy) and less pain (anxiety/fear, sadness, and anger) in their passionate relationships than do others. The clingy (obsessed with relationships), should possess the potential to experience both great pleasure and great pain in their passionate affairs. The skittish, casual, and uninterested (wary of relationships or disinterested in them) might be expected to experience little pleasure and (at best) little pain and (at worst) a great deal of pain in their romantic encounters. For the fickle, love should be extremely problematic. They should tend to encounter the problems that plague *both* the clingy and the skittish. They should tend to experience little pleasure and a great deal of pain in their encounters. As yet, there is no evidence in favor of these contentions.

Finally, let us consider the basis of Hypothesis 3. Theorists have also predicted that people who possess various love schemas should differ in their capacity for companionate love, which requires both commitment and intimacy. Hatfield and Rapson (1993a) defined companionate love as:

The affection and tenderness we feel for those with whom our lives are deeply entwined. Companionate love is a complex functional whole including appraisals or appreciations, subjective feelings, expressions, patterned physiological processes, action tendencies, and instrumental behaviors (p. 9).

In line with this reasoning, we proposed Hypothesis 3 which contended that the more strongly people endorse a secure schema, the more capable they should be of companionate love (which requires both commitment and intimacy). Endorsement of a clingy view of relationships should be less strongly related to feelings of companionate love. Finally, the more people endorse a skittish, fickle, casual, or uninterested

schema, the less capable they should be of maintaining a companionate relationship.

To test these notions, we conducted the following survey. (We would like to remind readers, however, that our survey data are correlational, and cannot, of course, attest to the causal relationship of our variables).

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 117 men and 118 women from the University of Hawaii, who were enrolled in various social science classes. They were interviewed in groups of four or five and given bonus points for their participation. Subjects' average age was 23.3 ($SD = 5.80$). As is typical of Hawaii's multi-cultural population, the subjects were from diverse ethnic backgrounds: African-(2.1%), Chinese-(5.1%), European-(31.5%), Filipino-(8.1%), Hawaiian-(6.0%), Japanese-(32.9%), Korean-(4.3%), Samoan-(2.1%), South Asian-(1.7%), and Other-American-(7.2%).

Measures

Assessing Love Schemas. Subjects were asked to complete the Love Schema Scale, a 6-item, self-report measure (see the Appendix). The first three items of the scale were taken directly from Hazan's and Shaver's (1987) Adult Attachment Questionnaire. After extensive pretesting, the remaining three items were constructed to tap the three love schemas not included in that scale. Subjects were asked to *rate*¹ to what extent each of the six schemas was representative of their own feelings and experiences. Responses were to be indicated on a 5-point Likert-type scale with anchors of "Never true of me" (0%) and "Always true of me" (100%). (For information on the reliability and validity of the Adult Attachment Questionnaire, see Shaver & Hazan, 1993. There, the authors reviewed 150 studies utilizing this scale and reported compelling evidence that the questionnaire is a reliable and valid measure of the secure, clingy, and fickle attachment styles).

Assessing Passionate Love. Subjects were asked to complete the 15-item Passionate Love Scale, developed by Hatfield and Sprecher (1986).

¹ Originally, Hazan and Shaver's (1987) Adult Attachment Questionnaire was designed to assess the three attachment styles (the secure, clingy, and skittish) which were assumed to be orthogonal and mutually exclusive traits. More recently, many attachment theorists have come to recognize that attachment styles may alter with age and experience (Scharfe & Bartholomew, 1994). Recently, Shaver and Hazan (1993) introduced an updated version of their questionnaire which asked subjects to *rate* the extent to which they agree with the three self-descriptions (see Shaver & Hazan, 1993 for a discussion of this point). Thus, in our study, in line with these changes, we asked subjects to rate the extent to which they endorsed each of the six love schemas.

Subjects were asked to think about the person they loved (or had loved) most passionately and to indicate how they felt about that person at the time when their feelings were most intense. The scale includes such items as: "Sometimes I feel I can't control my thoughts; they are obsessively on ____"; and "I want ____ physically, emotionally, mentally." Subjects indicated their responses on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (Definitely not true) to 9 (Definitely true). The higher the score, the more passionately in love subjects were said to be (or to have been). (For information on the reliability and validity of the Passionate Love Scale, see Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986. In this early psychometric study, the scale was found to have high internal consistency [Coefficient $\alpha = 0.91$], to be uncontaminated by a social desirability bias, and to be unidimensional. Assessments of its construct validity found it to be highly correlated with a variety of other indicants of passionate love.) In this study, Cronbach's α for the scale was .89.

Assessing Other Emotions. Subjects were asked how many of the basic emotions other than love—how much joy, anger, anxiety/fear, and sadness—they had felt in their most passionate of relationships. Possible responses ranged from 0 (None at all) to 4 (Extremely much). (For information on the reliability and validity of the Other Emotions Scale, see Stockert, 1993. In the Stockert study, subjects' self-ratings of emotion were found to be positively correlated with judges' objective ratings of emotional expression).

Assessing Companionate Love. Subjects were asked to complete an 8-item scale developed by Sternberg (1986) to measure companionate love's two components—decision/commitment and intimacy. Subjects were asked to think about the person they loved (or had loved) most and to indicate how they feel (felt) about him or her. Decision/commitment was measured by such items as: "I expect my love for ____ to last for the rest of my life" and "I can't imagine ending my relationship with ____." Intimacy was measured by such items as "I have a relationship of mutual understanding with ____" and "I feel emotionally close to ____." Subjects indicated responses on a scale which ranged from 1 (Not at all) to 9 (Extremely). The higher the subjects' Companionate Love score, the more companionately they were said to love. (For information on reliability and validity of this scale see Sternberg, 1986; Whitley, 1993. Sternberg, 1986, for example, found that the scale and subscales were reliable, [the overall scale reliabilities were in the high .90s and the subscale reliabilities were in the .80s and .90s], multidimensional, and possessed considerable construct validity.) In this study, Cronbach's α was .90 for the total Companionate Love Scale, .88 for the commitment subscale, and .85 for the intimacy subscale.

Analyses

Bias. We were concerned about the possibility that subjects' response sets—especially possible gender differences in reactions to the Love Schema Scale—might bias our findings. To determine whether or not such response sets existed, we conducted two types of comparisons: First, we computed subjects' *total scores* on the Love Schemas measure to determine whether or not gender had an impact on the way subjects responded to the scales. (Logically, if subjects were using the scales in the way we intended, their total scores should be roughly equivalent. Because the Love Schema scale is designed to assess subjects' *relative* preferences for the six schemas, it was important to ensure that subjects' total scores were in fact roughly equivalent. If men tend to rank themselves a bit higher on *all six* schemas than do women, for example, the simple comparison of raw scores might lead one to conclude that men and women differed in relative preferences for the various schemas, when in fact they did not.)

We found that men's total Love Schema scores were significantly higher than women's ($t(233) = 6.38, p < .001$). To adjust for this gender bias, (which would have made interpretation of gender differences in the endorsement of various schemas problematic), each subject's mean score (on the sum of the six items) was subtracted from his or her score on each of the six schema items. One hundred was then added to all scores to make a grand mean of 100. This adjustment neutralized gender differences in scale use by placing each individual's six ratings relative to his or her average (now 100) for all the ratings. (See Schwartz, 1992, for a discussion of the theoretical and empirical justifications for utilizing such techniques in analyzing cross-cultural data.) These adjusted ratings were highly correlated with the original ratings (Secure $r = .83$; Clingy $r = .84$; Skittish $r = .83$; Fickle $r = .91$; Casual $r = .89$; and Uninterested $r = .84$).

The adjustment neutralized the overall tendency for men to endorse all six schema items to a greater extent than women. All of the analyses below incorporate these adjusted schema scores. We also compared men's and women's total scores on the four emotions items. No gender differences in the sums of the emotion items were found to exist ($t(233) = .80, ns$) and thus no correction was necessary.

To complete our analyses of gender-based bias, we compared men's and women's scores on the various independent and dependent measures to determine whether or not their standard deviations differed. No significant differences were found.

Approach to data. The Passionate and Companionate Love scales are standard multiple-item scales which have been used in previous research, and so these were treated as independent measures with univariate statis-

tics employed to determine gender differences. The schema and emotions scales, on the other hand, are single-item measures. These data were examined using a repeated-measures analysis of variance. Either schema type or emotion type was the within-subjects factor and gender was the between-subjects factor. This conservative approach allows the use of the multivariate error term in the univariate analyses to control for the multiple comparisons of means. It also allows the determination of variance associated with within-subjects factors. This is useful in assessing the ability of the scales to differentially measure schemas and emotions.

RESULTS

Gender Main Effects

We did not propose any specific hypotheses concerning the impact of gender on our dependent variables. Nonetheless, let us comment briefly on some of the gender differences we observed (see Table 1). First, American psychologists have long been interested in determining who loves the most passionately, men or women. Surveys utilizing the Passionate Love scale generally find either that men and women report loving with equal passion or that men report experiencing somewhat less passionate love than do women (Hatfield & Rapson, 1987). Previous research has not found such gender differences to be robust, however (Dion & Dion, 1993; Hatfield & Rapson, 1993a; Peplau, 1983). In previous research, men have generally been found to companionately like and love their partners less than they are liked and loved in return (Hatfield & Rapson, 1987). Again, gender has not been found to be a robust variable. In this study, we found that men did report experiencing less passionate love than women ($p < .001, R^2 = .05$) and less companionate love than women ($p < .001, R^2 = .05$). Although these differences are statistically significant, the effect sizes are small. An examination of the two subscales composing compassionate love reveals that women score significantly higher on both, with sex differences in intimacy accounting for 8% of the variance.

Now let us turn to Question 1: Do men and women differ in the extent to which they endorse the various love schemas? Table 1 shows the results for several statistical approaches to this question. Univariate statistics for clingy, casual and uninterested show small but significant differences in schema strength for men and women. As expected, men were less clingy, but more casual and uninterested than women. These data were also subjected to a repeated-measures analysis of variance with gender as a between-subjects factor and schema type as a repeated factor. Overall, there was a main effect for schema type ($F(5, 1160) = 81.65, p < .001$,

TABLE 1 Gender Differences in Love Schemas, Passionate and Companionate Love, and Other Emotions.

Measure ^a	Men		Women		Univariate		Multivariate	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	R ²	F	R ²
Love Schemas^b								
Secure	120.83	24.22	126.00	25.17	2.56	.01	.55	.00
Clingy	97.76	24.40	105.48	23.68	6.06*	.03	1.23	.01
Skittish	96.69	20.51	100.14	20.07	1.70	.01	.25	.00
Fickle	103.53	22.44	100.36	23.64	1.11	.01	.021	.00
Casual	98.61	19.20	91.38	21.51	7.35**	.03	1.07	.01
Uninterested	82.59	18.72	76.64	16.57	6.62*	.03	.73	.00
Passionate Love^c	6.91	0.97	7.36	1.00	12.88***	.05	na	na
Companionate Love	6.91	1.25	7.47	1.25	11.43***	.05	na	na
Commitment	6.72	1.50	7.15	1.69	4.28*	.02	na	na
Intimacy	7.10	1.26	7.78	1.06	19.55***	.08	na	na
Other Emotions								
Joy	3.11	0.63	3.45	0.64	16.86***	.07	3.77	.01
Anxiety	2.15	0.83	2.17	1.01	.04	.00	.02	.01
Sadness	1.93	1.03	1.61	0.94	6.22*	.03	3.40	.01
Anger	1.72	1.10	1.45	0.95	4.01*	.02	2.37	.01

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ ^aThe higher the score, the stronger the endorsement of a schema or the more emotion people report experiencing.^bAdjusted for acceptance bias (see text).^cMultivariate analysis not applied to Passionate and Companionate Love scales.

$R^2 = .26$) as well as a small but significant interaction of gender and schema type ($F(5, 1160) = 4.01, p < .001, R^2 = .02$). The adjustment of means described above insured that there would be no main effect for sex.

Although none of the gender differences in specific schemas reached significance when the multivariate error term was used to compute the differences (see Table 1), the multivariate interaction indicates that gender does affect the pattern of schema strengths. The variance accounted for by the interaction (.02) is quite small, especially when compared to the variance associated with schema type (.26). The main effect of schema type was investigated in post hoc contrasts that compared each schema mean to the mean of the other five combined. These contrasts showed that secure was rated significantly higher than the rest ($F(1, 232) = 210.28, p < .001$). Casual ($F(1, 232) = 14.09, p < .001$) and uninterested ($F(1, 232) = 311.32, p < .001$) were rated lower than the rest. Thus, people did differentiate among the various schemas, but gender differences were minimal.

Lastly, we investigated the correlations among the various schemas and compared them across the sexes. Table 2 shows that, of the 15 correlations, there are 6 significant differences between men and women. For men, the strong endorsement of a secure schema, for example, goes along with the endorsement of the clingy schema and the rejection of a skittish or an uninterested schema. For women, on the other hand, endorsement of the secure schema goes along with the rejection of a clingy or a skittish schema; it is unrelated to the endorsement of an uninterested schema. These results suggest that perhaps the most important differences in men's and women's schemas are not their central tendencies, but rather the pattern of correlations among the schemas. This possibility remains to be explored in subsequent research.

Love Schema Main Effects

Love Schemas and Passionate Love. In Hypothesis 1, we proposed that people who differ in their endorsement of the various love schemas should also differ in their susceptibility to passionate love. A glance at preliminary bivariate analyses provided strong support for this contention. Clingy schema scores were most highly correlated with passionate love scores ($r = .46$); casual and uninterested scores were least positively correlated ($r_s = -.27$ and $-.39$, respectively). To test our first hypothesis, we regressed the six love schema ratings, gender, and the gender x schema interactions against the passionate love scores. Because we were interested in discovering which of these components contributed most to the variance in passionate love, we used a stepwise regression. This technique enters the variables into the regression equation according to their relative contributions, with the most powerful entered first, and

TABLE 2 Correlations of Schema Self-Ratings, Combined and by Sex

	<i>Secure</i>	<i>Clingy</i>	<i>Skittish</i>	<i>Fickle</i>	<i>Casual</i>
Men and Women (N = 235)					
Clingy	.06				
Skittish	-.35***	-.19**			
Fickle	-.39***	-.14*	-.24***		
Casual	-.33***	-.54***	.00	-.07	
Uninterested	-.17**	-.40***	-.08	-.20**	.13
Women Only (n = 118)					
Clingy	-.11				
Skittish	-.48***	-.23*			
Fickle	-.39***	.01	-.18*		
Casual	-.39***	-.53***	.05	-.14	
Uninterested	.06	-.32***	.04	-.45***	-.04
Men Only (n = 117)					
Clingy	.19*				
Skittish	-.25***	-.18*			
Fickle	-.38***	-.29**	-.29**		
Casual	-.43***	-.53***	-.01	.00	
Uninterested	-.36***	-.45***	-.17	-.01	.24**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Correlations in italics differ between men and women (Fisher Z test, two-tailed, $p < .05$).

continues so long as variables reach the $p < .15$ level of significance (see Table 3).

Overall, 30% of the variance in passionate love was explained by the regression. As predicted, those who endorsed a clingy schema had the highest passionate love scores; those who endorsed an uninterested schema the lowest scores. In the regression, also as expected, clingy contributed the most ($r^2 = .21$), with uninterested, secure and the interaction of sex and clinginess each contributing significantly.

Love Schemas and Other Emotions. In Hypothesis 2, we predicted that people's endorsements of the various love schemas should be correlated with how much pleasure and pain they experienced in passionate encounters. When we turn (again) to Table 3, we find considerable support for that contention in the regressions of schemas against the four emotions. The schemas and their interactions accounted for 6% to 23% of the variance in the emotions.

The fickle and clingy schemas were positively associated with anxiety, accounting for 6% of the variance, while they were negatively

TABLE 3 Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression of Love Schemas on Emotions

	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β^a
Model for Passionate Love	4, 231	24.65****	.30	—	—
Stepwise Procedure					
1. Clingy	1	63.39****	.21	.21	.36
2. Uninterested	1	14.88****	.26	.05	-.20
3. Secure	1	7.55***	.28	.02	.15
4. Sex*Clingy	1	5.02**	.30	.02	.13
Model for Companionate Love	6, 229	24.77****	.40	—	—
Stepwise Procedure					
1. Secure	1	60.74****	.21	.21	.51
2. Clingy	1	43.78****	.33	.12	.45
3. Skittish	1	9.00***	.36	.03	.17
4. Casual	1	6.05**	.38	.02	.17
5. Sex*Uninterested	1	5.00**	.39	.01	.42
6. Sex*Skittish	1	3.90*	.40	.01	-.32
Model for Commitment	3, 232	54.34****	.27	—	—
Stepwise Procedure					
1. Secure	1	36.44****	.13	.13	.28
2. Clingy	1	33.19****	.24	.11	.31
3. Fickle	1	8.06***	.27	.03	-.18
Model for Intimacy	6, 229	23.92****	.42	—	—
Stepwise Procedure					
1. Secure	1	65.56****	.22	.22	.54
2. Clingy	1	32.32****	.32	.10	.44
3. Sex*Uninterested	1	15.12****	.36	.04	.50
4. Casual	1	9.34***	.38	.02	.26
5. Skittish	1	10.52***	.41	.02	.17
6. Sex*Skittish	1	3.22*	.42	.01	-.31
Model for Joy	5, 230	17.28****	.23	—	—
Stepwise Procedure					
1. Uninterested	1	27.03****	.10	.10	-.31
2. Fickle	1	15.29****	.16	.06	-.23
3. Casual	1	12.39****	.20	.04	-.18
5. Sex*Fickle	1	8.62***	.23	.03	.18

(continued)

TABLE 3 (Continued)

	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β^a
Model for Anxiety	2, 233	6.86***	.06	—	—
Stepwise Procedure					
1. Fickle	1	9.12***	.04	.04	.21
2. Clingy	1	4.47**	.06	.02	.14
Model for Sadness	5, 230	12.16****	.22	—	—
Stepwise Procedure					
1. Fickle	1	32.95****	.12	.12	.44
2. Uninterested	1	15.65****	.18	.06	.31
3. Sex*Skittish	1	3.45*	.19	.01	-.52
4. Clingy	1	3.25*	.20	.01	.13
5. Sex*Casual	1	3.85*	.22	.01	.42
Model for Anger	4, 231	9.22****	.14	—	—
Stepwise Procedure					
1. Fickle	1	13.49****	.05	.05	.23
2. Uninterested	1	12.31****	.10	.05	.18
3. Sex*Uninterested	1	3.28*	.12	.02	-.83
4. Sex	1	6.20**	.14	.02	.73

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$; **** $p < .001$

^aStandardized parameter estimate.

Note: Sex was coded male (-1) and female (1). Hence, interactions with positive β s indicate that the association was stronger for women than for men.

associated with joy. They accounted for 10% of the variance in that emotion after an initial 10% was removed due to the negative effect of the uninterested schema. Fickle, uninterested and clingy were also positively associated with sadness, accounting for 19% of the variance in that emotion. Finally, self-reported anger was associated with greater endorsement of the fickle and uninterested schemas, as well as gender and the interaction of gender and uninterested. It is interesting to note that while mean differences in anger were slightly higher for men, after the effects of fickleness, uninterestedness, and the interaction of gender and uninterested were accounted for, women reported experiencing more anger than did men.

Love Schemas and Companionate Love. In Hypothesis 3 we proposed that people who possess different love schemas will differ in their ability to love companionately (which requires both commitment and intimacy). Theoretically, the more strongly people endorse the secure schema, the more capable of companionate love they would be expected to be.

Examination of preliminary bivariate analyses seemed to provide support for that contention. Scores on the secure and clingy schemas were most highly correlated with companionate love scores ($r_s = .46$ and $.38$, respectively), while scores on the fickle, casual, and uninterested schemas were most negatively correlated ($r_s = -.36$, $-.28$, and $-.28$, respectively). When we examine Table 3, we see that both secure and the clingy scores contributed significant variance in regressions on companionate love, commitment, and intimacy scores. Secure and clingy accounted for 33% of the variance in companionate love, 24% in commitment, and 32% in intimacy.

We secured one perplexing finding. After controlling for the effects of secure and clingy, companionate love was also related to a much lesser extent with self-reported skittishness and casualness. This result is somewhat surprising; we would expect skittish and casual to be negatively related to companionate love. As we observed earlier, in bivariate relationships this was true—companionate love was correlated with skittish ($-.07$, ns) and casual ($-.28$, $p < .001$). It seems that when one controls for the lack of security associated with skittishness ($r = -.35$, $p < .001$) and casualness ($r = -.33$, $p < .001$), however, these tendencies have a small, but positive influence on companionate love.

Finally, as expected, fickle was negatively related to commitment, accounting for 3% of the variance. It appears, then, that people who differ in the extent to which they endorse the various love schemas do differ in their ability to love companionately.

Table 4 summarizes the relationship of schemas to the various emotions.

DISCUSSION

In this survey we explored two major questions: Do men and women possess similar love schemas? And are people's love schemas related to their vulnerability to passionate love, their tendency to experience related emotions in their love affairs, and their ability to enjoy a companionate relationship?

In Question 1, we asked whether or not men and women possessed similar views of love. We did not really get a clear answer to this question. We found that the pattern of means was generally consistent with those other theorists might expect. As some have predicted, men were less likely to endorse the secure and clingy schemas and more likely to endorse the fickle, skittish, casual, and uninterested schemas than were women. The statistical comparisons told a different story, however. Only one gender comparison reached statistical significance; men admitted to being more casual about relationships than did women.

TABLE 4 Summary of Variance in Emotions Accounted for by Love Schemas

Schema	Love			Other Emotions			
	Passionate	Companionate	Intimacy	Joy	Anxiety	Sadness	Anger
Secure	.02	.21	.22	—	.02	—	—
Clingy	.21	.12	.10	—	—	.01	—
Skittish	—	.03	.02	(.06)	.04	.12	.05
Fickle	—	—	.02	(.04)	—	—	.05
Casual	—	.02	—	(.10)	—	.06	.02
Uninterested	(.05)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sex	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sex*Secure	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sex*Clingy	.02	—	(.01)	—	—	(.01)	—
Sex*Skittish	—	(.01)	—	.03	—	—	—
Sex*Fickle	—	—	—	—	—	.01	—
Sex*Casual	—	—	.04	—	—	—	—
Sex*Uninterested	—	.01	—	—	—	—	(.02)
R ² Total	.30	.40	.42	.23	.06	.22	.14

Note: Parentheses indicate a negative β weight. Due to rounding, columns may not add to the total.

Perhaps men and women differ not in their views of love, but only in how important they consider passionate love relationships to be. Other gender differences, not predicted, seem to support such a view. Men were also found to love less passionately, to experience less joy and more sadness and anger in relationships, and to experience less companionate love than did women, though again the size of these differences was small for the most part. The data also showed some significant differences in the pattern of correlations among the schema strengths when men and women were compared.

In accord with Hypothesis 1, people with different views of love were found to differ in their vulnerability to passionate love. In *Love, Stendhal* (1975) observed:

Women of sensibility, you who seek to know whether you are loved passionately by the man you adore, examine your lover's early youth....A man of cheerful, gentle disposition, easy to please, can never love with the passion your heart demands (p. 224).

If we assume that the "cheerful" man was essentially casual or uninterested in relationships, Stendhal's observation is consistent with our findings. It was the secure and the clingy who were found to be most vulnerable to love; the casual (and uninterested) were the most resistant to falling-in-love.

As we predicted in Hypothesis 2, people's love schemas were also related to the emotional tone of their romantic relationships. For those receiving high scores on the clingy schema, love was primarily a tense experience—associated with anxiety and anger. The casual and the uninterested, on the other hand, found the bitter-sweet emotion of passionate love to be a more bitter experience. Casualness was negatively related to joy. Those endorsing the uninterested schema reported high ratings of sadness and anger as well as reduced joy in their love relationships. Perhaps it should not be surprising, then, that the casual and uninterested tend to shy away from romantic encounters. The fickle did seem to be a "mess." They suffered most of all in their love relationships. They experienced little joy and a great deal of anxiety, sadness, and anger in their passionate affairs.

In Hypothesis 3, we proposed that those who differed in how strongly they endorsed the various love schemas would also differ in their ability to love companionately. We found strong support for this contention. Those who received high scores on the secure and clingy items were most receptive to companionate love (which requires both commitment and intimacy). Those who received high scores on the fickle, casual, and uninterested items were the least receptive to companionate love, commitment, and intimacy.

Of course, we have no information about the causal nature of these correlations. People's love schemas may shape the way they interpret the normal vicissitudes of relationships or shape the kinds of experiences they have. Conversely, people's experiences with love, for good or ill, may shape their love schemas.

What about the future? Several projects would seem to be important. One necessary first step is to attempt to develop a better measure of the six Love Schemas. A multi-item measure of the construct should be more reliable than is the current single-item measure. Once a more reliable scale is developed, the next step would be to assure ourselves that the Love Schema Scale was appropriate in diverse populations—that it was appropriate in groups which vary in ethnic background, socioeconomic class, age, sexual orientation, and the amount of romantic experience they have had. (One reviewer, for example, pointed out that people's love schemas, like all other schemas, should become increasingly articulated as they participate in actual love relationships. The veteran of several romances, for example, should possess far more definite and detailed ideas about the nature of love than should someone with little or no experience in love relations.) Additionally, future research should examine the relationship between self-reports and actual behavior.

Once we have assured ourselves that the Love Schema Scale is reliable and valid, is appropriate in diverse populations, and is correlated with actual behavior, it might be profitable to begin to go beyond simply comparing means and begin to focus on documenting the *processes* of relationships. In setting priorities, we would probably choose to focus on 1. exploring the difference between people who are secure in their relationships versus those who endorse clingy, fickle, or skittish schemas, or 2. exploring differences between those who are securely interested in relationships versus those who are casual or uninterested in relationships. Thus far, little research has been conducted to explore the inner lives and experiences of people who endorse the fickle, casual, or uninterested schemas. This inner life cannot be captured by a simple classification of individuals into types. The data presented here reveal that an individual's approach to love is a combination of schemas. The effects of these various schemas must be considered as a whole rather than as separate tendencies.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M.D.S., Blehar, M.C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 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.
- Bowlby, J. (1979). *The making and breaking of affectional bonds*. London: Tavistock.
- Cimbalo, R.S., & Novell, D.O. (1993). Sex differences in romantic love attitudes among college students. *Psychological Reports, 73*, 15-18.
- Collins, N.L., & Read, S.J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 644-663.
- Daniels, T., & Shaver, P.R. (1991). *Attachment styles and power strategies in romantic relationships*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Dion, K.K., & Dion, K.L. (1993). Individualistic and collectivistic perspectives on gender and the cultural context of love and intimacy. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*, 53-69.
- Doherty, R.W., Hatfield, E., Thompson, K., & Choo, P. (1994). Cultural and ethnic influences on love and attachment. *Personal Relationships, 1*, 391-398.
- Erikson, E. (1982). *The life cycle completed: A review*. New York: Norton.
- Feeney, J., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 281-291.
- Fiske, S.E., & Taylor, S.E. (1991). *Social cognition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fischer, K.W., Shaver, P.R., & Carnochan, P. (1990). How emotions develop and how they organize development. *Cognition and Emotion, 4*, 81-127.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gray, J. (1993). *Men are from Mars, women are from Venus*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R.L. (1987). Gender differences in love and intimacy: The fantasy vs. the reality. In W. Ricketts & H.L. Gochros (Eds.), *Intimate relationships: Some social work perspectives on love* (pp. 15-26). New York: Hayworth.
- Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R.L. (1993a). *Love, sex, and intimacy: Their psychology, biology, and history*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R.L. (1993b, October). *Passion and its enemies*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R.L. (1995). *A world of passion: Cross-cultural perspectives on love and sex*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1986). Measuring passionate love in intimate relations. *Journal of Adolescence, 9*, 383-410.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511-524.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 392-402.

- Hindy, C.G., Schwarz, J.C., & Brodsky, A. (1989). *If this is love why do I feel so insecure?* New York: Atlantic Monthly.
- Keelan, J.P., Dion, K.L., & Dion, K.K. (1994). Attachment style and heterosexual relationships among young adults: A short-term panel study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11*, 201-214.
- Kirkpatrick, L.A., & Davis, K.E. (1994). Attachment style, gender, and relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 502-512.
- Kunce, L.J., & Shaver, P.R. (1991). *An attachment-theoretical approach to caregiving in romantic relationships*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Levy, M.B., & Davis, K.E. (1988). Lovestyles and attachment styles compared: Their relations to each other and to various relationship characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5*, 439-471.
- Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1990). Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth strange situation. In M.T. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti, & E.M. Cummings (Eds.), *Attachment in the preschool years* (pp. 121-160). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 63-78.
- Markus, H., & Kunda, Z. (1986). Stability and malleability of the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 858-866.
- Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 38*, 299-337.
- Mikulincer, M., & Nachshon, O. (1991). Attachment styles and patterns of self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 321-331.
- Napier, A.Y. (1977). *The rejection-intrusion pattern: A central family dynamic*. Unpublished manuscript. School of Family Resources, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Oliver, M.B., & Hyde, J.S. (1993). Gender differences in sexuality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*, 29-51.
- Peplau, L.A. (1983). Roles and gender. In H.H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J.H. Harvey, T.L. Huston, G. Levinger, E. McClintock, L.A. Peplau, & D.R. Peterson (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 220-260). New York: Freeman.
- Pietromonaco, P.R., & Carnelley, K.B. (1994). Gender and working models of attachment: Consequences for perceptions of self and romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships, 1*, 63-82.
- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16*, 265-273.
- Scharfe, E., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Reliability and stability of adult attachment patterns. *Personal Relationships, 1*, 23-43.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1992). Universals in the structure and content of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25*, 1-65.
- Shaver, P.R., & Hazan, C. (1993). Adult romantic attachment: Theory and empirical evidence. In D. Perlman & W. Jones (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships* (Vol. 4, pp. 29-70). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Simpson, J.A. (1990). The influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 971-980.
- Stendhal, (1975). *Love* (G. Sale & S. Sale, Trans.). New York: Penguin. (Original work published 1822)

- Sternberg, R.J. (1986). *Construct validation of a triangular theory of love*. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University, New Haven.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1988). Triangulating love. In R.J. Sternberg & M.L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 119-138). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stockert, N. (1993). *Perceived similarity and emotional contagion*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI.
- Tannen, D. (1991). *You just don't understand*. New York: Ballantine.
- Whitley, B., Jr. (1993). Reliability and aspects of the construct validity of Sternberg's triangular love scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 10*, 475-480.

APPENDIX

Romantic Feelings and Experiences

People have different experiences in their romantic relationships. Some people prefer to be involved in a romantic relationship, but deep down they know that, if things fall apart, they will be able to manage on their own. Others need to be close to someone; they are miserable when they are forced to be on their own. Still others need great deal of time on their own. Some people aren't quite sure what they *do* want. (They *think* they want a relationship, but somehow they always seem to fall in love with someone who isn't interested in them.) Finally, some people are just very casual about relationships...or uninterested in them.

Please take a moment to think of the times you have been romantically and/or passionately in love. (It doesn't matter whether or not your feelings were reciprocated). Please read the following six descriptions, and indicate to what extent each describes *your* feelings and experiences in romantic and passionate love affairs.

***1. [Secure]: I Am Comfortable With Closeness and/or Independence:** I find it easy to get close to others and am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't often worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close to me.

***2. [Clingy]: I Need a Great Deal of Closeness:** I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me or won't want to stay with me. I want to merge completely with another person, and this desire sometimes scares people away.

***3. [Skittish]: I Need a Great Deal of Independence:** I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others; I find it difficult to trust them completely, difficult to allow myself to depend on them. I am nervous when anyone gets too close, and often, love partners want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being.

4. [Fickle]: I Am Not Quite Sure What I Need: Sometimes, I don't know *what* I want. When I'm in love, I worry that my partner doesn't really love me or won't want to stay with me. When people get too interested in me, however, I often find that I'm just not interested in them—I end up feeling bored, irritated, or smothered. Either I fall in love and the other person doesn't or the other person falls in love and I don't.

5. [Casual]: I Am Fairly Casual About Relationships: I like having someone, but I don't want to have to get *too* committed or to have to invest *too* much in a relationship.

6. [Uninterested]: I Am Uninterested in Relationships: I don't have time for relationships. They are generally not worth the hassle.

Respondents are asked to indicate their reactions to all six questions on the following scale:

0%	25%	50%	75%	100%
Never true of me		True of me about 50% of the time		Always True of me

*These three items are based on Hazan & Shaver, 1987, p. 515.