

# Are adults' love and hate more advanced?

Gershon Breslavs

## Abstract

The increased amount and quality of research on love and other sentiments in psychology of personality and social psychology are not in coherence with the attention to love and other sentiments in developmental psychology. At the same time it is no doubt impossible either to understand the role and mechanisms of these important phenomena, or the choice and change of partners in adulthood outside life-long development.

The objective of this research is to fill the gap in the field and to compare the development of Love and Hate at different ages starting with adolescence. The Sternberg triangular model (Intimacy-Passion-Decision/Commitment) was used, and his second 45-item version of love measure (Sternberg, 1988, 1997) was adapted in Latvian and Russian. His model (Sternberg, 2005) was also used for the development of an original Likert-like 18-item Hate scale that became two-factor (active and passive) after two-stage data collection and Factor component analysis (Breslavs, Tjumenewa, 2008a). The hypothesis predicts different changes of love features and its links with hate, particularly the increase of Commitment and decrease of Passion in Adulthood. Three age samples (16-18, 26-28, 36-38) were selected. 240 participants filled in both inventories. The results are analyzed.

The increased amount and quality of research on love and other sentiments in psychology of personality and in social psychology show a significant shift of psychological priorities to more ecological processes in human life (Buss, 2000; Salovey, 1991; Sternberg, & Weis, 2006). The study of sentiments such as the Love, Jealousy, and Envy was recently supplemented by the study of Hate (Burris, & Rempel, 2006; Sternberg, 2005). As a result the first 18-item Likert-like the Hate scale (Breslavs, & Tjumenewa, 2008a) emerged. This increase of studies in the field is not in coherence with attention to love and other sentiments in developmental psychology. The topic of sentiments seems to be a "Cinderella" in many psychological branches including developmental psychology (Breslavs, 2006). At the same time it is no doubt impossible to understand either the role or mechanisms of these important phenomena in adulthood outside life-long development. It is especially important taking into account cultural tradition established in Europe and America from 20<sup>th</sup> century for the choice and change of partners on the basis of love existence.

The absence of this topic was compensated partly by studies on developmental aspects of romantic relationships (Carver, Joyner, & Udry, 2003; Collins, & Sroufe, 1999). In 2004 Deborah Welsh and Shmuel Shulman organized the first symposium focused on observational studies on adolescents' romantic relationships in Baltimore, Maryland. This interest was later increased by combining observational and self-report data in many studies published in the special 6<sup>th</sup> issue of the 31<sup>st</sup> volume of the *Journal of Adolescence* (2008). But studies of this group have little emotion and sentiment analysis which is very important in the study of dating and other forms of romantic relationships in adolescence, but not in middle childhood where love and friendship relationships are not clearly differentiated (Carlson, Rose, 2007). At the same time it is impossible to understand a shaping of partnership without developmental trends of these sentiments analyze from adolescence to adulthood.

The development of romantic relationships in adolescence involves the integration of attachment, affiliate, care-giving, and sexual reproductive behavioral systems (Furman, & Wehner, 1997). It means a step-by-step transfer of this relationship from just companionship and friendship to the romantic partner who becomes a major figure in late adolescence or early adulthood, integrating support, comfort, care, and sexual fulfillment (Seiffge-Krenke, 2003). The empirical data indicate a progression of involvement and intensity with age, relationship

duration, and experience in romantic relationships (Meier, & Allen, 2009). The development of intimate relationships in adolescence and adulthood can be mediated by social strata as well. Lower-class adolescents are more likely to engage in intimate-relationship practices, such as cohabitation, early marriage, and sexual activity (Meier, & Allen, 2008).

**There are different approaches to the understanding and study of Love (Sternberg, & Barnes, 1988; Sternberg, & Weiss, 2006; Бреслав, 2004). Some researchers consider love to be a multi-faced phenomenon, which requires a separate study of different types of love (Berscheid, 2006), while others differentiate styles of loving (Lee, 1988; Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2006) or inner elements of love and its dynamics (Sternberg, 2006) which seem to be similar with styles. It seems that some old data on the decrease of love in long-time partnerships (Cimbalo, Faling, & Mousaw, 1976) could be reinterpreted as the decrease of some specific styles or elements of love, as, for example, the diminishing of the Ludus style (love as a game) in long-term couples (Frazier, & Esterly, 1990).**

One of the first approaches to love operationalization resulted in the Rubin's differentiation of love and friendship scales (Rubin, 1970). A similar vision resulted in Passionate Love theory and scale differentiated Passionate (sexual by essence) and Companionate (asexual) Love (Berscheid, & Walster, 1977; Hatfield, 1988; Hatfield, & Sprecher, 1986). This seems to be an important but oversimplified concept of love. The next to be mentioned is Lee's model of styles of loving (Lee, 1973; 1988). It extends love types to three primary (Eros, Ludus, and Storge) and three secondary, mixed styles of love (Pragma, Mania, and Agape). Later two inventories for styles of love assessment were elaborated (Hendrick, & Hendrick, 1986; Lasswell, & Lobsenz, 1980). Eros & Storge are similar to Passionate and Companionate love accordingly in the previous model, but Ludus is defined as game-playing-love. In the Style model types of love seem to have been selected by different criteria, but mostly by partner-oriented motivation and acceptance/non-acceptance. The next model tries to extend the attachment concept to love phenomenology (Hazan, Shaver, 1987/1997; Shaver, Hazan, Bradshaw, 1988). It captures some features of love (long-term emotional link, mutual dependence, the role of trust), but is not specific enough. The last three-dimensional or triangular model was proposed independently by different researchers as a structural model of love (Aron, Westbay, 1996; Maxwell, 1985; Sternberg, 1986). The Sternberg model seems to be more elaborated methodologically.

There is very long tradition, at least from Descartes and Spinoza, to interpret hate as a sentiment opposed or reversed to love. By Spinoza the love is a pleasure from an agent and a desire to survive the link with this agent or to bring closer but the hate is displeasure and a desire to eliminate or destroy the agent (). This tradition is represented in contemporary interpretations too. Some authors interpret the love as *positive identification* and the hate as a symmetrical syndrome of *negative identification* (Royzman, McCauley, & Rozin, 2005). In the same time their interpretation of hate "as a tendency to emote in a number of ways to a number of situations involving the object of hatred" (Royzman, et all, p.6) looks attractive enough because is close to the nature of all sentiments (Бреслав, 2004). Similar understanding of hate as an opposition to love is represented in the Sternberg's model (Sternberg, 2003; 2005).

While we have no data on the development of hate, it would be productive to use data on the development of similar phenomena: aggression, anger, and hostility. Especially important seem to be the data on aggression development, not only because this topic is studied more intensively in psychology (Durkin, 1997), but also due to direct links between the hate phenomenon and enemy aggression (Buss, 1961; Hartup, 1974). Obviously, the scope of aggression increases with age according to the increase of physical opportunities till adolescence, but later it decreases, and if not, this can be an indicator of behavioral problems (Crick, 1997; Durkin, 1997). For example, physical aggression for rural American adolescents peaked around age 15; social aggression peaked around age 14 (Karriker-Jaffe, Foshee, Ennett, Suchindran, 2008). At the same time aggression development is mediated by innate factors. Hyperactivity that can be considered a genetically determined feature, can predict aggressiveness in children

aged from 8 to 11 (Farrington, 1994). In its turn, hate is mediated more by cultural factors which are responsible for hate value in the social environment through a socialization process (Staub, 2005).

Just a few studies tried to analyze opposite emotion systems, but not in the developmental context (Ellis, Malamuth, 2000; Fitness, & Fletcher, 1993) or not empirically (Alford, 2005; Goldberg, 1993). The research situation in the field is in stark contrast with the significance of these sentiments in life-long development, especially in family and close relationships. This study can be a small step bridging the gap and deepening our knowledge of love and hate development across life stages.

The objective of this research is to compensate for the lack of studies in the field and to compare the development of Love and Hate at different ages starting with adolescence. To study these sentiments all existing psychological theories, models, and data were taken into account, especially in the field of love which in the last 30 years has been studied more and more intensively.

## Method

### Participants

Three age samples (1 -16-18, 2 - 26-28, 3 - 36-38) equal in number were selected from different regions of Latvia. Gender, education, and ethnic belonging were controlled. Economic status was controlled for half of participants only. 240 participants filled in both inventories: 45-item 9-point Sternberg love scale (where 15 items represent Intimacy subscale; 15 – Passion scale, 15 – Commitment scale) and 18-item 9-point Hate scale (where 7 items represent Active hate subscale, such as “I think that such persons as ... , tend not help but create problems to others” (Мне кажется, что такие как ... стремятся не столько помочь, сколько причинить вред другим.); 11 – Passive hate scale as “I want to escape from meeting with ...” (Мне хотелось бы избежать встреч с ... ).

### Measures

*Love scale.* The Sternberg triangular model (Intimacy-Passion-Decision/Commitment) as more advanced theoretically and empirically was used for the study. His second 45-item 9-point Likert scale version of love measure with three subscales - Intimacy, Passion, and Commitment (Sternberg, 1888, 1997) was adapted in the Latvian and Russian languages independently in Latvia and Russia (Breslavs, & Tjumeneva, 2008b).

*Hate scale.* His Hate triangular model (Sternberg, 2005) was also used for the development of scale for hate assessment. The list of 63 feelings and emotions related to hate from narratives, dictionaries, and previous phenomenological descriptions was reformulated and distributed into three subscales according to Sternberg’s model and the second version of his inventory on love (Sternberg, 1997). Using the results of a pilot study, a 45-item scale *My antipathies* was developed. Responses to each of these items are presented on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from *does not apply to me* (1) to *strongly apply to me* (9). *The distance or negation of intimacy* subscale consists of fourteen statements, *the passion* subscale of fourteen statements too, *the commitment* or *accusation* subscale of seventeen statements. Factor component analysis of the first study data on 166 (48 males and 118 females from 18 to 57, the average age – 25) participants in Moscow has revealed a three-factor structure, but many points had no specific loads according to proposed subscales.

According to these results the number of scale items was reduced at the next stage to 34 items (12 for intimacy, 11 for passion, 11 for commitment/ accusation). The second study involved 60 participants (21 males and 39 females from 18 to 27, the average age – 19.6) from

Moscow humanitarian universities. The 34-item hate scale version was verified using the short 13-item version of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale (Crowne, Marlow, 1960; Reynolds, 1982). Factor analysis has not confirmed the expected three-dimensional structure of the hate construct. Taking into account these results it was decided to reject the *passion* subscale. After two-stage Factor component analysis 18-item 9-point Likert-like Hate scale was elaborated that comprised two-factors only renamed as “active” or “struggle-with hate” and “passive” “escaping-from hate” (Breslavs, Tjumenewa, 2008b).

In Riga the 18-item Hate scale was adapted in Latvian-Latvian and Latvian-Russian, it was validated by contrast-samples method and verified on convergent validity by the 50-item Ethnic Tolerance scale consisting of three Guttman-like 4-points subscales (negative attitude to out-group, positive attitude to out-group, positive stereotypes about out-group)( Abele, Breslavs, Derjabo, Pishinska, & Roze, 2008). On the Latvian stage of the scale elaboration the sample included 122 Latvian-speaking Latvian students of Police Academy, social workers and military personnel (27 males and 84 females from 20 to 63 years old, average age – 31.1) and 102 Russian-speaking Latvian students of Police Academy, medical staff and military personnel (52 males and 50 females from 20 to 63 years old, average – 31.6). Factor analysis of Latvian data showed the same two factors: “active” or “struggle-with hate” and “passive” or “escaping-from hate” (Abele, et all, 2008).

The hypothesis predicts differences of love and hate features in adolescence and adulthood, particularly higher *commitment* and lower *hate* in adulthood.

## Results

Table 1. Comparison of adolescents and young adults. U-Mann-Whitney Test Statistics(a)

	Love_S	Hate_S	Intim	Passion	Commitment	Passiveh	Activeh
Mann-Whitney U	2617.000	2471.500	3161.000	2435.000	2468.000	2628.500	2402.500
Wilcoxon W	5857.000	5711.500	6401.000	5675.000	5708.000	5868.500	5642.500
Z	<b>-1.990</b>	<b>-2.486</b>	-.133	<b>-2.611</b>	<b>-2.499</b>	-1.951	<b>-2.723</b>
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.047	.013	.894	.009	.012	.051	.006

a Grouping Variable: Age

Table 2. Comparison of adolescents and middle age adults. U-Mann-Whitney Test Statistics(a)

	Love_S	Hate_S	Intimacy	Passion	Commitment	Passiveh	Activeh
Mann-Whitney U	2978.000	2657.500	3168.000	3033.500	2607.500	2786.000	2502.500
Wilcoxon W	6218.000	5897.500	6408.000	6273.500	5847.500	6026.000	5742.500
Z	-.758	-1.852	-.109	-.568	<b>-2.022</b>	-1.413	<b>-2.382</b>
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.449	.064	.913	.570	.043	.158	.017

a Grouping Variable: Age

Table 3. Variance analysis of age groups (ANOVA)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Love_S	Between Groups	10098.325	2	5049.162	1.486	.228
	Within Groups	805068.325	237	3396.913		
	Total	815166.650	239			
Hate_S	Between Groups	6006.233	2	3003.117	<b>4.167</b>	.017

	Within Groups	170792.563	237	720.644		
	Total	176798.796	239			
Intimacy	Between Groups	167.808	2	83.904	.234	.792
	Within Groups	85053.988	237	358.878		
	Total	85221.796	239			
Passion	Between Groups	4383.058	2	2191.529	4.921	.008
	Within Groups	105542.125	237	445.325		
	Total	109925.183	239			
Commitment	Between Groups	2886.358	2	1443.179	2.884	.058
	Within Groups	118601.938	237	500.430		
	Total	121488.296	239			
Passiveh	Between Groups	1616.033	2	808.017	2.487	.085
	Within Groups	76999.700	237	324.893		
	Total	78615.733	239			
Activeh	Between Groups	1409.733	2	704.867	5.259	.006
	Within Groups	31767.662	237	134.041		
	Total	33177.396	239			

## Discussion

Comparison of adolescents and young adults using the Mann-Whitney and the Kruskal-Wallis statistical tests confirmed the hypothesis mainly, excluding Intimacy subscale of Love and Passive subscale of Hate that is on the edge of significant result.

A slightly different profile using the Kruskal-Wallis and the Mann-Whitney statistical tests can be seen in the comparison of adolescents and middle age adults due to dramatically dropped passions in middle adulthood.

The variance analysis also shows three main differences between age groups – Hate in general, due to the big difference in Active hate subscale, and the differences on Passion subscale of Love. The passion variable increase in young adulthood and decrease in middle adulthood seems to be most important result of the study. The hypothesis on Hate dropping in adulthood was supported to the active version of hate only.

These differences cannot be interpreted as age differences only because such an important variable as a marital status was not controlled. These results can possibly be explained by the differences between married and unmarried participants or between persons involved in short-term & long-term love relationships. Some studies show that most differences in love attitudes occur between unmarried and married groups (Montgomery, & Sorell, 1997).

## Conclusion

The hypothesis was confirmed partly only. The predicted decrease of hate is significant for active hate only. Young adults were significantly higher on *commitment* than adolescents but not middle adults. In the same time were revealed dramatically increasing passion in young adulthood with strong drop in the middle age.

## References

- Abele, U., Breslavs, G., Derjabo, L., Pishinska, I. & Roze, J. (2008). Are we tolerant? Development of societal ethnic tolerance assessment scale. Vai mēs esam iecietīgi?: Sabiedrības etniskās iecietības monitoringa metodikas izveide. Rīga, „Salus” (in Latvian).
- Alford, C. F. (2005). Hate is the imitation of love. In R. Sternberg (ed.), *The Psychology of Hate* (pp.235-254). Washington, DC: APA.

- Aron, A.; Westbay, L. (1996). Dimensions of the Prototype of Love. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 70 (3), 535-551.
- Berscheid, E. (2006). Searching for the Meaning of "Love". In R. J. , Sternberg, & K. Weis, (Eds.) *The New Psychology of Love* (pp.171-183). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1977). *Interpersonal attraction* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Breslavs, G. (2006). Cross-cultural Study of Sentiments: the "Cinderella" in Psychology. *The paper presented at the European Colloquium on Intercultural Communication*, Riga, May, 5-7.
- Breslavs, G., & Tjumeneva, J. (2008a). Development of the Russian version of Sternberg's Love scale. *The paper presented at the 14<sup>th</sup> European conference on Personality*, Tartu, July 16-20.
- Breslavs, G., & Tjumeneva, J. (2008b). Is Hate an opposite to Love ? *The paper presented at the 14<sup>th</sup> European conference on Personality*, Tartu, July, 16-20.
- Burris, Ch. T., & Rempel, J. K. (2006). "You're Worthless": *The Role of Devaluation in the Experience of Hate*. Poster presented on the SPSP conference.
- Buss, A. (1961). *The psychology of aggression*. New York: John Wiley.
- Buss, D. M. (2000). *The dangerous passion: Why jealousy is as necessary as love and sex*. New York: The Free Press.
- Carlson, W., Rose, A. J. (2007). The role of reciprocity in romantic relationships in middle childhood and early adolescence. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 2,
- Carver, Karen, Kara Joyner, and J. Richard Udry. (2003). "National Estimates of Adolescent Romantic Relationships." Pp. 23-56 in P. Florsheim (Ed.), *Adolescent Romantic Relations and Sexual Behavior: Theory, Research, and Practical Implications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- Cimbalo, R.S., Faling, V., & Mousaw, P. (1976). The cours of love: A cross-sectional design. *Psychological Reports*, 38, 1292-1294.
- Collins, W. A., & Sroufe, L. A. (1999).Capacity for intimate relationship: A developmental construction. In W. Furman & B.B. Brown (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence. Cambridge studies in social and emotional development* (pp.125-147). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Crick, N. (1997). Engagement in gender normative versus nonnormative forms of aggression: links to social-psychological adjustment. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 610-617.
- Durkin, K. (1997). *Developmental Social Psychology: From Infancy to Old Age*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Ellis, Bruce J.; Malamuth, Neil M. (2000). Love and Anger in Romantic Relationships: A Discrete Systems Model. *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 68 (3), 525-557.
- Farrington, D. P. (1994). Childhood, adolescence, and adult features of violent males. In L.R. Huesmann (ed.), *Aggressive Behavior: current perspectives* (pp.215-240). New York: Plenum Press.
- Fitness, J., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (1993). Love, hate, anger, and jealousy in close relationships: A prototype and cognitive appraisal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 942-958.
- Frazier, P. & Esterly, E. (1990). Correlates of relationship beliefs: Gender, relationship experience and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7:331-352.
- Goldberg, J. G. (1993). *The dark side of love: The positive role of our negative feelings – anger, jealousy, and hate*. New York: Putnam.
- Hatfield, E. (1988). Passionate and Companionate Love. In: R.Sternberg & M.Barnes (Eds.) *The Psychology of Love* (pp.191-217). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hazan, C., Shaver, P. (1987/1997). Romantic love conceptualised as an attachment process. In Hewstone, M., Manstead, A.S., & Stroebe, W.(Eds.), *The Blackwell Reader in Social Psychology* (pp.377-406). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of Love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, v.50, 392- 402.
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2006). Styles of Romantic Love. In R. J. , Sternberg, & K. Weis, (Eds.) *The New Psychology of Love* (pp.149-170). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Joyner, Kara and Mary Campa. (2006). "How do Adolescent Relationships Influence the Quality of Romantic and Sexual Relationship in Young Adulthood." Pp. 93-102 in Alan Booth and Ann C. Crouter (Eds.), *Romance and Sex in Adolescence and Emerging Adulthood: Risks and Opportunities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- Furman, W., & Wehner, E.A. (1997). Adolescent romantic relationships: A developmental perspective. In S. Shulman & A. Collins (Eds.), *Romantic relationships in adolescence: New Directions for Child Development* (pp. 21–36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hartup, W.W. (1974). Aggression in childhood: Developmental perspectives. *American Psychologist*, v.29, 336-41.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of Love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, v.50, 392- 402.
- Karriker-Jaffe, K. J.; Foshee, V. A.; Ennett, S. T.; Suchindran, Ch. (2008). The development of aggression during adolescence: Sex differences in trajectories of physical and social aggression among youth in rural areas. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 36(8), 1227-1236.
- Lasswell, M., & Lobsenz, N. M. (1980). *Styles of loving: Why we love the way you do*. New York: Doubleday.
- Lee, J. (1973). *Colours of love*. Toronto: New Press.
- Lee, J. (1988). Love-styles. In: R.Sternberg & M.Barnes (Eds.) *The Psychology of Love* (pp.38-67). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Meier, A., & Allen, G. (2008). Intimate relationship development during the transition to adulthood: Differences by social class. In J. T. Mortimer (Ed.), *Social class and transitions to adulthood. New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 119, 25–39.
- Meier, Ann, & Allen, Gina. (2009). Romantic Relationships from Adolescence to Young Adulthood: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Sociological Quarterly*, 50 (2), 308-335.
- Montgomery, M. J., & Sorell, G. T. (1997). Differences in love attitudes across family life stages. *Family Relations*, 46:55-61.
- Royzman, E. B., McCauley, C., & Rozin, P. (2005). From Plato to Putnam: four ways to think about hate. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The Psychology of Hate* (pp.3-35). Washington, DC: APA.
- Salovey, P. (Ed.), (1991). *The psychology of jealousy and envy*. New York: Guilford.
- Seiffge-Krenke, Inge (2003). Testing theories of romantic development from adolescence to young adulthood: Evidence of a developmental sequence. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27 (6), 519-531.
- Shaver, Ph., Hazan, C., Bradshaw, D. (1988). Love as Attachment: The Integration of Three Behavioral Systems. In: R.Sternberg & M.Barnes (Eds.) *The Psychology of Love* ( pp.68-99). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A Triangular Theory of Love. *Psychological Review*, 93 (2), 119-135.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1988). Triangulating Love. In: R.Sternberg & M.Barnes (Eds.) *The Psychology of Love* ( pp.119-138). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1997). Construct validation of a triangular love scale. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27(3), 313-335.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2003). A duplex theory of hate: Development and application to terrorism, massacres, and genocide. *Review of General Psychology*, 7, 299-328.
- Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.), (2005). *The Psychology of Hate*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2006). A Duplex Theory of Love. In R. J. , Sternberg, & K. Weis, (Eds.) *The Psychology of Love*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

*New Psychology of Love* (pp.184-199). New Haven: Yale University Press.  
 Sternberg, R. J. , & Weis, K. (Eds.) (2006). *The New Psychology of Love*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

**Table 4. Descriptive data of age groups**

	Age groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Love_S	1.00	80	305.6250	56.47591	6.31420
	2.00	80	321.4625	67.92884	7.59468
	3.00	80	312.4375	48.85573	5.46224
	Total	240	313.1750	58.40153	3.76980
Hate_S	1.00	80	122.4375	23.95504	2.67826
	2.00	80	110.6625	28.43199	3.17879
	3.00	80	113.6125	27.92326	3.12192
	Total	240	115.5708	27.19823	1.75564
Intimacy	1.00	80	107.3625	19.91580	2.22665
	2.00	80	107.0750	21.46518	2.39988
	3.00	80	108.9750	14.80675	1.65545
	Total	240	107.8042	18.88323	1.21891
Passion	1.00	80	98.4375	20.91202	2.33803
	2.00	80	106.6750	23.25738	2.60025
	3.00	80	96.9625	18.91449	2.11470
	Total	240	100.6917	21.44617	1.38434
Commit	1.00	80	99.8250	22.40297	2.50473
	2.00	80	107.7125	24.95626	2.79019
	3.00	80	106.5000	19.40573	2.16963
	Total	240	104.6792	22.54594	1.45533
Passiveh	1.00	80	77.4500	16.09772	1.79978
	2.00	80	71.2250	19.36784	2.16539
	3.00	80	73.2250	18.45074	2.06286
	Total	240	73.9667	18.13660	1.17071
Activeh	1.00	80	44.9875	10.72734	1.19935
	2.00	80	39.4375	12.60485	1.40926
	3.00	80	40.3875	11.32097	1.26572
	Total	240	41.6042	11.78209	.76053