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Maslow (1956) suggested that self-actualization in an important determinant of the type of love experienced in heterosexual relationships. Recent work has suggested that the self-actualization of each member of a couple may also be important in determining the level of self-disclosure intimacy which occurs in the couple, and also that self-disclosure itself is an important determinant of interpersonal attraction. The present study employed the technique of path analysis (Wright, 1960) to determine 1) the direct and indirect contribution of each partner's self-actualization to his experience of five love components identified by Critelli, Myers, Ellington, and Bissett (1981), 2) the contribution of each partner's self-actualization to his self-disclosure intimacy, and 3) the contribution of the partner's self-disclosure intimacy to their experience of the five love components.

The hypotheses predicted 1) that high self-actualization would contribute to high Communicative Intimacy, Respect, and Physical Arousal, and to low Romantic Dependency and low Idealistic Compatibility in both couple
members, 2) that high self-actualization would contribute to high self-disclosure intimacy in both partners, and 3) that high self-disclosure intimacy would contribute to high Communicative Intimacy, Respect, and Physical Arousal, and to low Romantic Dependency and low Idealistic Compatibility.

Results from 97 non-married college couples generally failed to show a relationship between self-actualization, measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrum, 1966), and the love components, except that high self-actualization was associated with low Romantic Dependency in females. High self-actualization in each partner was significantly related to high self-disclosure intimacy in the couples. High self-disclosure intimacy predicted high scores on all the love components for males and on four of the five components for females. The indirect contributions of self-actualization to the love components via the self-actualization → self-disclosure → love pathway were thus consistently positive.
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That love and intimate relationships are important in everyday life is hardly a revelation. What is noteworthy is the attention these topics are receiving today. Both the lay public and mental health professionals are involved in a complementary effort to understand how intimate relationships are successfully begun and maintained. Some evidence from a sociological perspective would suggest that this effort stems from the failure of the "sexual revolution" of the 60's and 70's to provide the widespread relationship satisfaction that sexual freedom was supposed to allow (Leonard, in press; Marin, 1983). Thus, interest in the more traditional virtues of love and romance is appearing in the wake of the sexual revolution.

Information about relationship building now appearing in the popular media reflects not only a widespread concern with interpersonal issues but also reflects a great deal of accumulated research in psychology and related disciplines. A recently published guide to successful marriage lists over 400 references relevant to "mating" (Minge, Giuliani, & Bowman, 1983), and Huston and Levinger's (1978) review of the scientific literature on interpersonal attraction and relationships references 335 articles. As a special case of
interpersonal attraction, however, love has only recently been the explicit subject of empirical research. While a great deal of attention in the literature has been given to the initial attraction between strangers, little is yet known about what variables may influence the strengths of different kinds of love in ongoing relationships. One possibility is that general features of personality development, such as self-actualization, predispose one toward experiencing certain components of love and/or exciting particular components of romantic attraction in one's admirers. Another possibility is that the self-disclosure between romantically involved partners may influence the kinds of attraction which develop. The present study attempts to sort out the possible contributions of self-actualization and self-disclosure to various components of love in intact couples.

**Types of Love**

Although the empirical investigation of love is a recent phenomenon, the nature of love has been a topic of theoretical speculation for many years. The early theories within psychology derived primarily from clinical observations and were generally concerned with healthy versus unhealthy types of love. Psychoanalytic theorists postulated that different types of intimate attachments could exist between adults, depending on each person's level of psychosexual development.
Eric Fromm was perhaps the first psychoanalyst to focus on the identification of different "types" of love. He distinguished "genuine love," a relatively rare expression of optimal psychological functioning, from "pseudo love," a much more common emotional expression which he thought to be neurotically motivated (Fromm, 1956). Genuine love was characterized by an active quality of giving, caring, responding, and experiencing the loved one openly, freely, and without pretense or role playing. He described brotherly, motherly, fatherly, and erotic love as different expressions of genuine love. Fromm suggested that each type of love might be experienced alone or that different types of love could coexist in one relationship.

Within Fromm's scheme, brotherly love is the most fundamental kind of love: love between equals which grows out of an experience of "oneness" or communality with all men. In contrast, motherly love is love between unequals, an unconditional affirmation of the life and needs of the helpless by one in a superior position, which ultimately ends in separation. Fatherly love, also love between unequals, is conditional love which is given only when earned. In contrast to these three types of love there is erotic love, which is characterized by its exclusiveness, expressed in the desire for intimacy with a single other person. Fromm believed that, to be nonexploitative, an intimate sexual relationship must be based on a foundation
of brotherly love, which is responsible for respect and equal mutual valuing between the partners (Fromm, 1956, p. 46).

Maslow (1962) drew a distinction between Being-love (B-love) and Dependency-love (D-love). B-love was said to be unselfish, ecstatic, spontaneous, and to contain a minimum of anxiety, hostility or emotional defensiveness. D-love, on the other hand, was said to be characterized by selfishness, possessiveness, and motivated by a desire for need gratification. With the same clinical attitude that characterized Fromm's theory, Maslow clearly associated B-love with psychological well being, i.e. self-actualization, and D-love with relatively poorer mental health.

More recently, empirical procedures have led to the construct validation of love as distinct from liking. Rubin (1970) investigated the qualities of romantic love. He viewed romantic love as being characterized by feelings of intimacy, attachment, and caring, while liking emphasizes admiration, respect, and perceived similarity. His scale of romantic love was the first instrument designed to measure this elusive emotional state. The scale included dimensions of affiliative and dependency needs, feeling of exclusiveness and absorption, and the predisposition to help.

That loving represents an attachment or commitment different from liking has been borne out in other studies using intact couples. Guinsberg (1973) found that males and
females alike readily distinguish platonic from romantic relationships, and that both sexes attributed more emotional closeness and comfort to the latter. Rubin (1974) reported that love correlates more highly than liking with eventual marriage. Veerhusen (1979) found that the degree of love one feels and believes to be reciprocated by one's partner is a more powerful predictor of stability in dating couples than the degree of liking they report.

In a particularly enlightening study of the components of love and the subjective feelings associated with a love relationship as opposed to one of dating or friendship, Pam, Plutchick, and Conte (1973) constructed a 43-item questionnaire to measure respect, congeniality (which included trust), altruism, physical arousal, and attachment. Subjects were asked to pick a person of the opposite sex and indicate whether their relationship was love, dating, or friendship. There were significant differences among the relationship types on the total score and on every subscale except Congeniality. For total score and the three subscales of Altruism, Physical Attraction, and Attachment, the love group had the highest scores. On the subscale Respect, the love group's score was higher than the dating group but not the friendship group. These results demonstrate clear differences in the subjective experience of love, dating and friendship. Also very interesting was the finding that for the love group, only the subscales Respect and Congeniality
showed a significant correlation, whereas most of the scales were significantly correlated with each other for the other two groups. The authors suggested that in choosing a love partner, greater emphasis is placed on some attributes than others, whereas in dating and friendship more uniform emphasis is placed on a number of qualities.

Not only have distinctions been made between the experience of loving and liking, but between different kinds of loving as well. Driscoll, Davis, and Lipetz (1972) conceptualized romantic love to include physical arousal, passion, and idealization, in addition to feelings of intimacy and attachment. These authors drew a distinction between romantic love, which they suggested is not necessarily associated with trust, and conjugal love, which they said develops out of partners' mutual satisfaction and confidence in the relationship. Driscoll, et al found that while both married and unmarried relationships may have elements of romantic and conjugal love, serious relationships evolve over time from a predominantly romantic to a more conjugal type of love.

Lee (1974) described six different "styles of loving," three pure types and three blended types. His data were obtained with a 30-item questionnaire containing general statements about love, and a 170-item love story questionnaire which dealt with the respondent's own experiences in love. The three pure types of love Lee called "eros,"
"ludus," and "storgus." Eros was characterized by a strong sensual attraction guided by a concept of ideal beauty, and a strong desire to fuse with the loved one. Ludic love was characterized by enjoyment of love as a pleasant pastime, a playful attitude, and management of the relationship to keep it balanced, avoiding too much intimacy. Storgic love was a tranquil affection which developed slowly over time, based on enduring friendship. This style of love lacked the passion of eros and the playfulness of ludus, being in general much less intense than these two types but much more enduring. Manic love was described as a blend of eros and ludus. It was characterized by obsessive preoccupation with love and one's partner, intensely ambivalent feelings toward the partner, and wide mood swings between ecstasy and despair about the relationship. Pragma combined storgus and ludus. It was seen to be love which grew out of compatibility based on practical criteria, and utilized conscious manipulation to further the affair. Agape combined elements of storgic and erotic love for a strong initial attraction with an altruistic attitude toward the loved one in which reciprocity is not demanded. Agape, which Lee suggested was quite rare, was characterized by a strong element of self-sacrifice for the loved one. A 35-item love scale accompanied Lee's article and he asserted that the love typology "held up" in three subsequent samples. No
reliability or validity were detailed in these or in any other studies this author could find.

Swenson identified six components of love in a series of factor analytic studies using data gathered from 388 items administered to 1200 subjects of various ages (Swenson, 1961; Swenson, 1973; Swenson and Gilver, 1964). The items were originally derived from interviews with 200 individuals who described relationships with parents, children, brothers, sisters, spouses, and friends. The factors which were identified from this work are 1) verbal expression of feelings, such as trust, love, happiness, 2) self-disclosure of goals, plans, problems, 3) willingness to tolerate unpleasant aspects of the loved one, 4) non-material evidence of love, such as support and encouragement, 5) unexpressed feelings, and 6) material evidence of love, such as money and gifts. Interestingly, some additional factors which were identified in early work but omitted in the final 120-item love scale due to their low factor loading were physical expression of love, considerateness, parenting behavior, and doing things together. Fiore and Swenson (1977) showed that these scales distinguish functional from dysfunctional marriages, with spouses in the former group scoring higher on every scale than spouses in the latter group.

Critelli, Myers, Ellington, and Bissett (1981) identified five components of love through factor analysis of a
63-item questionnaire they administered to a sample of dating couples. The factors which emerged were Romantic Dependency, Communicative Intimacy, Physical Arousal, Respect, and Idealistic Compatibility. Romantic Dependency was characterized by feelings of exclusive attachment, need, and the fear that one would have difficulty getting along without their partner. Communicative Intimacy tapped feelings of being understood, trust of the partner, and beliefs concerning the solidity of the relationship. Physical Arousal included passion and sexual excitement concerning the partner. Respect seemed to tap thoughts and opinions about one's partner's abilities and level of maturity. Idealistic Compatibility loaded with items attesting to one's belief in inevitable happiness with their partner, lack of disagreement, and temperamental similarity. Women were found to experience higher levels of Communicative Intimacy than men with no sex differences evident in their other four components. This is consistent with reports that women experience higher levels of Maslow's B-love than do men (Dietch, 1978; McGovern, 1977).

The studies of Swenson, and Critelli et al arrived at very different types of factors, reflecting their different intents and correspondingly different data bases. Swenson organized items from descriptions of a number of different relations and the resulting factors are all behavioral indices of love. He reported that love among peers is most
often reflected in verbal expressions of love while material expression of affection is found largely within marriage and families; only in marriage is love expressed through all six factors (Fiore and Swenson, 1977). In contrast, Critelli et al (1981) focused more specifically on romantic involvements and used as a data base statements which reflected emotional or attitudinal components of one's own love experience. Swenson's scale is more likely to demonstrate how loved a person feels in light of his partner's behavior, whereas the love scale described by Critelli et al indicates how much and in what way a person feels love for his partner.

Self-Actualization and Love

Self-actualization is the core concept of Maslow's humanistic approach to psychological health (Maslow, 1968). A self-actualizing individual is motivated primarily by a desire for self-expression. Low self-actualizers, in contrast, seek only to compensate for basic unfulfilled needs. Thus, healthy self-expressive individuals may have less need for love while being more able to give love. Maslow indicated that because of their heightened self-acceptance, esteem, openness, and basic security, only high self-actualizers are capable of the more healthy B-love. Low self-actualizers, because of their basic insecurity and unfulfilled personal needs were thought to be incapable of B-love; they were thought to be more inclined toward
interpersonal relationships characterized by dependency, and D-love.

In support of these hypothesized differences between high and low self-actualizers, Dietch (1978) found a significant positive correlation between self-actualization and B-love for both sexes in a sample of dating college couples. Self-actualization was measured with the Personal Orientation Inventory and B-love was measured with a 16-item questionnaire Deitch constructed. Items on this questionnaire were statements of feelings about the partner, some compatible with B-love and others incompatible with B-love, which each subject rated on a 9-point scale of agreement. For example, high agreement with the item "I loved ______ to my fullest capacity" was compatible with B-love, whereas high agreement with the item "My love was so great I saw no faults in ______" was incompatible with B-love.

In Deitch's sample of couples, level of self-actualization was also correlated with ever having been involved in a love relationship for both sexes, raising some question about the ability of low self-actualizers to form, recognize, or admit to such a relationship regardless of whether the relationship is based on dependency or self-expression. No significant correlation was found between B-love and length of relationship, suggesting that at least in short-term relationships B-love is a stable, somewhat "all or nothing" phenomenon. The couples Deitch studied had been
dating an average of 19.6 months. It has also been shown that romantic love is unrelated to time within ongoing dating relationships (Rubin, 1970). Deitch suggested that during a "pre-love" stage partners are preparing to label themselves as "in love" and perhaps also determining the level of love that will characterize the early stages of their relationship. Since neither B-love nor romantic love appears to change during the early stages of romantic relationships, it seems likely that prospective partners are also inadvertently determining what kinds(s) of love will characterize their relationship at least during its first two years.

Other results which Deitch obtained indicated that termination of important love relationships results in a decrease in B-love, but does not affect one's level of self-actualization. However, low self-actualizers feel more resentment toward their ex-partner than do high self-actualizers. This was found to be true for both sexes, regardless of the time since the termination. These findings attest to the stability of one's level of self-actualization while also suggesting that low self-actualizers of both sexes have involvements in relationships that are qualitatively very different from those of high-self-actualizers.

Results obtained by Dion and Dion (1973) tend to support Deitch's findings. These authors found that
individuals with high self-esteem and low defensiveness experience romantic love more frequently than low self-esteem individuals (regardless of their defensiveness). Maslow (1950) has characterized high self-esteem and low defensiveness as a trait pattern of central importance of self-actualization. These results suggest that high self-esteem alone does not necessarily promote romantic involvements; one must also be accessible. However, low self-esteem alone appears sufficient to interfere with romantic love since even in subjects who were relatively non-defensive, the frequency of their romantic involvements was low when their self-esteem was low. In a later study, highly defensive individuals described their love experiences as more guarded and expressed a more cynical attitude about love than did low defensive individuals (Dion & Dion, 1975). Dion and Dion (1978) found that highly defensive women express less liking for males than for females, and present themselves less favorably to males than to females. This attitude and behavior pattern would clearly interfere with romantic involvement. For the low self-esteem individual, openness may serve only to reveal one's doubt or negative self-image, thus making them less attractive and less successful in love.

Dion and Dion postulated a dependence model for the relationship between personality and romantic love. They suggested that an individual's feelings of influencibility
and vulnerability become more salient as interpersonal intimacy increases, leading those with a heightened sense of vulnerability to avoid initiating or responding to romantic overtures.

This "dependence" model for the relationship between personality and romantic love should not be confused with issues of interpersonal "dependency." The model suggests simply that a person's experience with romantic love depends on his own personality, specifically, on his sense of personal vulnerability. Issues concerning the role of interpersonal dependency in relationships were not included in this work.

In addition to the simple effects of one's own level of self-actualization on love which Deitch found, other studies have demonstrated that the level of self-actualization of one's partner is also an important determinant of feelings for the partner. Wombacher (1973) presented behavioral descriptions of "self-actualizing," "normal," and "compensating" targets to subjects who were divided into the same three groups based on their scores on the Personal Orientation Inventory. After reading the descriptions of each target, the subjects indicated their degree of liking and respect for them. Targets in the self-actualizing group received higher ratings of respect and liking than targets in the other two groups; there were no differences between liking and respect scores and no effects for sex of subject
or target. An interaction effect occurred, in which high self-actualizing subjects' attraction scores for the self-actualizing target increased as the similarity between rater and stimulus person increased. This pattern of increasing attraction with increasing similarity was not found for the normal and compensating subjects.

Larson (1979) repeated Wombacher's design using videotaped interviews of the targets in place of written descriptions, and measured attractiveness with the Interpersonal Judgement Scale (Byrne, 1969). She also found that self-actualizers were perceived as more attractive than normal or compensating targets, but did not find any interaction effects.

Self-Disclosure and Love

An important area of research in the literature on interpersonal attraction concerns the role of self-disclosure in developing relationships. Self-disclosure may be defined as any information about oneself which Person A verbally communicates to Person B. The term "self-disclosure" is used to refer both to a personality construct and a process of interaction which occurs between two people (Cozby, 1973). The basic parameters of self-disclosure are 1) the breadth or amount of information disclosed, 2) depth or intimacy of information disclosed, 3) duration or time spent disclosing on a particular topic, and 4) desirability of the information disclosed. Of these
four parameters, intimacy and desirability have been the most widely studied. An additional parameter which Critelli and Neumann (1976) pointed out is variation in the content of self-disclosure, i.e. whether self-disclosure provides information about one's own traits or feedback about one's reactions to the traits of another person.

The actual self-disclosing behavior that occurs in intact couples has been the subject of a number of studies that have focused on sex differences. Rubin, Hill, Peplau, and Schetter (1980) found equal amounts of self-disclosure in the men and women of a sample of dating college couples, but differences in the topics of self-disclosure appeared between the sexes. Women disclosed more about their feelings regarding their parents, closest same sex friends, classes and work, greatest fears, and accomplishments than men. Men disclosed more about their political views, things they were most proud of, and things they like most about their partners. Critelli, et al (1981) found that in love letters written to their dating partners, females expressed a higher number of romantic, friendship, and favorable emotional statements than did males. Within married couples, Hendrick (1979) found that wives disclose more to their husbands than husbands disclose to their wives.

The subject of sex differences in self-disclosing behavior has been of considerable interest, with some studies finding no difference between the sexes in self-disclosure
and others reporting that women self-disclose more than men. These differing results appear to stem from the study of different self-disclosure measures and variables from study to study. Cozby (1973) reported that no study had ever found a higher level of self-disclosure in men than women, but even this generalization must be qualified with respect to the differences in topical self-disclosure reported above. It seems more accurate to conclude that no study has ever found men to self-disclose more intimately than women.

An important practical aspect of the level of self-disclosure within couples is its relationship to the satisfaction each participant derives from their association with one another. In Hendrick's (1979) study, the level of self-disclosure was correlated significantly with marital satisfaction for both sexes. Cozby (1973) reported that significant but low correlations are generally found between these two variables. Lombardo and Wood (1979) found that while high self-disclosers in general are most satisfied with their same sex friendships, moderate self-disclosers are most satisfied with their romantic relationships. This study would seem to argue against a simple linear relationship between self-disclosure and satisfaction in intimate couples.

In a direct comparison of the amount of love experienced by both spouses in functional and disfunctional marriages, Fiore and Swenson (1977) did find that the chief
failure and disappointment in the expression of love was verbal. As described earlier, their "love scale" actually measures a number of types of disclosure as well as other behaviors.

Functional wives and husbands express more affection to each other verbally, disclose more personal facts about themselves to each other, and provide more psychological encouragement and moral support to each other.... Disfunctional couples reveal fewer personal facts about themselves to their spouses and provide much less moral support and encouragement (p. 713).

Critelli and Neumann (1976) investigated the amounts of positive and negative self-disclosure and positive and negative feedback given to best dating friend, best non-dating opposite sex friend, and best same sex friend by males and females. They found that an "affiliative" disclosure pattern, defined as positive feedback plus negative self-disclosure, was more characteristic of the disclosures of both sexes across all targets combined than a "dominance" pattern, defined as negative feedback plus positive self-disclosure. Tests for simple effects indicated that across all targets combined, both sexes gave more feedback than self-disclosures. Also, the rank order of means for each type of disclosure to best dating friend was negative feedback, positive feedback negative self-disclosure, and positive self-disclosure, ranked from most to least frequent. Other simple effects tests indicated that females disclosed more about their own traits than males.
disclosed about theirs, and that both sexes disclosed more
to their dating partner than to other targets. This is
consistent with Jourard and Lasakow's (1958) finding that
spouses self-disclose more to each other than to any other
targets. Critelli and Neumann found no difference in the
total amounts of self-disclosure to dating partner by men
and women.

The relationship between love and self-disclosure has
been neglected until recently and very few studies of this
topic appear in the literature. In a study of love letters
which dating partners were asked to write to one another,
Critelli and Dupre (1978) found that the intimacy level
of statements which females made in their letters was
correlated with a measure of the romantic love they felt for
their boyfriends. This relationship was not significant for
men. However, a measure of past self-disclosure to partner
was significantly associated with romantic love measured at
the time of the study for both sexes.

Adams and Shea (1981) investigated the causal relation-
ship between self-disclosure and romantic love in a sample
of dating college couples. Using a cross-lagged panel
design, they found that romantic affect precedes increases
in self-disclosure intimacy for females, but that intimate
self-disclosure precedes increases in romantic affect in
males, thus suggesting important sex differences in the
causal relationship between self-disclosure and romantic
love. The authors suggested that these sex differences may be due to sex-role development.

For women, who traditionally gain identity through their partner, it might be prudent to be sure one is in love before revealing personal information. The needs of a man, however, being more instrumental, may dictate a decision to fall in love once convinced a prospective partner is supportive of his plans and goals (p. 82).

Critelli, et al (1981) investigated the relationships among self-disclosure, love, and sex-role type for men and women in a sample of college couples. Within each sex, important differences appeared between traditional and non-traditional subjects on love and self-disclosure. Traditional women were characterized by strong feelings of Idealistic Compatibility, Romantic Dependency, and Respect, and self-disclosures which included a high number of romantic statements to their partners. Nontraditional women were characterized by strong Communicative Intimacy and Physical Arousal, and by self-disclosure which expressed emotions favorable to their partner and the relationship. Among men, nontraditionals showed strong feeling of Communicative Intimacy and Respect, and also disclosed emotions favorable to their partner and the relationship. Traditional men scored high on Idealistic Compatibility, Romantic Dependency, and Physical Arousal, and characteristically made a large number of romantic statements to their partners.
The differences which were found to exist within each sex are more meaningful than those found between the sexes. For both sexes, traditional sex-role development brought about a romantic, idealistic kind of love experience in which dependency plays an explicitly important role. This picture of a traditional love affair is reinforced by the apparent importance of Physical Arousal in the men and Respect for partner in the women. Nontraditional development, on the other hand, was associated with a love experience essentially devoid of romanticism, and characterized instead by mutual understanding, trust, confidence in the relationship, and, interestingly, a relatively high level of Respect for partner in the men and Physical Arousal in the women.

The relationship between love and self-disclosure is decidedly complex. One recent study indicated that time has an important effect on the nature of self-disclosure that occurs as a relationship develops. Won-Doornick (1978) studied the intimacy of self-disclosure that occurs between females at different stages of friendship development. She found that non-intimate and medium intimate disclosures characterize a newly beginning relationship. As the relationship progresses, high intimate self-disclosures become most prominent in the "middle stage" of friendship development. Finally, between "best friends," the frequency of high intimate disclosures decreases significantly and medium
intimate self-disclosures become most characteristic of their interaction. Won-Dornick also determined that changes in the amount of intimate self-disclosure that occurred were not caused by differences in reciprocal self-disclosure at the different stages. The percentage of intimate self-disclosures which were reciprocated in the early, middle, and advanced stages of friendship were extremely consistent (approximately 47%). Thus, changes in the frequency of intimate self-disclosures across relationship stages were a direct result of disclosure initiations, rather than being determined by differential rates of reciprocation across stages.

In a study of male friendship pairs, Critelli, Rappaport, and Golding (1976) found that the amount of both personal and impersonal self-disclosure increases with the degree to which friends know each other, but that intimate self-disclosure increases with degree of liking while impersonal self-disclosure does not. These results together with Won-Doornick's findings indicate that real increases in intimate self-disclosure relative to non-intimate self-disclosure do occur as same sex friends grow to like each other.

Numerous theories have been offered to explain how self-disclosure affects attraction. Several theories about the process fall into a group characterized by their dyadic approach to the issue (Huston and Levinger, 1978). These
dyadic theories focus on the reinforcing effects of mutual self-disclosure. For example, Altman and Taylor's (1973) exchange theory postulates that relationships proceed from non-intimate to intimate areas of exchange in a progressive movement toward mutuality they call "social penetration." They suggested that the rate and movement from non-intimate to intimate areas of exchange are determined by reward/cost factors of past, present, and projected future exchanges.

In a similar vein, Huesmann and Levinger (1976) postulated a formal model for the progression of dyadic social interactions termed "incremental exchange theory," which was derived from general equity theory (Walster, Berscheid, and Walster, 1973). The fundamental assumption of this model is that the expected values of rewards increases as the level of a pair's mutual involvement in their relationship increases. The basis for this approach lies in the hypothesis from equity theory that individuals will work to maximize their outcomes, i.e. the difference between rewards and costs, in relation to others. Thus, relationships develop in a stepwise fashion marked by increments in mutual disclosure and the continuing perception of a beneficial outcome level. Expected reward values increase as mutual involvement increases, and disclosure and perceptions of high outcome become reciprocally causative.

The studies by Won-Doornick (1978) and Critelli, et al. (1976) discussed above provide a clear empirical
demonstration of this dyadic process of mutual exploration and involvement. Increases in intimate communication during relationship formation is "social penetration", or "incremental exchange," in action. Won-Doornick's study in particular suggests an endpoint to this process may be movement into long term acceptance of the relationship. Rejection of the relationship also seems to be a possibility during the exploratory period, and this would also end the process.

Other theories have offered a more individualistic approach to describing the relationship between attraction and self-disclosure. These theories are not so behavioral in their approach, but consider individual personality characteristics to be important in determining how one person may respond to another. Thus, Dion and Dion's dependency model stresses that one's own feelings of influencibility and vulnerability become more salient in determining his response to the relationship as intimacy increases. Another example of the individualistic perspective is Maslow's concept of the relationship between self-actualization and love which links one's own personality traits to the kind of emotional experience a person is likely to have in an intimate relationship.

It is interesting to examine the results of Critelli and Neumann's (1976) study, reported above, in light of these theories. Recall that they found an affiliative response pattern overall to three types of "best friends"
for males and females. This affiliative response pattern was characterized by higher levels of positive feedback and negative self-disclosure than positive self-disclosure and negative feedback. It can be argued that this pattern of verbal disclosure implicitly enhances the value or status of one's partner while diminishing one's own relative value in the dyad. The affiliative disclosure pattern may carry the message that one's friends are better than one's self, thus helping to create or sustain the experience of high outcome in the relationship.

An alternative to this interpretation of Critelli and Neumann's finding is that the high positive feedback and negative self-disclosure pattern creates a context in which the most affiliating member of the couple becomes dependent on the other. This is suggested by the apparent positive valuing of the partner and negative valuing of one's self which is implied by the affiliative response pattern. Dependency would most likely be promoted when an affiliative partner is paired with a dominant partner.

In contrast to their findings of an overall affiliative pattern, Critelli and Neumann's data indicate that feedback is more frequent than self-disclosure to dating partners and that in men at least there is a tendency to give more negative than positive feedback. It can be argued that this is indicative of a dominant attitude. From a metacommunications perspective (Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson, 1967) a
person who supplies high levels of feedback to some other person may hold a dominant position in their relationship by virtue of assuming the role of critic.

Another important theoretical perspective regarding the relationship between self-disclosure and interpersonal attraction comes from Adams and Shea (1981), whose data indicated that the relationship between romantic love and self-disclosure is different for men and women. Recall they found that romantic affect precedes intimate self-disclosure in women, suggesting an "affective model". Simply stated, this model suggests that romantic affect must first develop for women to intimately self-disclose about themselves. In males, however, they found that meaningful self-disclosure precedes increases in romantic affect. This is consistent with Altman and Taylor's suggestion that self-disclosure is an important antecedent of movement toward greater depth and commitment in a relationship. Adams and Shea's study only incorporated one retest in the cross-lagged panel comparisons and they discussed the possibility that their data only reveals one step in the ongoing reciprocally causal relationship between self-disclosure and romantic love.

Ajzen (1977) offered an explanation for the relationship between self-disclosure and interpersonal attraction based on an information processing framework. He suggested that it is beliefs or attributes about the other person which are salient to attraction rather than the interaction
per se. That is, perceived attributes about the partner which one develops based on the partner's self-disclosures are more important determinants of attraction than is the self-disclosing behavior itself.

A study by Dalto, Ajzen, and Kaplan (1979) demonstrated how attributions affect the role of self-disclosure in attraction. Subjects were presented with written self-disclosures of a fictitious female target and then rated her attractiveness. Desirability of the self-disclosures had a simple effect on attractiveness, but intimacy did not. Disclosure of desirable information produced higher attractiveness ratings than did disclosure of undesirable information. A significant interaction effect occurred in which disclosure of superficial desirable information produced the highest attraction, followed by disclosure of intimate desirable information, intimate undesirable information, and superficial undesirable information.

A different group of subjects interacted with a female confederate and then rated her attractiveness as above. However, in this sample, half the subjects were required to list attributes they associated with the target prior to rating her attractiveness. For those subjects who did not list attributes, the results were exactly as noted above in the first phase of the study. For those subjects who were forced to consider attributes prior to making their
attractiveness ratings, the results were different. Desirability, again, produced a simple effect while intimacy did not, but the effect of the interaction of these two variables changed. In the attribution condition, the highest attractiveness ratings were given in response to disclosure of intimate desirable information, followed by superficial desirable information, superficial undesirable information, and intimate undesirable information. This pattern illustrates that when attention to one's attributions about the target was required, intimate information became more salient than superficial information. Furthermore, attraction ranged much farther in both directions with attributions than without attributions, indicating that intimate information can be much more helpful, or harmful, than superficial information.

This study serves not only to point out the role of cognitive processing in understanding how self-disclosure affects attraction, but also indicates the impact intimate information can have on the responses of other people when they consider what the self-disclosures say about the discloser. The attribution condition seems most similar to the situation in ongoing relationships, where time always exists for this kind of evaluation. Thus, one would look for intimate information to have the most profound impact in intact couples. Whether intimacy level alone affects the love they experience is open to question.
Self-Actualization, Self-Disclosure, and Attraction

The relationship between mental health and self-disclosing behavior has long been of interest, since one's ability to self-disclose to others has been judged to indicate accessibility, or lack of defensiveness. Several theories have existed about this relationship. The basic disagreement has been whether the relationship between self-actualization and self-disclosure is linear or curvilinear.

Rogers (1961) stated that disclosure about self is not only indicative of adjustment, but is necessary or basic to the process of achieving positive mental health and establishing close relationships with others. He implied a linear relationship between self-actualization and self-disclosure. Jourard (1971), in contrast, suggested that the relationship between the two variables is curvilinear. His view was that low disclosers are socially anxious, repressed, threatened by their own internal experience as well as external involvements, and therefore maintain a withdrawn, inhibited, inaccessible posture. The characteristically high self-discloser may be just as socially anxious and threatened by internal and external experience, but attempts to conceal this, or overcome it, by being highly disclosing. One would appear, or try to appear, accepting of oneself and involved with others when in fact he or she would be just as preoccupied with self as the low discloser. The medium discloser, who maintains moderately close relationships with
others would represent the most desirable adjustment in Jourard's curvilinear model.

Research findings concerning the relationship between self-disclosure and mental health have been conflicting. Virtually every type of relationship has been reported in the literature. The conflicting results have been largely due to methodological differences, as well as to the apparent complexities in the relationship between these two variables. Lombardo and Fantasia (1976) attempted to address these issues directly by improving on measurement of self-disclosure, and using multiple measures of adjustment. They found a consistent linear relationship between self-disclosure and adjustment as measured by social avoidance, fear of negative evaluation, alienation, self-actualization, and repression-sensitization (repression indicated adjustment).

Regardless of the possible overall connection between high self-disclosure and positive mental health or adjustment, high self-disclosing behavior may induce unfavorable perceptions on the part of the listener under certain circumstances. In Dion and Dion's (1978) study, targets who disclosed highly intimate information about themselves were less liked and perceived to be less self-confident, less outgoing, and less well adjusted than targets who disclosed less intimate information about themselves during an initial encounter. In spite of these negative attributions however, high intimate self-disclosers received more reciprocal
self-disclosure than low intimate self-disclosers although the reciprocal disclosures were more unfavorable than those returned to low intimate disclosers. Thus, in terms of intimacy, high self-disclosers may be less well thought of than low disclosers, but receive more reciprocal self-disclosure on first encounters.

Early intimate self-disclosure could provide a great opportunity for relationship development of a most meaningful nature, since the high initial self-discloser appears to be rewarded for his effort with highly intimate reciprocal self-disclosure, in spite of the negative attributions. It seems likely that the negative attributions and unfavorableness of the reciprocal self-disclosure would be influenced by the favorableness of the initial self-disclosure. Recall Dalto, et al's findings that intimate self-disclosures strongly influence attraction when attributions are highlighted, and that reactions to intimate disclosures are strongly negative or positive, depending on the favorableness of the disclosures. Unfortunately Dion and Dion did not manipulate favorableness of initial disclosures in their study. The point Dion and Dion's study does bring out is that high intimate self-disclosers stimulate intimate verbal exchange. There is clearly an implicit risk in this, but in those couples who successfully navigate the matter of early intimacy one would expect to find a relationship characterized by trust and understanding.
Cozby (1973) hypothesized that high self-actualizers are discriminately self-disclosing, characterized by high self-disclosure to a few individuals but low to moderate self-disclosure in general. Larson (1979) demonstrated that this is true in her study of the interactions among high, medium, and low self-actualizers. She found that high self-actualizers disclose most to other high self-actualizers, less to "normal" targets, and still less to "compensating" (low self-actualizing) targets in all sex combinations. The normal and compensating subjects in her sample did not show such discrimination, but disclosed equally to all targets. Recall that she also found a simple effect of the target's self-actualization on their attractiveness, and Wombacher (1973) found that high self-actualizers are most attracted to targets whose levels of self-actualization approximate their own.

Shapiro and Swenson (1977) reported results strikingly similar to the findings of Larson in a study of the effects of self-concept on self-disclosure. Self-concept was measured with the Tennessee Department of Mental Health Self-Concept Scale. Self-disclosure was measured by the author's revision of the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire. In same sex pairs, high self-concept subjects disclosed more than medium or low self-concept subjects, and disclosed most to high self-concept partners. The highest self-disclosure was between high self-concept subjects, and the lowest
self-disclosure was between low self-concept subjects. The authors concluded that high self-concept individuals are apparently more sensitive to the behavior of their partners than are medium and low self-concept individuals. Comparisons of self-disclosures in male-female pairs, however, failed to show any significant effect of self-concept on self-disclosure. This finding is not consistent with Larson's results, which showed the same interaction effect between the self-actualization of subject and target in all combinations of sex.

Summary and Hypotheses

Empirical studies have recently differentiated among components of love in a number of different relationship contexts. Factors have been described which distinguish among opposite sex peer relationships (Pam, Plutchik, and Conte, 1973) and among different familial as well as friendship relations (Swenson, 1973). Different components of love in "romantic" relationships have been described also. Critelli, et al (1981), for example, identified five component types of love in dating couples. These components were labeled Communicative Intimacy, Respect, Physical Arousal, Romantic Dependency, and Idealistic Compatibility. Very little is known about what variables may influence the development of these different kinds of love.

Self-actualization appears to be an important feature of personality development which affects the kind of love
one is likely to experience, with high self-actualizers presumably experiencing what Maslow has termed B-love (Deitch, 1978; Maslow, 1950). The relationship between self-actualization and other kinds of love has not been studied. In addition, experimental studies have shown that self-actualization of both members of a dyad appears to be important in determining interpersonal attraction (Larson, 1979; Wombacher, 1973), at least during initial encounters between strangers. Whether the same is true for the types of love experienced by intact couples is not known.

Hypothesis I: High self-actualization for each member of a couple contributes to high Communicative Intimacy. This is based on the high self-actualizer's previously demonstrated positive attraction to other high self-actualizers (Larson, 1979; Wombacher, 1973), and on their capacity for mutual understanding, acceptance, trust, and openness (Maslow, 1950).

Hypothesis II: Low self-actualization contributes to high levels of Romantic Dependency and Idealistic Compatibility in the individual, without significant contribution from the partner's level of self-actualization. This is based on the fact that these types of love are characterized by strong deficiency motivation and lack of realism (Critelli, et al, 1981), whereas high self-actualizers are characterized by accurate perception, acceptance of reality, and self-sufficient autonomy (Maslow, 1950).
Hypothesis III: High self-actualization for each member of a couple contributes to high Respect. This is based on the apparent competency in living which characterizes high self-actualizers, and which can be expected to earn them respect from their partner. Also, one's own level of self-actualization is expected to contribute to respect for partner since, according to Maslow (1950), high self-actualizers are more able to hold others in high esteem, accepting both their partner's strengths and faults, than are low self-actualizers.

Hypothesis IV: High self-actualization for each partner contributes to high Physical Arousal. This is based on Maslow's (1950) report that high self-actualizers are characterized by greater acceptance of their own physiological processes, particularly their sexual responses, than low self-actualizers.

Self-actualization has also been shown to have significant effects on self-disclosure. High self-actualizers disclose more intimately to others whose level of self-actualization is similar to their own than to others whose self-actualization is lower than theirs, at least during first encounters (Larson, 1980; Shapiro and Swenson, 1977). It is not known if self-actualization has a similar effect on self-disclosure in intact couples. Hypothesis V is that high self-actualization for each member of a couple contributes to high self-disclosure intimacy.
In addition to the effects which self-actualization is presumed to have on love, other studies have shown that self-disclosure may affect love, at least in women. As discussed above, Critelli and Dupre (1978) found that the intimacy of statements women made to their boyfriends in love letters was related to the strength of romantic love the women felt, while the intimacy level of reported prior disclosures was related to romantic love in both sexes. In a more explicit investigation of the causal relationship between self-disclosure intimacy and romantic love, Adams and Shea (1981) found that romantic involvement precedes increases in disclosure intimacy in women, but that in men intimate self-disclosure precedes increases in romantic involvement.

Hypothesis VI is that high self-disclosure intimacy in each member of a couple contributes to high levels of Communicative Intimacy, Respect, and Physical Arousal, and to low levels of Idealistic Compatibility. The first three types of love all appear to be based on reality and incorporate true sharing. While Physical Arousal is a rather pure expression of physical attraction, this is likely influenced by the degree of intimacy experienced in other areas by the couple. Idealistic Compatibility, on the other hand, is based on fantasy and idealism which real intimacy would not appear to support.
When considered in relationship to each other, Hypotheses I-IV, Hypothesis V, and Hypothesis VI describe a systemic model for predicting each love component from self-actualization and self-disclosure intimacy. The general model which these hypotheses describe can be illustrated by a path diagram as suggested by Wright (1960) and shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. General structural model of the assumed sequential effects of self-actualization and self-disclosure on love in couples

As an aid to conceptualization, this path diagram indicates pathways of assumed causal influence among the variables composing the hypothetical system. The single-headed arrows represent pathways of direct influence which are assumed to be unidirectional. Thus, for example, male self-actualization is assumed to have a direct influence on male self-disclosure, female self-disclosure, and components of male and female love. The straight double-headed arrow
connecting male and female self-disclosure indicates that the relationship between these two variables is assumed to be reciprocally causal. The curved line connecting male and female self-actualization indicates an assumed non-causal covariation between these variables. The hypotheses offered for evaluation in this study dealt specifically with the pathways of direct influence indicated in the diagram of the general structural model.

In Figure 1, male and female self-actualization are depicted as having direct independent influences on the self-disclosure of both partners. Hypothesis V specifies that this influence is positive. Each partner's self-actualization is also shown as having a direct independent influence on love for both partners. Hypotheses I-IV specify that the influence of self-actualization is positive for Communicative Intimacy, Respect, and Physical Arousal, but negative for Idealistic Compatibility and Romantic Dependency. Finally, Figure 1 shows that male and female self-disclosure intimacy is assumed to have direct independent influences on love for both partners. Hypothesis VI specifies that disclosure intimacy has a positive influence on Communicative Intimacy, Respect, and Physical Arousal, but a negative influence on Idealistic Compatibility. The path diagram extends the hypotheses insofar as it implies that male and female self-actualization may have an indirect
influence on love via the self-actualization → self-disclosure → love pathway.

Method

Subjects

Ninety-seven nonmarried couples who were recruited at a large southwestern university completed the study. Students in freshman and sophomore level psychology classes were asked to participate with a dating partner in exchange for class credit and $4.00. The males ranged in age from 18 to 45 years with a mean of 23.8 years and a median of 22.6 years. The females ranged in age from 17 to 46 years with a mean of 22.4 years and a median of 21 years. The length of time each couple had been dating ranged from one to 72 months with a mean of 15.37 months and median of 12 months. Eighty-one of the males (84%) and 73 of the females (75%) reported they were dating only one person at the time of the study. The couples were predominantly Anglo and identified themselves with traditional religions. Table 7 (Appendix A) provides detailed information on demographic characteristics of the sample.

Instruments

Self-Actualization: Each subject's self-actualization was measured with the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (Shostrum, 1964, 1966). The POI was selected because its reliability and validity have been demonstrated in a number
of studies (Tosi & Lindamood, 1975) and because it has been widely used as a direct measure of self-actualization. The POI measures mental health rather than psychopathology. It is based on the assumption that a mentally healthy individual is more self-actualized than a mentally unhealthy individual, and that self-actualization is expressed through a person's system of values (Fox, Knapp, & Michael, 1968). The instrument consists of 150 forced-choice items which present the subject with a clear choice between two opposing value judgments.

The POI can be scored on two major scales labeled Time Competence and Inner Directedness plus 10 subscales. However, for the purposes of the present study, overall level of self-actualization was measured by obtaining the total raw score across all 150 items. Shostrum (1966) and Damm (1969) have both suggested this scoring as an acceptable measure of overall self-actualization.

Love: Each subject's feelings for his/her partner was assessed with a measure developed by Critelli, et al (1981). Of several "love scales" and questionnaires which were mentioned in an earlier section, this is the only scale which was developed from data gathered from young dating couples to measure different feelings involved in "romantic" relationships. The scale (Appendix B) consists of 35 simple declarative statements retained from the original 63-item pool. Each item indicates a feeling, opinion, or attitude
about a designated target person which the subject rates on a 5-point scale of agreement. An example is "I feel _____ understands me well."

The items provide scores on five factor scales, each composed of seven items. The five factor scales are Romantic Dependency, Communicative Intimacy, Physical Arousal, Respect, and Idealistic Compatibility. The score for each factor is the numerical sum of the ratings given each component item. Each factor score has a range of 5-35. In Critelli et al's (1981) sample of college couples, Cronbach alpha's for each scale were .91 (Romantic Dependency), .88 (Communicative Intimacy), .85 (Physical Arousal), .81 (Respect), and .71 (Idealistic Compatibility). In the same study these scales were found to distinguish traditional from non-traditional men and women, thus providing some external validity for their use.

**Self-Disclosure:** The intimacy of prior self-disclosure of each couple member was measured using a list of 90 conversational topics selected for use in this study from a list of 671 topics compiled by Altman and Taylor (1966) who had each topic rated for its intimacy level by a college sample. The mean intimacy rating given by the college sample was 5.40. The topics were subsequently assigned to thirteen categories by a separate sample.

The SD Inventory, Form S (Appendix C) was constructed by selecting three topics of low, medium, and high intimacy
judged to be appropriate for dating couples from the categories of Religion, Own Marriage and Family, Love-Dating-Sex, Parental Family, Physical Condition and Appearance, Money and Property, Emotions and Feelings, Relationships, Personal Attitudes, and School-Work. This sample of 90 items had a mean intimacy rating of 5.80 (SD = 2.58) with a range of 1.23 to 10.42. The categories of Government, Interests, and Biographical Characteristics were not included because of their topical irrelevance and low mean intimacy levels. Fox, Knapp and Michael (1968) demonstrated that alternative lists of 60 statements composed of 20 items of low, medium, and high intimacy are equivalent. However, due to the method of measuring intimacy of self-disclosure within couples, to be explained below, a somewhat longer list of items was judged to be desirable.

The directions for Form S asked the subject to indicate whether or not they had discussed the information referred to with their dating partner. Forms PM and PF were made up of the same list of topics as Form S, but the directions for these two forms asked the subject to indicate whether or not their partner had discussed the information with them. The wording of each item was changed from first to third person. Form PM was worded for male subjects and Form PF was worded for female subjects. Form PF is presented in Appendix D.

Using two forms of the SD Inventory as described, Form S and Form PM or PF, was intended to provide a accurate
index of each subject's prior self-disclosure to the partner. The intimacy level of a subject's self-disclosure to partner was defined as the total intimacy score of the topics both people indicated had been previously disclosed by the person. The total intimacy score of each person's prior self-disclosure was calculated by summing the intimacy ratings of the topics both partners indicated the person had disclosed.

Ninety items were chosen instead of 60, as referred to earlier, in order to provide a larger pool of topics for the subjects to review. Since both partners must have checked a topic for it to be scored, a longer item list was judged necessary to protect against limited range and variance in the resulting intimacy scores.

Procedure:

At the time participation was requested, students were asked to bring a dating partner to complete the questionnaire during regularly scheduled hours at the university. They were also given the option of taking one or both sets of questionnaires to complete at home and return. Each subject was given a packet containing their questionnaires in a random order. Partners who were tested together were separated during testing. When one partner came alone, he/she was tested and then allowed to take their partner's packet to them. Instructions which were attached to the packets sent home explicitly directed the partners to
complete their questionnaires independently. This was also stressed verbally when the subjects received the packets.

One hundred nine couples volunteered to participate in the study and were given questionnaires. In four couples only one partner returned the questionnaires. An additional seven couples were eliminated because one or both partners omitted more than 15 items on the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrum, 1966 suggested that protocols with more than 15 omissions are invalid). In another case, one female had two male partners complete the male's questionnaires. Thus, data from 12 of the original sample of 109 couples was omitted in the final analysis, leaving a usable sample of 97 couples.

Analysis and Results

Before proceeding to a test of the hypotheses, tests were conducted to insure the comparability of data supplied by students who had completed the questionnaires on campus or at home. For every independent and dependent variable measured, a one-way ANOVA test was used to test for differences in the mean scores obtained from couple members who were both tested on campus (N = 22), from couples in which one partner completed the questionnaires at home and the other partner completed the instruments at school (N = 12), and from couple members who both completed the questionnaires at home (N = 62). No differences were found
in the mean scores on any of the dependent or independent variables across these subject groups (Table 8, Appendix E).

Additional one-way ANOVA tests were performed on four variables computed specifically to check for differences in the way SD Inventory Forms S and P may have been completed by subjects who took questionnaires home, since the nature of these instruments could have prompted collaboration between the partners. Within couples, the difference between the number of self-disclosure topics a couple member endorsed on Form S and the number of topics endorsed on Form P by his/her partner was obtained for each sex. Separate one-way ANOVA tests computed for males and females on these difference scores were not significant. Similar one-way ANOVA tests were computed on differences between the intimacy scores obtained within each couple from a comparison of one member's SD Inventory Form S and his/her partner's SD Inventory Form P. Within each couple, an intimacy score was obtained for each person's Form S and their partner's Form P by summing the intimacy ratings of all topics endorsed by each partner on their respective forms. Then the difference between the intimacy score from each partner's Form S and the score for him/her from the partner's Form P was obtained. One-way ANOVA tests were used to compare these intimacy difference scores across the three groups which differed in where each person had been tested. No differences were found, indicating that no more agreement,
i.e. no collaboration, occurred between couple members in describing prior self-disclosure intimacy in couples who took questionnaires home than in couples who completed all questionnaires at school. Thus, with no demonstrable effect of location of testing, all 97 couples were considered together in the analysis.

The main hypotheses were tested in a series of standard multiple regression equations to determine the magnitude of effect along each pathway in the structural model presented earlier in Figure 1. However, since preliminary tests showed an extremely high correlation between male and female self-disclosure intimacy \((r = .90)\), these two variables were not included in the regression equations as initially defined. Using male and female self-disclosure as initially defined would have introduced problems associated with multicollinearity between independent predictors (Kim & Kohout, 1975, p. 340). When independent variables in a regression equation are extremely highly correlated, estimates of their partial regression coefficients are inaccurate, i.e. estimates of the partial regression coefficients fluctuate markedly between different samples. Also, estimates of the partial regression coefficients of highly positively correlated independent variables are themselves highly negatively correlated. That is, the partial regression coefficients are not at all independent,
and the correlated independent variables are to a large extent interchangeable.

To illustrate briefly the misleading results which could be obtained when using highly correlated independent variables in a regression equation, a series of stepwise multiple regression equations were computed using male and female self-actualization, and male and female self-disclosure intimacy, to predict each kind of love in each sex. In some cases male intimacy proved to be a significant predictor but female intimacy was not, while in other cases the opposite was true. However, since male and female intimacy were known to be correlated .90 with each other they would in fact be largely interchangeable as predictors. The conclusion that one partner's intimacy was significant and not the other's would have been erroneous in this case.

This problem was managed by replacing the partner's own self-disclosure intimacy scores with the sum and the difference between these scores in the regression equations. This general strategy was recommended by Kim and Kohout (1975). Using the sum and the difference between two scores in place of the original scores has the advantage that no information contained in the original scores is lost, and the sum and difference between two sets of scores tend to be uncorrelated (Thornby, 1983). The correlation which was observed between the sum and difference between male and female
partner's self-disclosure intimacy scores was in fact negligible (.035).

In obtaining the differences between male and female disclosure intimacy in each couple the arbitrary decision was made to subtract the female's intimacy score from the male's intimacy score. The resulting values for this new variable ranged from -108 to 95.8. Negative scores indicated greater female than male disclosure intimacy and positive scores indicated greater male than female disclosure intimacy.

As described earlier, the general structural model (Figure 1) portrays explicitly the assumptions that 1) male and female self-actualization have simultaneous independent effects on self-disclosure intimacy in each sex and 2) that both self-actualization and self-disclosure intimacy in each sex have simultaneous independent effects on love for each partner. (The specific direct effect which variables within the model were expected to have are described by the hypotheses).

Examination of the specific hypotheses was accomplished by the technique of path analysis (Wright, 1960). Path analysis uses a series of standard regression equations to determine the magnitudes of the effects which occur along each pathway. The model indicates explicitly what regression equations are to be performed. One simply moves backwards, from right to left generally, to solve regression
equations which predict each variable from those which are indicated to have a direct effect on it.

Path analysis is a way of working out the logical consequences when one assumes 1) a causal order among covariates, and 2) that the relationships among the covariates is closed to outside influence (Kim & Kohout, 1975). Given a pair of variables \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \), the causal order \( X_1 \rightarrow X_2 \) is established when it is assumed or known that \( X_1 \) may affect \( X_2 \) but that \( X_2 \) cannot affect \( X_1 \).

Although causal ordering may not be unequivocal it provides the basis for prediction of a special kind. Ordinarily the strict interpretation which may be applied to regression solutions is limited to a correlational description. For example, in strict terms the equation \( Y = .35 X_1 + .48 X_2 \) might be said to mean that if two groups differ by 1 unit on \( X_1 \) (and \( X_2 \) is controlled), they would also differ by .35 units on \( Y \). In path analysis however, precisely because one assumes or knows that \( X_2 \) may affect \( Y \), the meaning of the equation is that if one group undergoes a change of 1 unit on \( X_1 \) (and \( X_2 \) is controlled), then the group will also change by .35 units on \( Y \). In this relationship \( X_1 \) is not required to be a cause of \( Y \). The important feature is the implication of possible manipulation of \( X_1 \) and the prediction of subsequent changes in \( Y \). Changes in \( X_1 \) may bring about changes in other variables as well, which may in turn affect \( Y \), but this does not compromise the
significance of a path analysis. It makes no difference what the causal mechanism is because path analysis does not attempt to prove causation, only the consequences of assumed causation (Gordon, 1968).

In the present study the causal ordering represented by Figure 1 was assumed for several reasons. First, self-actualization is theoretically a personality trait, which characterizes a person prior to and apart from love experiences. It is a "condition" which exists prior to a love experience. It makes intuitive sense as an antecedent variable. Also, self-actualization appears to be more stable than love through the process of relationship formation and termination. Recall Deitch (1978) found that B-love was lower in those who had terminated their most important love relationship than in those who had not, but that the self-actualization of these two groups was equal. Thus it was inferred here that self-actualization may affect love and not that love may affect self-actualization. The same reasoning holds for assuming that self-actualization affects self-disclosure but not vise-versa.

The sequential ordering of the self-disclosure → love pathway is perhaps more problematic since Adams and Shea (1981) suggested that feelings of love precede intimate self-disclosure for females. This study was inconclusive however because only two data points were used and further cross-lagged correlational studies are yet to be done. It remains
possible that self-disclosure may make some contribution to love in females as it apparently does for males. More pragmatically, the present study was concerned with the prediction of love, not self-disclosure.

If Adam's and Shea's results had been adopted completely then a potentially useful predictor of the love components for women would be lost, namely self-disclosure intimacy. The result would be that love components for women would be predicted solely by the partner's self-actualization scores and predictive power could be lost in the process. Even if the assumed self-disclosure → love causal pathway is not valid for women, predictions of the love components making use of the partial regression coefficient for self-disclosure intimacy would still hold. The only error would be in predicting that a love component may change due to a change in self-disclosure intimacy. Thus, the self-disclosure → love pathway was adopted as an operating assumption for practical reasons in the absence of conclusive proof that a different assumption would be more valid.

The second assumption of path analysis, i.e. causal closure, is the assumption that covariation in X and Y is not due to their mutual dependence on some third variable. This may be recognized as the assumption of independent errors which underlies regression statistics generally.
"Standard" regression equations provide the correct solution of a path model because the procedure provides statistical control of the array of independent variables as the partial regression coefficient of each independent variable is computed in turn. All independent predictors are entered in the equation in a single step and the contribution of each one is computed as if it were the last variable entered, i.e. the variation in the dependent variable attributed to the other independent variables is first removed. In this sense standard regression equations provide control over the various independent variables statistically where experimental control is lacking, and the partial regression coefficients indicate the true independent effects of each predictor on the dependent variable.

To test the main hypotheses as required by the general structural model, standard regression equations were first computed to predict the couple's total self-disclosure intimacy and the difference between the partner's disclosure intimacy from male and female self-actualization and length of their relationship. Length of relationship was included as a predictor because previous studies have shown a strong relationship between this variable and disclosure intimacy, making it necessary to control for this influence in assessing the relationship between self-actualization and self-disclosure intimacy. Standard regression equations were
also computed to predict each partner's score on each of the five love scales from male and female self-actualization, the couple's total self-disclosure intimacy, and the difference between the partner's self-disclosure intimacy scores. This last step resulted in 10 regression equations which used all four of these variables as independent predictors.

**Self-Actualization:** Shostrum (1966) reported early normative studies of the POI which revealed a mean score of 90.7 (SD = 11.8) for males and 92.2 (SD = 12.4) for females in a sample of entering college freshmen. In a sample of male junior and senior college students, the subjects earned a mean score of 95.7 (SD = 12.3). In the present study the mean score on the POI was 97.9 (SD = 11.9) for males and 97.4 (SD = 12.9) for females. Thus, scores earned by subjects here were judged to be an accurate representation of the level of self-actualization to be found in a diverse sample of college students. The slightly higher scores earned by the present sample was perhaps due to the somewhat higher than normal average age of the students at the university where the sample was taken. In the present study the correlation between male and female self-actualization within the couples was .20 (p < .05).

**Self-Disclosure:** The mean self-disclosure intimacy score for males, computed by summing the item intimacy ratings for all items that each male and his partner indicated he had
disclosed, was 262.95 (SD = 112.74), and Cronbach's alpha was found to be .90. For females, the mean self-disclosure intimacy score, computed similarly to the procedure for males, was 271.69 (SD = 111.07) with a Cronbach's alpha of .91. Thus, the measure constructed for measuring self-disclosure intimacy for each partner showed acceptable reliability. The mean of the couple's total self-disclosure intimacy score, obtained by adding together the partner's intimacy scores in each couple, was 534.6 (SD = 218). The mean difference score, obtained by subtracting each female's self-disclosure intimacy score from her partner's score, was 8.7 (SD = 49.6).

The multiple regression coefficient for the couple's total self-disclosure intimacy was .54 (F = 9.83, p < .001) and all the independent predictors were significant. The standardized partial regression coefficients (beta values) were .36 for length of relationship (t = 4.07, p < .001), .22 for male self-actualization (t = 2.34, p < .05) and .27 for female self-actualization (t = 2.99, p < .01). Neither the multiple regression coefficient nor any partial regression coefficients were significant in the prediction of the difference between partner's disclosure intimacy (Table 1).

Love Components: Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations, and alpha coefficients for the love scales in both sexes. For males, the means ranged from 23.46 on Idealistic Compatibility (SD = 5.66) to 29.27 on Respect (SD = 4.73).
Table 1
Beta Values and Multiple R for Prediction of Couple's Self-Disclosure Intimacy and Difference Between Partner's Self-Disclosure Intimacy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Mult.</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Intimacy</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>9.83***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference Between Partner's Intimacy</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Statistics from standard regression solutions (N=97)

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

The means for females ranged from 23.73 on Idealistic Compatibility to 29.72 on Respect ($SD = 3.79$). The reliability estimates for all the scales appeared to be satisfactory. The lowest alpha coefficients were on the Idealistic Compatibility scales for both sexes ($\alpha = .74$ for males and .69 for females). The highest alpha coefficients were on the Romantic Dependency scale for males ($\alpha = .90$) and on the Physical Arousal scale for females ($\alpha = .88$).

For males, the multiple regression coefficients for all of the five love scales were significant, as shown in Table 3. These coefficients were .50 for Communicative Intimacy
Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Coefficients for Love Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Int.</td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>29.31</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. Dep.</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy. Arousal</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Id. Comp.</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 97 couples

(C1) (F = 7.80, p < .001), .40 for Respect (R) (F = 4.32, p < .01), .54 for Romantic Dependency (RD) (F = 9.28, p < .001), .43 for Physical Arousal (PA) (F = 5.20, p < .001), and .41 for Idealistic Compatibility (IC) (F = 4.76, p < .01). The only significant predictor in any of these five equations was the couple's total self-disclosure intimacy score (SD Total), and it was significant in every equation. The standardized partial regression coefficients (beta values) for total self-disclosure intimacy were .49 in the equation predicting Communicative Intimacy (t = 4.98, p < .001), .37 in the equation predicting Respect (t = 6.10, p < .001), .47 in the equation predicting Physical Arousal (t = 4.55, p
Table 3
Beta Values and Multiple R for Prediction of Love Components in Males and Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Diff. in Partner's Intimacy</th>
<th>Male SA</th>
<th>Female SA</th>
<th>Mult. R</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Int.</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7.80***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. Dep.</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>9.28***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Ar.</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>5.20***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Comp.</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>4.76**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Int.</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2.96*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. Dep.</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>6.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Ar.</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Comp.</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>5.17***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Statistics from standard regression solutions (N=97)

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
< .001), and .42 in the equation predicting Idealistic Compatibility ($t = 4.04, p < .001$). As shown in Table 2, neither male nor female self-actualization (MSA and FSA), nor the difference between the partner's disclosure intimacy scores (SD Diff) made a significant independent contribution to the prediction of any of the love component scores in the males.

Figures 2 through 6 present the structural models for each love component for males in which the standardized partial regression coefficients are shown along each pathway of direct influence (significant values are starred) and the simple correlation between partner's self-actualization is shown too. The variable defined as the difference between the partner's disclosure intimacy scores is omitted from the models since it was neither predicted by self-actualization nor did it predict any of the love components. Length of relationship is shown for its contribution to the prediction of total self-disclosure intimacy.

![Path diagram of variable affecting male communicative intimacy](image)

Figure 2. Path diagram of variable affecting male communicative intimacy
Figure 3. Path diagram of variables affecting male respect

Figure 4. Path diagram of variables affecting male Romantic Dependency

Figure 5. Path diagram of variables affecting male Physical Arousal
Figure 6. Path diagram of variables affecting male

Idealistic Compatibility

The results for females were not as consistent as those for males (see Table 3). For females, the multiple regression coefficient of .22 for Respect was not significant ($F = 1.18, p < .326$) and thus none of the individual predictors of Respect were significant. Communicative Intimacy and Physical Arousal were predicted significantly, with multiple $R^2$s of $.34 (F = 2.96, p < .05)$ and $.35 (F = 3.11, p < .05)$, respectively. As in the males, total self-disclosure Intimacy was the only significant independent predictor of these two components of love for the females. The standardized partial regression coefficient for SD Total in predicting Communicative Intimacy was $.33 (t = 3.06, p < .01)$, and $.38$ in predicting Physical Arousal ($t = 3.33, p < .01$). Romantic Dependency was predicted significantly overall (Multiple $R = .47, F = 6.44, p < .001$) and two independent predictors were found to be significant. Romantic Dependency was found to be positively related to total self-disclosure intimacy.
(beta = .49, t = 4.89, p < .001) and negatively related to the females own level of self-actualization (beta = -.20, t = -2.02, p < .05). Idealistic Compatibility was predicted significantly overall (Multiple R = .43, F = 5.17, p < .001) in the females with two significant predictors. Idealistic Compatibility in the females was positively associated with both total disclosure intimacy (beta = .32, t = 3.10, p < .01) and with the difference between the partner's disclosure intimacy scores. Thus, high Idealistic Compatibility was associated not only with high levels of total intimacy but also with higher male than female disclosure.

Figures 7 through 11 present the structural models for each love component for females showing the standardized partial regression coefficients along each pathway of direct influence and the simple correlation between partners self-actualization scores. Again, the variable describing the difference between the partner's disclosure intimacy scores is omitted except in the model for Idealistic Compatibility (Figure 11).

![Path diagram](image.png)

Figure 7. Path diagram of variable affecting female Communicative Intimacy
Figure 8. Path diagram of variables affecting female Respect

Figure 9. Path diagram of variables affecting female Romantic Dependency

Figure 10. Path diagram of variables affecting female Physical Arousal
The next step in the analysis was an examination of the indirect influence of self-actualization on certain components of love through the self-actualization + self-disclosure + love pathway (Kim & Kohout, 1975, p. 388). The only zero-order correlations between self-actualization and the love components (Table 4) which reached statistical significance were between female self-actualization and male Communicative Intimacy ($r = .187$, $p < .05$) and between female self-actualization and male Respect ($r = .212$, $p < .05$), yet female self-actualization was not found to exert a significant direct influence on either of these love components in males in the regression statistics. This suggested that the total influence on male Communicative Intimacy and Respect should include consideration of the

Table 4
Bivariate Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Length of Relationship</th>
<th>Total Intimacy</th>
<th>Difference in Partner's Intimacy</th>
<th>Male SA</th>
<th>Female SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Int.</td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>.502*</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.187*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>.202*</td>
<td>.376*</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.212*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. Dep</td>
<td>.379*</td>
<td>.500*</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Ar.</td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>.380*</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal. Comp.</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.380*</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Int.</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.322*</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. Dep.</td>
<td>.338*</td>
<td>.415*</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Ar.</td>
<td>.217*</td>
<td>.296*</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal. Comp.</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.280*</td>
<td>.313*</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 97
* p < .05

The breakdown of the total covariation between female self-actualization and male Communicative Intimacy and
between female self-actualization and male Respect is shown in Table 5. The total covariation between the variables is shown first by the zero-order correlation between them. In the present context these values indicate the maximum amount of change in male Communicative Intimacy and Respect which would be expected from a change of one unit in female self-actualization. The amount of change expected in male Communicative Intimacy and Respect as a result of the direct

Table 5
Decomposition of Bivariate Correlation Between Female Self-Actualization and Male Communicative Intimacy and between Female Self-Actualization and Male Respect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bivariate Relationship</th>
<th>Female SA, Male Comm. Int.</th>
<th>Female SA, Male Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Covariation (simple r)</td>
<td>.1870</td>
<td>.2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Influence of Female SA</td>
<td>.0200</td>
<td>.1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Influence of Female SA</td>
<td>.1323</td>
<td>.0999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Influence of Female SA</td>
<td>.1523</td>
<td>.2099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncausal Covariation</td>
<td>.0347</td>
<td>.0021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 97
influence of a change of one unit in female self-actualization is indicated by the respective beta values of .02 and .11 (as shown in Figures 2 and 3). The amount of change expected in male Communicative Intimacy and Respect as a result of the indirect influence of a change of one unit in female self-actualization via the self-actualization → self-disclosure + love pathway is obtained from multiplying the path coefficient (beta value) along the female SA → SD Total path by the path coefficient along the SD Total + Love path. Thus, from Figure 2, the product of .27 and .49 equals .1323, and from Figure 3, the product .27 and .37 is .0999. The total influence of female self-actualization on each love component is indicated by the sum of its direct and indirect influences on the love components. The last values shown in Table 5, labeled Non-causal Covariation, are simply the differences obtained by subtracting the Total Causal Influence of female self-actualization on each love component from the Total Covariation present between female self-actualization and each of the love components. This difference represents the amount of covariation between the variables which is unaccounted for by the assumed causal relationships between the variables.

The values shown in Table 5 indicate that 81.4% of the total covariation between female self-actualization and male Communicative Intimacy is predicted by the assumed causal influence of female self-actualization. Of this portion of
explained covariation, 13% is due to the direct influence and 87% is due to the indirect influence of female self-actualization on male Communicative Intimacy via the self-actualization-self-disclosure-love pathway. The value .1523 indicates the amount of increase in male Communicative Intimacy that would be predicted by the model from an increase in female self-actualization of one unit. While this increase is still small, it is larger than the increase of .02 predicted from the direct effect alone of female self-disclosure on male Communicative Intimacy, and more closely approximates the total covariation of .1870 between these two variables.

In the same manner, Table 5 shows that 99% of the covariation between female self-actualization and male Respect is predicted by the assumed causal influence of female self-actualization on male Respect within the model. Of this total amount of explained covariation, 52% is attributable to the direct influence of female self-actualization on male Respect and 48% is attributable to the indirect influence of female self-actualization via increases in self-disclosure intimacy. A increase of .2099 rather than .11 would be expected in male Respect from an increase of one unit in female self-actualization. While the magnitude of this change is small it is within the range of beta values which achieved statistical significance in the initial regression equations.
This method of partitioning total covariation into direct and indirect influences was also used to investigate the apparent discrepancy in finding that the simple correlation between female self-actualization and female Romantic Dependency was -.043 ($p = .336$) while the standardized partial regression coefficient for female self-actualization was -.20 ($p < .05$) when used as one of four predictors of female Romantic Dependency (see Table 2). The indirect causal influence of female self-actualization on female Romantic Dependency was found to be .1323. Thus decreases in female Romantic Dependency from the effects of increases in female self-actualization were offset by increases in Romantic Dependency created via the self-actualization-self-disclosure-romantic dependency pathway. The sum of -.20 and .1323 is -.0677 which represents the net change in female Romantic Dependency which would be expected from the model, given an increase of 1 unit on female self-actualization. Contrary to the results of earlier examples, here the sum of direct and indirect influences explained by the model is greater than the zero-order correlation of -.043 between female self-actualization and female Romantic Dependency. The most likely explanation for this type of discrepancy seems to be that female self-actualization may have an additional slight positive effect on female Romantic Dependence which occurs indirectly through a variable(s) not included in the present model. The major point remains,
however, that the statistically significant direct negative effect of female self-actualization on female Romantic Dependency was offset by the positive indirect effect of female self-actualization via self-disclosure, so that the net change in female Romantic Dependency was nil.

This type of analysis was not done for any of the other love components because 1) neither male nor female self-actualization appeared to have a significant direct effect on any other love components, and 2) the zero-order correlations between male and female self-actualization and the other love components were negligible. With this consistency between the regression analysis and the simple correlations there was no reason to look to the indirect effects of self-actualization for additional information.

In addition to the path analysis, stepwise regression equations were computed for each love component where length of relationship was included as a predictor. This was done because the zero-order correlations between length of relationship and a number of the love components were significant (see Table 4) and there was some interest in finding out whether or not length of relationship might account for more variance in the love components than self-actualization and self-disclosure. Unlike standard regression equations in which all independent predictors are entered simultaneously, the stepwise regression procedure enters predictor variables one at a time in single steps.
The entry order is determined by the magnitude of each variable's contribution to the variance in the dependent variable which remains unaccounted for at each step. Thus the predictor variable with the greatest contribution to variance in the dependent variable is entered first, then the variable which makes the largest contribution to the remaining variance in the dependent variable is entered, then the third, and so on until either all predictor variables have been entered or the remaining variables fail to meet criteria for entry which are present in the computer program. In the present case the criteria for entry was that the probability value of $F$ for each predictor variable be less than or equal to .05.

The major difference between this stepwise procedure and the standard regression solutions used earlier is that in the stepwise procedure the influences of variables which will be entered on later steps is not controlled when variables are entered on earlier steps. In other words, when the first variable is entered in the equation its partial regression coefficient is computed without controlling for the effects of variables which may be entered on subsequent steps. When the last variable is entered and its partial regression co-efficient is computed, the effects of variables entered on preceding steps have already been removed from the dependent variable; hence, the effects of preceding variables on the dependent variable are controlled whereas
the effects of variables entered later are not controlled. The results obtained with stepwise and standard regression equations are potentially quite different.

In this case the results of the stepwise procedure, presented in Table 6, were essentially the same as those of

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of</th>
<th>Diff. in Partner's</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Mult.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy Rel.</td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Int.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. Dep</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Ar.</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal. Comp.</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Int.</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. Dep</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Ar.</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal. Comp.</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Statistics from Stepwise regression solutions.

For all table entries, $p < .05$ ($N = 97$).
the standard regressions shown in Table 2. (Since the stepwise equations only included variables with a probability level of .05, blank entries in Table 6 indicate unaccepted, i.e. statistically insignificant, predictors). Length of relationship did prove to be a significant predictor of male Romantic Dependency (beta = .22, t = 2.3, p < .05) and female Romantic Dependency (beta = .19, t = 2.02, p < .05) but did not remove the importance of total self-disclosure intimacy as a predictor in either case, nor did this remove the importance of female self-actualization as a negative predictor of female Romantic Dependency. Length of relationship was not a significant predictor of any other love components in either sex.

**Discussion**

Contrary to initial assumptions, the results indicated that self-actualization had no influence on most of the love components measured in this study. Hypotheses I, III, and IV, that self-actualization for each member of a couple would contributes to Communicative Intimacy, Respect, and Physical Arousal, were not supported by the data. No significant relationships, either positive or negative, were found between self-actualization and these love components in males or in females. Hypothesis II, that a person's own level of self-actualization is negatively related to his experience of Romantic Dependency and Idealistic Compatibility, was supported only in the case of female Romantic
Dependency. In males, self-actualization and Romantic Dependency were unrelated; and no relationship was found between self-actualization and Idealistic Compatibility in either sex.

These results appear to contradict Maslow's suggestion that different types of love are related to self-actualization. Also, the results are inconsistent with an earlier study which demonstrated a significant positive relationship between self-actualization, measured by the POI, and B-love (Deitch, 1978). The love scales used in the present study do not have extensive validation but they do appear to be straightforward self-reports of feelings and attitudes regarding one's partner or relationship; and from the viewpoint of Maslow's theory, these love components would appear to differ in psychological healthfulness. Romantic dependency and Idealistic Compatibility appear to reflect defensive dependent and unrealistic qualities of love. Communicative Intimacy on the other hand, appears to describe an essentially healthy experience of trust and acceptance which is conceptually similar to Deitch's B-love scale. In addition Respect seems to be a clear and direct indication of one's positive regard for partner.

Part of the explanation for the negative findings may be that the love scale scores were somewhat negatively skewed, i.e. males and females alike tended to report relatively high levels of all the love components regardless of each
person's level of self-actualization. (The POI scores were essentially normally distributed, with means and standard deviations approximating the values found in early normative samples.) Related to this is the fact that the intercorrelations among the love scales tended to be somewhat high. The mean intercorrelation among the love components was .66 for men and .57 for women. Thus, most couple members reported relatively high levels of love in general; and where one love component was high the other components tended to be high too. The negatively skewed distributions served to restrict the correlations between self-actualization and love components, and the somewhat high intercorrelations among the love components contributed to the consistency of the results. These facts alone however would not seem to fully explain the near zero relationship between self-actualization and most of the love components.

Another explanation for the negative findings is that Maslow's theory is really specific to the types of love he described and that self-actualization in fact is not associated with most of the love components measured in the present study. Even the Communicative Intimacy component, which is conceptually similar to B-love, may measure a dimension of love which is significantly different from B-love and unrelated to self-actualization. Future research might begin by correlating the Communicative Intimacy scale with Deitch's (1978) measure of B-love and attempt to
replicate his findings. As it stands now, the present results are a notable exception to Maslow's theory in that they suggest that high and low self-actualizers experience most love components to the same degree.

The one exception to this general picture is that a negative relationship does appear to exist between self-actualization and Romantic Dependency for women. That high self-actualizing females experience lower levels of Romantic Dependency than low self-actualizing females is consistent with Maslow's description of high self-actualizers being more psychologically self-sufficient and showing greater personal autonomy and self-esteem than low self-actualizers. Romantic Dependency, as described earlier, is characterized by feelings of exclusive attachment, need for the partner, and the fear that one would have difficulty getting along without the partner. High self-actualizing women apparently experience love relationships with less of these feelings involved than do their lower self-actualizing counterparts.

That this relationship seems to hold for women but not for men is perhaps due to the emerging independence of women in general today. Feelings of personal self-sufficiency seem to have been made particularly salient for women by the "liberation" movement. Increasing autonomy, one of the hallmarks of self-actualization, may allow women to feel less dependent in romantic relationships.
Hypothesis V, that high self-actualization of each member of a couple contributes to high self-disclosure intimacy, was supported by the data. For both males and females, the results indicate that high self-actualizing partners self-disclose more intimately than do low self-actualizing partners. This is true regardless of the length of the couple's relationship, which was also used as a predictor of self-disclosure intimacy along with each partner's POI score. Not surprisingly, the self-disclosure intimacy score was found to increase over time independent of either partner's level of self-actualization.

That both partner's levels of self-actualization were found to be positively related to the intimacy level of the partner's prior self-disclosure is consistent with Maslow's description of high self-actualizers as less defensive, or more open, than low self-actualizers. These findings also seem to be generally consistent with two earlier studies, one which demonstrated that self-actualizers disclose more intimately during an initial encounter than low self-actualizers (Larson, 1980), and another which indicated that mental health and self-disclosure are linearly related (Lombardo & Fantasia, 1976). This study extends these findings to partners involved in ongoing relationships. One circumstance that may contribute to the apparent relationship between each partner's level of self-actualization and the couple's total disclosure intimacy is that the levels of
self-actualization of the partners were found to be significantly correlated. Based on Larson's study, one would expect this to make some difference, particularly to high self-actualizers, since she found this group to disclose more intimately to high than low self-actualizers.

Hypothesis VI, that high self-disclosure intimacy in each member of a couple contributes to high levels of Communicative Intimacy, Respect, and Physical Arousal, and low levels of Idealistic Compatibility in both couple members was not entirely supported as stated. High self-disclosure intimacy appeared to contribute to high levels of Communicative Intimacy and Physical Arousal for both partners. Feelings of understanding, trust, acceptance, and sexual responsiveness could understandably be heightened in an atmosphere of open communication. This is a fundamental principle in many, if not all, approaches to mental therapies (e.g. Ables & Brandsma, 1977; Kaplan, 1974). High self-disclosure also appears to contribute to high levels of Respect for partner in males but not in females. Specifically, the results indicated that males feel more Respect for their partner where the couple's self-disclosure intimacy is high than do males in couples where self-disclosure intimacy is low. Since the intracouple correlation between partner's self-disclosure intimacy scores was .90, the sex difference cannot be explained by sex differences in self-disclosure intimacy per se. It seems more likely that reactions to the
intimacy level of disclosures between partners in terms of Respect are related to sex-role identification and expectations of the partners. Several hypotheses appear plausible.

Based on cultural stereotypes, males may expect females to be particularly competent at developing intimacy. This expectation may be met in the process of forming and maintaining a close relationship marked by intimate self-disclosure, and the male subsequently grows to regard his girlfriend as mature, competent, and responsible. This type of interpersonal competency may not be expected of males by their girlfriends; thus, high intimate self-disclosure by males may not impress their partners in the same way that the woman's intimate disclosures impresses men. Critelli, et al's (1981) finding that traditional women feel more Respect for their partners than do nontraditional women is relevant here. Sex-role expectations of the partner may be different for traditional versus non-traditional women and may prompt different reactions on the Respect scale to intimate versus nonintimate male disclosure. Traditional women in particular may not expect high disclosure intimacy from males and may react to high intimate disclosure with decreased Respect. Nontraditional women could possibly be just the opposite. Two additional dimensions which would appear to have some relevance to this discussion are topical differences in self-disclosure and the relative favorableness of self-disclosure, neither of which were examined in
the present study. Recall that Rubin et al (1980) found that men and women tend to self-disclose most on different topics and several authors (e.g. Critelli & Neumann, 1976; Dalto, Ajyen, & Kaplan, 1979) have previously found that the favorableness of self-disclosures affects interpersonal attraction. Future studies could begin by determining whether sex-role development affects expectations of disclosure intimacy and topic, and then proceed to determine how Respect (as well as other love components) is affected by the interaction between sex-role development and the self-disclosure dimensions of intimacy, topic, and favorableness.

While high intimate male self-disclosure would not appear to increase female Respect, it does appear to contribute to Idealistic Compatibility for females within an interesting context. Contrary to Hypothesis VI, a high rather than low Idealistic Compatibility was found with high intimate self-disclosure in the couples. That high intimate self-disclosure might dispel the idealism which seems to be characteristic of Idealistic Compatibility appears to be simply untrue. A high level of self-disclosure intimacy can and does occur together with the partner's belief in inevitable happiness with each other, low reported disagreements, and reports of temperamental similarity. In addition, differences between the intimacy level of the partner's self-disclosure appeared to contribute to variation in Idealistic Compatibility for females. High
Idealistic Compatibility in females was associated with high intimate male self-disclosure combined with low intimate female self-disclosure. This was entirely unexpected. It would appear that Idealistic Compatibility is maximized for women when the relationship's total intimacy level is high primarily by virtue of the male's self-disclosure.

In a relationship between a high disclosing male and a low disclosing female, the female would seem to have the most information (she knows herself and more about her partner than perhaps he knows about her). Differences and similarities between the partners in feelings, thoughts, attitudes, and characteristic ways of behaving should be most apparent to her. One possibility is that she and her partner are in fact much alike, which she is able to know from her knowledge of herself and her partner. In this case her strong Idealistic Compatibility would have a real basis. This possibility was neglected in the current study and suggests caution in how one interprets the meaning of the Idealistic Compatibility scale. It may not necessarily reflect unsubstantiated idealism. That high intimate self-disclosure may lead to realistically based high Idealistic Compatibility is consistent with the attribution model for attraction (Ajyen, 1977). Recall this theory suggests that attraction is determined by the personal attributes a partner assumes on the basis of self-disclosure. For future research it would seem worthwhile to determine whether
scores on the Idealistic Compatibility scale are correlated with difference scores between measures of the partners' temperaments or personalities. If the Idealistic Compatibility Scale is sensitive to the degree of actual similarity between partners the scale name may usefully be renamed to suggest less "idealism". Attention may also be usefully addressed to the question of what personality characteristics may be associated with low self-disclosure in females that would explain her feeling compatible with and temperamentally similar to a high disclosing male. Perhaps sex-role development plays a role here. The Idealistic Compatibility scale is a good candidate to include in the research suggested in the preceding paragraph.

Although no prior expectations were held concerning the relationship between disclosure intimacy and Romantic Dependency, this love component was included in this portion of the analysis. The results suggest that high self-disclosure intimacy contributes to high levels of Romantic Dependency in both sexes. Also, Romantic Dependency appears to increase over time for males and females alike, but time does not appear to affect the strength of any of the other love components.

From a clinical point of view the finding that Romantic Dependency for both sexes increases over time, but other love components appear not to, is quite interesting. This suggests rather clearly that both partners may grow to
depend on each other and their relationship to an increasing
degree over time irrespective of increases in other love
components. This author is reminded of the stubborn per-
sistence with which partners in marital therapy cling to
a relationship which by their own admission is unhappy
and unproductive. In such cases partners often come for
treatment complaining of lack of trust, respect, and
physical satisfaction, with low expectations of happiness
with each other. From their own report one would expect low
scores on one or more of the love scales Communicative
Intimacy, Respect, Physical Attraction, and Idealistic
Compatibility perhaps accompanied by a higher level of
Romantic Dependency. This love component scale pattern
would indicate dependency combined with frustration in one
or more areas, which is recognized as a common relationship
dilemma, creating the bitter resentment so often seen in
marital therapy. It would seem to be a potentially very
useful study to compare the love scale scores of "happy"
couples and couples in therapy. In addition, since common
goals of marital therapy include increases in trust and
physical enjoyment in particular, and increases in respect
and belief in future happiness perhaps more indirectly, the
five component love scales used here may be a very useful
outcome measure for marital therapy research, used as a pre-
treatment diagnostic measure and subsequently during and
after therapy.
Turning to the path diagrams now, the evidence supporting Hypotheses V and VI suggests that self-actualization has a positive indirect influence on the love components via the self-actualization → self-disclosure → love pathway, but for most of the love components this is inconsequential. However, Respect and Communicative Intimacy in males show statistically significant, albeit low, zero-order correlations with female self-actualization, which are greater than what can be accounted for by the direct independent influence of female self-actualization alone. In these cases the indirect influence of female self-actualization becomes relevant in helping to predict the love components and in understanding the total influence of female self-actualization.

Thus, the increase in male Respect which would be predicted from the direct influence of female self-actualization is approximately doubled by the indirect influence of female self-actualization on male Respect. This occurs under the assumption that increasing female self-actualization also causes an increase in self-disclosure intimacy which in turn leads to an increase in male Respect. Another way of looking at this is to say that approximately half of the total covariation between female self-actualization and male Respect is due to the influence of female self-actualization on the intervening variable of self-disclosure intimacy. In the case of male Communicative
Intimacy, most of the total covariation between this love component and female self-actualization was found to be due to the indirect influence of female self-actualization, i.e. to increases in self-disclosure intimacy attributed to high female self-actualization. Even with this indirect influence included, however, self-actualization would not appear to be a significant predictor of male Communicative Intimacy.

The indirect influence of female self-actualization is also relevant for female Romantic Dependency, but in a somewhat different way. Recall that a significant negative relationship was found between these two variables, such that the direct influence of high self-actualization appeared to decrease Romantic Dependency. Contrary to this direct influence the effect of high female self-actualization along the indirect pathway is to increase Romantic Dependency by almost the same degree. Thus, the net effect of change in female self-actualization on female Romantic Dependency is nil.

The structural models illustrating the assumed causal influences of male and female self-actualization and self-disclosure intimacy on each love component in each sex can now be assessed. The prediction model for Communicative Intimacy in both sexes reduces to include only the couple's total self-disclosure intimacy level. Neither male nor female self-actualization appear to have a significant
direct influence on this love component, nor does the addition of the indirect influence of self-actualization appear significant. In males, Respect is best predicted by the couple's total disclosure intimacy and the female partner's level of self-actualization. The female's level of self-actualization gains importance as a predictor here because its small direct influence is augmented by its indirect influence via contributions to disclosure intimacy. Romantic Dependency in both sexes is best predicted by the disclosure intimacy level of the couple and by the length of time the couple has been dating. The effects of male self-actualization on this love component in either sex are negligible. In females, while there is a theoretically interesting negative relationship between self-actualization and Romantic Dependency, the net effect of the female's level of self-actualization on her Romantic Dependency is negligible because of the off-setting positive effects of self-actualization which occur via self-disclosure. Physical arousal is best predicted by the couple's total disclosure intimacy for both sexes. In males, Idealistic Compatibility is best predicted by only the couple's total disclosure intimacy. In females, Idealistic Compatibility is best predicted by the couple's total disclosure intimacy and the relative disclosure difference between the male and female.
The present study does not indicate that knowing the levels of self-actualization or self-disclosure intimacy of both partners rather than just one enhances the prediction of love except for female Idealistic Compatibility, where higher male than female disclosure intimacy would predict high Idealistic Compatibility. This differs from the findings of Larson (1980) and Wombacher (1974), who found that the respective levels of self-actualization of two strangers interact to determine initial attraction. The extremely high correlation between male and female disclosure intimacy means that either one could usefully be used as a predictor of love in either partner.

Perhaps the most unique aspect of the present study was the application of path analysis to the prediction of various love components. Use of this technique was advantageous in that it forced a conceptualization of the causal sequencing of suspected covariates, thus leading to a specific regression analysis, and it allowed an explicit examination of indirect influences via intervening variables.

The clearest implications of this study are 1) that self-disclosure intimacy has a rather consistent relationship with various love components which would make it an important indicator of relationship success or satisfaction, and 2) that Maslow's theory might best be judged as limited to specific forms of love more consistent with the general development of self-actualization. The present results
suggest that self-actualization may not have a clear and consistent relationship to all types of love. It does seem clear though that self-actualization stands up as an important determinant of self-disclosure.
### Appendix A

#### Table 7

Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Rel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participating</td>
<td>12.0mo</td>
<td>15.4mo</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.0mo</td>
<td>15.4mo</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-Am.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-Am.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Figures for Race and Religion are % falling in each category.
Appendix B

Relationship Inventory

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement carefully and decide how much you agree or disagree with the statement as it pertains to your partner using the scale below. Circle the appropriate number on the answer sheet.

1-Disagree  2-Tend to Disagree  3-Neither Agree nor Disagree  4-Tend to Agree  5-Agree

1. My relationship with ________ is more important than anything to me.
2. I feel that ________ understands me well.
3. In my opinion, ________ is an exceptionally mature person.
4. I feel very romantic about ________.
5. As long as I'm with ________, happiness will be inevitable.
6. I could never hate ________.
7. When I'm with ________, we almost always are in the same mood.
8. I spend a good deal of my time just thinking about ________.
9. My friendship with ________ is more important to me than anything else.
10. ________ is someone I can really communicat with.
11. I would highly recommend ________ for a responsible job.
12. I get very sexually excited when kissing ________.
13. ________ and I do not disagree on important matters.
14. It would be hard to get along without ________.
15. ________ is the person I would be most likely to talk to if I had a problem.
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16. When I see _______ my first reaction is one of excitement.

17. I think that _______ is one of those people who quickly wins respect.

18. _______ is the only real love for me.

19. I have great confidence in _______’s judgement.

20. I find _______ very easy to get along with.

21. _______ fulfills all my needs for love, affection, friendship, and security.

22. One of my primary concerns is _______’s welfare.

23. Most people would react favorably to _______ after a brief acquaintance.

24. My feelings for _______ are often highly passionate.

25. I think that _______ and I are quite similar to one another.

26. I need _______.

27. _______ and I have a very solid relationship.

28. I often notice my heart beating faster or other physical signs of excitement when I’m around _______.

29. I think that _______ is unusually well adjusted.

30. Because I have _______, I am not attracted to members of the opposite sex.

31. If I could never be with _______, I’d feel miserable.

32. I feel that I can confide in _______ about virtually anything.

33. _______ and I have very similar values.

34. I am very physically attracted to _______.

35. I know I could count on _______ for anything if I needed help.
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SD Inventory (Form S)

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement carefully and decide if you have told your partner the information referred to in the statement. Circle the appropriate number on the answer sheet: 1 for YES or 2 for NO.

1. My feelings about having sexual relations with someone with whom I am in love.

2. The age of boys/girls that I like to date.

3. Bad habits I have.

4. Times when I have been careless.

5. How sensitive I am compared to other people.

6. What my parents did well while raising me.

7. Whether or not I ever poke fun at people.

8. My views about borrowing money from a friend.

9. Whether I would rather live in an apartment or house after I get married.

10. My ideas concerning marriage.

11. My ups and downs in moods.

12. My feelings about standards of sexual behavior before marriage.

13. What animals make me nervous.

14. How often I read the Bible or other religious books.

15. How frequently I would want to have sex with my wife/husband.

16. How I feel about the new fashion styles for the opposite sex.

17. How I feel about using influential people I know to get ahead in a job.

18. How I feel about telling someone off when they are not fair.
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19. How much religious training I had as a child.
20. Bad habits my mother or father have.
21. Whether I like to do things alone or in a group.
22. My general attitude while in school.
23. The number of brothers and sisters I have.
24. The cost of my personal property.
25. What happens when I see blood.
26. How I would feel about having sex relations with another person after I was married.
27. What I would do if I caught my wife/husband playing around with other men/women.
28. What it takes to hurt my feelings deeply.
29. Whether or not I need people in order to be happy.
30. What I believe about God.
31. Why some people dislike me.
32. The ages of my brothers and sisters.
33. Whether or not I have ever lied to a boss.
34. How I budget my money.
35. Whether or not I want to have any children after I get married.
36. My views on drinking.
37. What I am most afraid of.
38. My total financial worth, including property, cash accounts, insurance, investments, etc.
39. Subjects about which I feel I am well informed.
40. What things I would like to do, if I had the chance, of great benefit to the world.
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41. The way I want to raise my children.
42. What foods I feel are best for my health.
43. My favorite subjects/classes in school.
44. Whether or not I have ever gone to a church other than my own.
45. My feeling about the place of religion in everyday life.
46. Things which would cause me to break up a friendship.
47. Problems and worries I had with my physical appearance in the past.
48. How well I get along with my brothers and sisters.
49. Situations that I like to avoid.
50. Whether or not I enjoy the excitement of a crowd.
51. The religious denomination to which I belong.
52. How I feel about going to the doctor.
53. Weaknesses that I feel I have in my personality.
54. The best friendship I ever had.
55. How many aunts and uncles I have.
56. Times when I have wished I could change something about my physical appearance.
57. Any fears of water I have.
58. The schools I have attended.
59. Times that I almost felt life wasn't worth living.
60. How often I have had sexual relations in my life.
61. Whom I like better, my mother or father.
62. The amount of money I have made by working.
63. My feelings about discussing sex with the opposite sex.
64. The number of colds I have each year.
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65. Kinds of bank accounts I have.

66. How often I pray.

67. What kind of toothpaste I use.

68. Whether or not I have ever asked a minister, priest, or rabbi for advice.

69. How satisfied I am with different parts of my body -- legs, waist, weight, chest, hair, etc.

70. The amount of money I usually spend when taking a trip.

71. How much money I owe.

72. My personal religious views.

73. Guilt feelings, if any, that I have or have had about my sexual behavior.

74. What kind of furniture I would like to have after I get married.

75. How good a cook I want my wife/husband to be.

76. My feelings about blind dates.

77. The amount of sexual freedom I feel women should have.

78. Times when I have told off a boy/girl.

79. The way I behave when I am around my parents.

80. Things I dislike about my mother.

81. My general health at this time.

82. Drugs I have taken to treat illnesses.

83. How important money is for my happiness.

84. Situations in which I become nervous.

85. My feelings about people who try to impress me with their knowledge.

86. Times when I have not been dependable.

87. How I feel about working with my hands.
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88. How I would chose a career or occupation.

89. The worst pressures and strains in my work.

90. How I really feel about the people I work for or work with.
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SD Inventory (Form PF)

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement carefully and decide if your partner has told you the information about themself referred to by the statement. Circle the appropriate number on the answer sheet: 1 for YES 2 for NO.

1. His feelings about having sexual relations with someone with whom he is in love.
2. The age of girls that he likes to date.
3. Bad habits he has.
4. Times when he has been careless.
5. How sensitive he is compared to other people.
6. What his parents did well while raising him.
7. Whether or not he ever pokes fun at people.
8. His views about borrowing money from a friend.
9. Whether he would rather live in an apartment or a house after he gets married.
10. His ideas concerning marriage.
11. His ups and downs in moods.
12. His feelings about standards of sexual behavior before marriage.
14. How often he reads the Bible or other religious books.
15. How frequently he would want to have sex with his wife.
16. How he feels about the new fashion styles for women.
17. How he feels about using influential people he knows to get ahead in a job.
18. How he feels about telling someone off when they are not fair to him.
19. How much religious training he had as a child.
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20. Bad habits his mother or father have.
21. Whether he likes to do things alone or in a group.
22. His general attitude while in school.
23. The number of brothers and sisters he has.
24. The cost of his personal property.
25. What happens when he sees blood.
26. How he would feel about having sex relations with another person after he was married.
27. What he would do if he caught his wife playing around with other men.
28. What it takes to hurt his feelings deeply.
29. Whether or not he needs people in order to be happy.
30. What he believes about God.
31. Why some people dislike him.
32. The ages of his brothers and sisters.
33. Whether or not he has ever lied to a boss.
34. How he budgets his money.
35. Whether or not he wants to have any children after he gets married.
36. His views on drinking.
37. What he is most afraid of.
38. His total financial worth, including property, cash accounts, insurance, investments, etc.
39. Subjects about which he feels he is well Informed.
40. What things he likes to do, if he had the chance, of great benefit to the world.
41. The way he wants to raise his children.
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42. What foods he feels are best for his health.

43. His favorite subjects/classes in school.

44. Whether or not he has ever gone to a church other than her own.

45. His feelings about the place of religion in everyday life.

46. Things which would cause him to break up a friendship.

47. Problems and worries he had with his physical appearance in the past.

48. How well he gets along with his brothers and sisters.

49. Situations that he likes to avoid.

50. Whether or not he enjoys the excitement of a crowd.

51. The religious denomination to which he belongs.

52. How he feels about going to the doctor.

53. Weaknesses that he feels he has in his personality.

54. The best friendship he ever had.

55. How many aunts and uncles he has.

56. Times when he has wished he could change something about his physical appearance.

57. Any fears of water he has.

58. The schools he has attended.

59. Times that he felt life wasn't worth living.

60. How often he has had sexual relations in his life.

61. Whom he likes better, his mother or father.

62. The amount of money he has made by working.

63. His feelings about discussing sex with the opposite sex.

64. The number of colds he has each year.
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65. Kinds of bank accounts he has.

66. How often he prays.

67. What kind of toothpaste he uses.

68. Whether or not he has ever asked a minister, priest, or rabbi for advice.

69. How satisfied he is with different parts of his body -- legs, waist, weight, chest, hair, etc.

70. The amount of money he usually spends when taking a trip.

71. How much money he owes.

72. His personal religious views.

73. Guilt feelings, if any, that he has or has had about his sexual behavior.

74. What kind of furniture he would like to have after he gets married.

75. How good a cook he wants his wife to be.

76. His feelings about blind dates.

77. The amount of sexual freedom he feels women should have.

78. Times when he has told off a girl.

79. The way he behaves when he is around his parents.

80. Things he dislikes about his mother.

81. His general health at this time.

82. Drugs he has taken to treat illnesses.

83. How important money is for his happiness.

84. Situations in which he becomes nervous.

85. His feelings about people who try to impress him with their knowledge.

86. Times when he has not been dependable.
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87. How he feels about working with his hands.

88. How he would chose a career or occupation.

89. The worst pressures and strains in his work.

90. How he really feels about the people he works for or work with.
Appendix E

Table 8

Mean Scores on Dependent and Independent Variables in Couples Which Completed Questionnaires at School or at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group Means</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-D Intimacy</td>
<td>254.5</td>
<td>239.7</td>
<td>270.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Act.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Int.</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. Dep.</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Ar.</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal. Comp.</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-D Intimacy</td>
<td>264.9</td>
<td>252.3</td>
<td>278.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Act.</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm Int.</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. Dep.</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Ar.</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal. Comp.</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Relationship</strong></td>
<td>13.2 mo.</td>
<td>13.5 mo.</td>
<td>16.5 mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 = both partners completed quest. at school (N=22)
Group 2 = one partner completed quest. at home (N = 13)
Group 3 = both partners completed quest. at home (N = 62)
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