
Respect in close relationships: Prototype definition, self-report assessment, and initial correlates

JENNIFER R. FREI AND PHILLIP R. SHAVER
University of California, Davis

Abstract

Researchers who study romantic relationships have mentioned *respect* as a factor contributing to relationship success, but little effort has been made to define respect, measure it, or discover how it relates to other relationship constructs. In Study 1 a prototype methodology was used to identify consensual features of respect. Participants in Study 2 rated the centrality of the features of respect and completed a new prototype-based respect-for-partner scale that was highly reliable and correlated in predictable ways with avoidant attachment and evaluative aspects of partner descriptions. In Study 3, the new respect scale predicted relationship satisfaction better than scales measuring liking, loving, attachment-related anxiety and avoidance, and positive and negative partner qualities. Suggestions are offered for future research on respect.

Researchers in a variety of fields including psychology, sociology, and communication have begun to explore the nature of close relationships (see Berscheid & Reis, 1998, and Hendrick & Hendrick, 2000, for comprehensive reviews), especially romantic and marital relationships. These scholars have attempted to identify factors that account for the success and stability of some relationships and the failure and dissolution of others. Self-report measures have been designed to assess such key variables as liking and loving (e.g., Rubin, 1973), attachment (see Crowell, Fraley, & Shaver, 1999, for a review), commitment (see Adams & Jones, 1999, for an overview), and satisfaction (see Sternberg & Hojjat, 1997, for an overview). Because of the complexity of relationship-

related cognition, emotion, and behavior, however, several important aspects of close relationships remain to be explored.

One potentially important issue is *respect*. Respect is often mentioned when ordinary people discuss their marriages (Robert W. Levenson, personal communication, 1998) and when marital researchers informally present their results (e.g., at professional meetings and in radio interviews), but it has not yet become the central focus of psychometric or empirical research. John Gottman (1994b), a leading marital researcher, wrote that “like most couples I’ve worked with over the years, [they] wanted just two things from their marriage—love and respect” (p. 18). Yet respect does not play a formal role in Gottman’s model of marital communication and divorce. It is included only indirectly as the presumed “opposite of—and antidote for” (p. 61) measured expressions of *contempt* and is mentioned in questionnaires included in some of the popular treatments of his work (e.g., Gottman, 1994b, pp. 63, 81). Because contempt is one of the major predictors of divorce, it would be worthwhile to understand how its presumed opposite, respect, functions

We are grateful to R. Chris Fraley, Sun-Mee Kang, Edward Radza, Caroline Tancredy, and Carol Tavris for advice and assistance with the studies and comments on the manuscript.

Correspondence should be addressed to Jennifer R. Frei, Department of Psychology, University of California, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616-8686; e-mail: jrfrei@ucdavis.edu.

and can be enhanced. Markman, Stanley, and Blumberg (1994) also mentioned the importance of respect in marital relationships, listing it as one of four core relationship values, the other three being commitment, intimacy, and forgiveness. But they did not report empirical research based on a validated measure of respect.

Although researchers portray respect as important in close relationships, they generally rely on unstated definitions of the concept and do not ask how respect differs from other relationship constructs such as love and commitment. Markman et al. (1994) wrote about "respect for the value and worth of others" (p. 293). Singer (1994) discussed the "acceptance of another as he is in himself" (p. 134) and occasionally used the word *respect* in place of *acceptance*. It appears that such relationship analysts were not thinking about respect for people who are considered higher in status by virtue of being older, more skilled, or more powerful, such as parents and grandparents, organizational and political leaders, experienced teachers, or accomplished professionals. Thus, respect may have a special meaning in the context of close relationships.

In addition, it appears that the few close-relationships researchers who have mentioned respect in their writings have not established consensus about its meaning. Rubin (1973) discussed respect for the "admired" characteristics of another. Kellenberger (1995) distinguished between respect for persons as persons and respect for persons based on accomplishments or abilities, respect for the rights of others, and respect for duty or moral law. Moreover, he asserted that respect is distinct from such related concepts as liking, love, and compassion. Yet in empirical research, respect has been listed as a component of both liking (Rubin, 1973) and love (Tzeng, 1993). Fehr (1988) found that respect was rated as a central feature of both love and commitment, yet Aron and Westbay (1996) found that respect was rated as central to intimacy but not to commitment. Fehr and Russell (1991) found that respect was characterized by study participants as a subtype of love. More work is needed before the concept

of respect can play a coherent role in theories of close-relationship functioning.

Why might respect be important? Considering it as the opposite of contempt provides useful clues. Implicit in contempt is a view of one's partner as beneath dignity and essentially beyond the reach of rational discussion. (Gottman, 1994a, assesses it by noticing nose wrinkles of disgust and upward eye-rolling, two very dismissive gestures.) When a person has contempt rather than respect for a partner, there is little the partner can do to get his or her feelings and needs taken seriously. Considering respect as similar to "sensitivity and responsiveness," identified by Ainsworth and colleagues (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978) and Gottman (1996) as the heart of good parenting, provides other useful clues about the interpersonal value of respect. What Ainsworth et al. call security-enhancing parental behavior and Gottman calls good "emotion-coaching" is closely related to parental respect for a child's unique moral value as a human being. It is associated with being attentive, empathic, sympathetic, kind, and supportive.

As popular writers about respect have suggested (e.g., Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2000b), one person's respect for another seems to generate respect in return, which deepens security and increases mutual trust. Wieselquist, Rusbult, Foster, and Agnew (1999) have reported strong evidence for a "mutual cyclical growth model" of relationships in which one partner's trust increases his or her dependence on a relationship, commitment to the relationship, and pro-relationship behavior (in that order), which in turn increases the other partner's trust, dependence, commitment, and pro-relationship behavior. In a similar process of mutual cyclical growth, respectable behavior on the part of one partner may both lead to and result from respectable behavior on the part of the other partner.

In order to pursue these ideas further, we needed to determine precisely what respect means in the context of close relationships and to create a measure of respect that could be used in relationship research. The three studies reported here were designed to achieve these goals and spark other researchers'

interest in exploring the nature and role of respect in close relationships. In Study 1 we used a prototype methodology to delineate the everyday concept of respect—the presumed meaning behind laypersons’ and professionals’ use of the term. In Studies 2 and 3 we created a new measure of respect, based on the features identified in Study 1, and tested it for convergent and discriminant validity. Although our research was necessarily exploratory, throughout the three studies we were interested in examining the importance of respect to relationship satisfaction and in determining whether respect can be distinguished from secure attachment, liking, love, and perceptions of a relationship partner’s moral qualities.

Study 1

The main purpose of Study 1 was to determine the everyday definition of respect in close relationships. We used a prototype methodology to explore this issue because existing discussions of respect in the close-relationships literature suggest that researchers were essentially relying on informal definitions and that respect is an inherently fuzzy concept that overlaps such concepts as liking and love. The prototype approach, which is based on theoretical and empirical work by Rosch (1978), establishes a definition of what Rosch called “fuzzy categories”—those that have no simple classical definition (based on necessary and sufficient features) and shade off into conceptually related categories or concepts. Such fuzzy categories are defined by prototypical (“central”) features and/or exemplars. Many everyday psychological categories, such as *personality* and *emotion*, have no agreed-upon classical definition (Fehr & Russell, 1984). For example, some features and kinds of anger or sadness are more prototypical than others (Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, & O’Connor, 1987). In an important series of studies, Fehr (1988) and Fehr and Russell (1991) provided fruitful methods for collecting research participants’ freely listed features of emotions, such as love, and other psychological states, such as commitment. These features could then be assessed for

centrality to the category. Therefore, a prototype methodology involves two steps: (1) gathering freely listed features of the concept and (2) collecting centrality ratings of those features. In the research reported here, Step (1) was the focus of Study 1, and Step (2) was the focus of Study 2.

Method—Study 1

Participants

A total of 189 students (45 men, 143 women; 1 who did not specify gender) in introductory psychology classes participated in the study. The students were from two northern California universities: 81 were students at University of California, Davis (UCD); 108 were students at California State University, Sacramento (CSUS).¹ They ranged in age from 15 to 46 years (median age: 19), with 78.6% aged 18 to 22 years. Regarding ethnicity, 51.6% described themselves as White/Caucasian/European (hereafter, Caucasian), 26.1% as Asian/Asian American, 10.6% as Hispanic, 6.4% as African American, 2.7% as Middle Eastern, 1.1% as Native American, and 1.1% as Pacific Islander. Fifty-five percent of the study participants described themselves as involved in a romantic or marital relationship at the time of testing; the median length of their relationships was 13.5 months.

Materials and procedure

Participants first provided demographic and relationship history information. They then completed an open-ended questionnaire asking for features of *respect*. The instructions, based closely on those used by Fehr and Russell (1991), read as follows: “Please list as many features of RESPECT as come to mind. The features of RESPECT that you list may include characteristics, components, facets, feelings, ideas or behaviors—anything that helps define RESPECT.” Because we

1. University was not associated with any variables of interest in the three studies. Therefore, analyses by university are not presented here.

were interested in respect in close relationships, we asked about three different relational contexts in which respect might or might not be conceptualized somewhat differently: (a) respect in a general interpersonal context (e.g., for oneself and for other people in the context of close interpersonal relationships), (b) respect for parents and caregivers, and (c) respect for romantic partners. The latter two sections asked participants to list features *again*, or *in addition* to the ones listed in the general section if they were unique or particularly important in that specific relational context. The major goal was to elicit as many potentially defining features as possible.

Results and Discussion—Study 1

To create a coding system for responses to the open-ended questions about respect, we transferred to index cards every feature listed by at least 1 of 20 randomly selected

participants. Both authors independently sorted the resulting 202 cards into conceptual categories. Our highly similar category systems were merged to create a single coding sheet, which we then used independently to code the data from 10 additional randomly selected participants. The few disagreements were discussed, and a revised coding sheet listing 31 substantive categories, plus an Other category, was created.

Using the final coding sheet, both authors independently coded the responses of 33 new randomly selected participants to test for interrater agreement, which was high: Cohen's kappa = .91. The first author coded the remaining participants' data, recording the number of features listed by each participant in each of the 31 substantive coding categories and an additional Other category. After the coding was completed, features in the Other category were reviewed and found to be unique to individual participants. They were therefore dropped from subsequent analyses.

Table 1. *Percentage of participants who mentioned a coding category*

Coding category	General	Caregiver	Romantic partner
Having moral qualities	50.3	40.8	17.5
Considerate	46.6	12.7	24.4
Accepting other	42.9	21.7	33.4
Honest	40.2	22.2	31.2
Listening	40.2	29.1	21.1
Inspiring	38.1	17.0	13.8
Member of a respectable social category	38.1	47.1	7.4
Trustworthy and reliable	33.9	26.5	31.3
Caring	33.9	17.0	26.0
Understanding and empathic	31.8	18.5	20.6
Admirable talents/skills	31.2	14.3	4.7
Mutuality	28.6	10.6	23.8
Loving	27.0	30.7	34.4
Loyal	26.5	4.8	26.5
Respecting other's views	25.4	9.0	22.8
Not abusive	23.3	5.3	15.9
Open and receptive	20.1	4.8	11.6
Sensitive to feelings	20.1	3.2	15.3
Open communication	19.1	11.1	17.0
Showing interest	18.0	4.3	7.9
Not judgmental	15.4	4.2	9.0
Helpful	15.4	17.0	17.4

The percentage of all participants who mentioned each of the 31 labeled coding categories was calculated. The 22 (of 31) coding categories mentioned by more than 15% of participants in any of the three relational sections of the questionnaire (general, parent/caregiver, romantic partner) are shown in Table 1. (The cutoff level of 15% was based on a natural break in the frequency distribution at that point and on the use of similar cutoff levels by Fehr, 1988, and Shaver et al., 1987.) The coding categories are listed from most to least frequently mentioned with regard to the general meaning of respect in interpersonal relationships. The inclusion of the parental and romantic relationship sections allowed for exploratory observations of respect features listed by participants as particularly important in these two kinds of relationships.

Based on the percentages shown in Table 1, we can draw preliminary conclusions about the definition of respect for each of the three relational contexts. First, most of what we intended to be features of respect turned out to be *features of a respectable relationship partner*. We did not anticipate this outcome based on earlier studies of *emotion* prototypes, which highlighted features of a process that unfolds over time. The prototype of anger, for example, includes appraising a situation as goal-obstructing and unfair, getting red in the face, raising one's voice, clenching one's fists, acting aggressively, and so forth (see Shaver et al., 1987). The results from the present study suggest that respect is not an emotion, but rather an attitude or disposition toward a particular person based on his or her perceived good qualities.

One of the most salient features of a respectable close relationship partner is "admirable moral qualities" (e.g., self-discipline, honor, patience, wisdom, self-knowledge). This was mentioned by 50.3% of participants when writing about respect in general interpersonal contexts. Also frequently mentioned were being considerate, being accepting (e.g., "fostering space" and allowing freedom and development), being honest/truthful, and listening to and hearing the other's viewpoint. Taken as a group, these salient features suggest, as we expected, that the respectable relation-

ship partner is what attachment theorists call a good (i.e., security-enhancing) attachment figure: a person on whom one can rely for protection, comfort, support, and encouragement (e.g., Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1973; De Wolff & van IJzendoorn, 1997).

In line with this observation, the definitions of respect generated with regard to parents and romantic partners corroborate the interpretation of a respectable partner as a good attachment figure. Specifically, the definition of respect with regard to parents (attachment figures par excellence) was only slightly different from the more general definition. Having moral qualities, being accepting, being honest, and listening were again emphasized. Nevertheless, the most frequently mentioned feature of respect for parents was "being a member of a respectable social category" (47.1%). Many participants mentioned that parents deserve one's respect simply by virtue of being one's parents. Being loving, trustworthy, reliable, and responsible were also relatively salient. In the section focused specifically on romantic relationships, being loving, accepting, honest/truthful, and trustworthy and reliable were all, once again, emphasized as central features of respect.

Overall, then, Study 1 indicates that respect is an attitudinal disposition toward a close relationship partner who is trustworthy, considerate, and accepting, and this conception holds across a variety of close relationships. Having delineated these prototypical characteristics of respect, we next sought to assess their relative centrality to the concept and create a new method of measuring respect in close relationships.

Study 2

Study 2 was motivated by three goals. First, we wanted to create a new means of measuring respect based on the findings of Study 1 and evaluate its reliability and factor structure. Second, we wanted to complete the prototype methodology by obtaining centrality ratings of the features of respect identified in Study 1. This step in the procedure adds further information about the core features of respect. To assess feature centrality we used a method

developed by Fehr and Russell (1991): asking participants to rate the centrality of every feature on a numerical scale. Third, we wanted to begin assessing the construct validity of the new scale and placing it in a nomological network of related constructs (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955).

When creating a scale measuring respect for one's relationship partner, we wished to include as many of the features listed by Study 1 participants as possible. Because each of the 31 coding categories included a variety of specific participant comments and distinctions, more than one scale item could be created for most categories. For example, the category "Caring" (in Table 1) included issues related to being caring and compassionate and to being concerned and protective. Therefore, two different scale items (numbered 31 and 39 in the Table 1) were created to represent this category. As a result of this differentiating process, a total of 45 scale items were created.

Two kinds of measures were included in Study 2 to assess construct validity and the location of the new respect measure in a preliminary nomological network of related constructs. One measure was the Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) scale, a 36-item, two subscale measure of attachment-related avoidance and anxiety (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). *Avoidance* refers to avoidance of intimacy and dependence on partners, whereas *anxiety* refers to anxiety about love-worthiness, rejection, and abandonment. These dimensions are conceptually parallel to two discriminant functions reported by Ainsworth et al. (1978) in their studies of infants' patterns of attachment to parents, and are essentially the same as the two dimensions underlying the four-category typology of adult attachment styles developed by Bartholomew and colleagues (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994).

We predicted that the more avoidant participants would be less respectful of their partners for one or both of two reasons: (a) that avoidance reflects a negative model of others (in particular, of attachment figures), which might include an element of disrespect (a proposal made by Bartholomew and

Horowitz, 1991); (b) that avoidance is a defensive strategy based on prior attachment relationships; failing to fully respect romantic partners may be one way to avoid becoming emotionally close to and/or dependent on them (a proposal made by Shaver and Clark, 1994). We did not expect attachment-related anxiety to correlate strongly with respect for partner because anxious individuals can vary in avoidance (the two dimensions are conceptually and empirically orthogonal), and some may respect their partners, whereas others may not. Some anxious individuals may attribute their lack of security to themselves while maintaining high respect for their partner, but others may angrily blame their partner for their own feelings of insecurity.

The second measure used to assess construct validity was the Inventory of Personal Characteristics (IPC; Benet & Waller, 1995; Tellegen & Waller, 1987), which was designed to assess seven fundamental factors of one's own or another person's personality: the original Big Five trait factors plus two new, more evaluative and morality-relevant trait factors, positive and negative valence. The two new factors are especially interesting for our purposes because they refer to moral and other qualities of a person that might be related to respectworthiness (e.g., being noble, wicked, or evil; deserving to be admired or hated). We expected that greater respect for one's partner would be associated with perceiving the partner as more moral and less wicked. If scores on the positive and negative valence dimensions (applied to one's relationship partner) correlate with respect for the partner and also predict other variables such as relationship satisfaction, stability, and dissolution better than respect, there would be little need for a respect scale. The correlations between the valence scales and the new respect scale were determined in Study 2; the issue of relative predictive power was assessed in Study 3.

Method—Study 2

Participants

A total of 182 introductory psychology students (60 men, 120 women, 2 who did not

specify gender) participated in the study. Eighty-nine were UCD students; 93 were CSUS students. Their ages ranged from 18 to 46 years (median age: 22), with 74.2% aged 19 to 23 years. Regarding ethnicity, 54.5% described themselves as Caucasian, 23.0% as Asian, 10.7% as Hispanic, 7.9% as African American, 2.2% as Pacific Islander, and 1.7% as Middle Eastern. Sixty-two percent were involved in a relationship at the time of testing; median relationship length was 21.0 months.

Materials and procedure

Participants each completed the same demographic questionnaire used in Study 1. They then completed a questionnaire packet including the following measures (in the order listed): the newly created respect measure, a measure of centrality ratings of the features of respect, the ECR measure of attachment-style dimensions, and the positive and negative valence scales from the IPC.

For each of the 45 respect items (e.g., “S/he is willing to listen and hear my viewpoint,” “S/he is inspiring, motivating, admirable”), participants indicated on a 7-point scale (*disagree strongly* to *agree strongly*) whether or not the statement applied to their current romantic partner. Participants not currently involved in a relationship described their “most important previous” relationship partner. Next, participants completed a centrality rating form that listed the features of respect mentioned in all 31 coding categories in Study 1. The participants were asked to rate each feature with regard to how central it was to “respect in the context of interpersonal relationships.” Relationships with parents, romantic partners, friends, and coworkers were given as examples. The scale ranged from 1 (*not at all central*) to 7 (*extremely central*). The instructions and rating scale for the centrality measure were adapted from Fehr and Russell (1991).

Half of the ECR scale items measured attachment-related avoidance (e.g., “I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close”); half measured attachment-related anxiety (e.g., “I worry about being abandoned”). Items were rated on a 7-point

Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. As in previous studies, coefficient alphas in the present study were high: .94 for avoidance and .90 for anxiety.

The two evaluative scales from the IPC (Benet & Waller, 1995), positive valence and negative valence, were used to measure participants’ perceptions of their partner’s moral qualities. For each item, participants indicated whether the characteristic listed was *definitely true*, *probably true* or *mostly true*, *probably false* or *mostly false*, or *definitely false* of their relationship partner. An example of the positive valence items is “noble”; an example of the negative valence items is “wicked.” In the present study, the alpha coefficients were .89 for positive valence and .91 for negative valence. Because of time constraints at CSUS, the two subscales of the IPC were administered only at UCD.

Results and Discussion—Study 2

Feature centrality

The centrality ratings of all 31 features of respect included in Study 1 were analyzed to determine which were viewed as most and least central to the concept of respect. The results are shown in Table 2. All 31 features received mean ratings above 4.0, the midpoint of the 7-point centrality scale, which is what should have happened given that all of the features were listed as characteristics of respect by at least some of the participants in Study 1.

Comparisons between Study 1 and Study 2.

Generally, participants in the two studies agreed about the features that are most and least important for defining respect. One similarity between the results of Studies 1 and 2 is that eight of the nine features of respect listed by fewer than 15% of Study 1 participants (and therefore not included in Table 1) fell in the bottom half of Table 2. Only “follows the Golden Rule” moved from a low frequency of mention in Study 1 to a high centrality rating in Study 2, perhaps suggesting that it summarizes an important

Table 2. Mean centrality ratings of respect features

Respect feature	Mean centrality rating (and <i>SD</i>)
Honest	6.72 (0.53)
Not abusive	6.67 (0.74)
Loyal	6.54 (0.89)
Trustworthy and reliable	6.39 (0.95)
Sensitive to feelings	6.36 (0.86)
Follows the Golden Rule	6.36 (0.86)
Listening	6.27 (0.89)
Respecting other's views	6.25 (0.90)
Accepting other	6.23 (0.97)
Open and receptive	6.11 (1.03)
Mutuality	6.04 (0.95)
Open communication	6.02 (1.10)
Understanding and empathic	5.99 (1.00)
Having moral qualities	5.99 (1.15)
Not judgmental	5.88 (1.21)
Considerate	5.85 (1.19)
Mutual care	5.84 (1.20)
Loving	5.77 (1.34)
Showing interest	5.76 (1.23)
Helpful	5.73 (1.26)
Caring	5.71 (1.10)
Friendship	5.69 (1.31)
Forgiving	5.66 (1.26)
Altruistic	5.52 (1.24)
Appreciation	5.49 (1.26)
Inspiring	5.40 (1.40)
Sharing ideas and feelings	5.37 (1.32)
Comfortable	5.10 (1.60)
Personal qualities (appearance)	5.04 (1.65)
Admirable talents/skills	4.77 (1.66)
Member of a respectable social category	4.12 (1.90)

aspect of respectable individuals but is not a characteristic that most participants in Study 1 spontaneously generated in these particular words. Other features that were mentioned infrequently but rated as very central are "loyal," "not abusive," and "sensitive to feelings."

A difference between the results in Tables 1 and 2 is that two traits mentioned spontaneously by a sizable portion of Study 1

participants, being a member of a respectable social category and having admirable talents and skills, were rated as least central to respect by Study 2 participants. These two features are aspects of certain kinds of respect, and so may have come to mind in a free-recall format (Study 1), but seemed less important when listed among other salient features (Study 2).

An important similarity between the results in the two tables is that the top five features from the General column in Table 1 (having moral qualities, being considerate, being accepting of the other, being honest, and listening) and four of the five most frequently mentioned features in the Romantic Partner column of Table 1 (accepting, trustworthy and reliable, honest, and loyal) are in the top half of the centrality hierarchy in Table 2. These findings indicate agreement among participants about the features that are most important and central to respect in interpersonal relationships. A reading of the top few features from either Table 1 or Table 2 conveys the special nuances of respect in this context: It is not respect for an authority figure or respect for someone who evokes fear, but rather respect for a morally good, considerate, and trustworthy person who respects others' views. As mentioned earlier, these are characteristics of someone who can be expected to serve as a good attachment figure. It is noteworthy that participants were saying, with regard to respecting others' views, that respect engenders respect, an idea mentioned in the introduction.

Centrality across subgroups of the sample. Mean centrality ratings for each of the 31 features of respect were calculated for students in each of the four largest ethnic groups (Caucasian, Asian/Asian American, Hispanic, and African American). For each pair of ethnic groups, correlations across the 31 features were then computed. All six correlation coefficients were high (with r ranging from .87 to .97; all $p < .001$), indicating substantial agreement on the relative centrality of the 31 respect features across ethnic groups. Similar analyses were conducted to compare men's and women's

centrality ratings. The Pearson r was .57 ($p < .001$). The relatively low value of r led us to wonder whether large differences in centrality ratings of just a few features between men and women influenced the correlation. We calculated Spearman's rho to determine if the *rankings* of feature centrality were more similar across gender than the actual values. Rho was a high .83 ($p < .001$). Further analyses revealed that the relatively low r was indeed due primarily to statistically significant gender differences in the mean centrality ratings for four features: listening (M for men, 6.00; M for women, 6.39; $t(178) = 2.85, p = .005$), respecting others' views (men, 6.03; women, 6.37; $t(178) = 2.36, p = .019$), helpful (men, 6.02; women, 5.58; $t(178) = 2.20, p = .029$), and not abusive (men, 6.50; women, 6.76; $t(178) = 2.21, p = .028$). In other words, women rated a partner's listening, respecting others' views, and not being abusive as more central to respectworthiness than did men. Men rated partner's being helpful as more central to respectworthiness than did women.

Of the 31 features only 4 showed statistically significant gender differences, all of which were less than .45 of a scale point (on a 7-point scale). This is compatible with the conclusion that men's and women's conceptions of respect are similar. Still, the differences are comparable to ones found in many studies of married couples. Men often seem to be looking for a helpmate or supportive partner—women's traditional role in marriage. Women often complain about not being "heard" and sometimes about being physically or emotionally abused. These problems are presumably related to traditional sex differences in power and influence (see Tannen, 1990; Tavris, 1992). In general, the centrality ratings of respect features were highly similar across subgroups in Study 2, including differences in ethnicity and gender, suggesting that the ratings were far from arbitrary.

Respect scale

We turn now to analyses of the new respect scale, henceforth called the Respect for Partner Scale, or RPS, which was designed for use in the context of romantic relationships.

This 45-item scale proved to be highly reliable ($\alpha = .98$).² The possibility that some of the internal consistency was due to our having worded all items in the respectable direction—a consequence of deriving them from spontaneously listed features of respect in Study 1—was explored in Study 3. A second possibility—that viewing a person as respectable is more or less equivalent to liking or loving the person—was also examined in Study 3.

The high alpha coefficient for the 45-item version of the scale implies that the scale is unifactorial. To confirm this implication statistically, we submitted the inter-item correlation matrix to a principal components analysis. The scree plot indicated that there was one large factor and many small factors. The first principal component had an eigenvalue of 24.56 and accounted for 53.90% of the variance. All 45 items loaded above .40 on this factor. No other principal component accounted for even 5% of the variance; thus, no attempt was made to interpret the weaker components.

The respect scores were analyzed for possible associations with demographic variables. There was a small but significant negative correlation between age and respect score ($r = -.17, p = .02$). (Further partial-correlational analyses indicated that this association was not attributable to current relationship status or length.) Effects of gender on respect scores were assessed with t tests and did not approach significance: $t(177) = .72, p = .47$. The effect of ethnicity on respect was assessed with a one-way ANOVA (treating the four largest ethnic groups as four levels of an ethnicity variable). The resulting $F(3,166)$ was only .43. Because it seemed likely that participants who described a past relationship partner rather than a current one would, on

2. The 20 best items (in terms of corrected item-total correlations) were tested for internal consistency and found also to have a high alpha coefficient (.97), suggesting that a shorter scale can be used in future research (see the Appendix). In the present paper we report results for the 45-item version of the scale because it contains all of the features that Study 1 participants associated with respect, none of which we wished to exclude at this early point in our research.

average, report lower respect for their partners, a *t*-test was conducted to determine the effect of relationship status on respect scores. The result was highly significant: $t(170) = 5.59$, $p < .001$. The mean respect score for people currently in a relationship was 6.09; for those describing their most important previous relationship, 5.29 (lower, but still well above the scale midpoint). The weak associations between respect scores and demographic variables are encouraging because they indicate that the concept measured by the RPS is viewed similarly across differences in age (within the relatively narrow age range tested), gender, and ethnicity.

As predicted, respect scores were significantly correlated with the attachment-style avoidance dimension ($r = -.40$, $p < .001$). Participants who scored higher on avoidance tended to respect their partners less. Also as expected, respect scores were not related to the attachment-style anxiety dimension ($r = -.09$, $p = .23$). Finally, additional support for the validity of the RPS comes from the finding that respect scores were significantly correlated with both positive valence ($r = .54$, $p < .001$) and negative valence ($r = -.55$, $p < .001$). As respect for a romantic partner increased, positive evaluation of the partner's moral character also increased and negative evaluation of the partner's depravity decreased. The positive and negative valence scales themselves were correlated, $r = -.23$, $p < .04$, but not so highly as to render their associations with respect redundant. The correlation between positive valence and respect was still $.50$ ($p < .001$) when negative valence was controlled; the correlation between negative valence and respect was still $-.52$ ($p < .001$) when positive valence was controlled.

Because some of the associations between the RPS and the attachment and valence variables might have been strengthened by including participants who were reporting on a previous relationship that might have failed for reasons related to respect, attachment, and valence, we recalculated the correlations with relationship status controlled. The directions and significance of the correlations remained the same, although the coefficients changed slightly in size: for avoidance, $-.34$ ($p < .001$);

for anxiety, $-.15$ ($p = .11$); for positive valence, $.46$ ($p < .001$); and for negative valence, $-.50$ ($p < .001$).

Study 3

With the newly created RPS in hand, we were ready to tackle the issue of discriminant validity. Is the new respect measure redundant with existing measures of related constructs such as attachment, love, and partner personality, or does the RPS capture an aspect of relationship functioning that is not fully accounted for by concepts other than respect? Does the RPS explain relationship satisfaction better than those constructs? In Study 2 we found that the RPS was negatively associated with avoidant attachment and negative partner valence, and positively associated with positive partner valence. But the associations were not so strong as to suggest that respect is simply redundant with those constructs. In Study 3, we measured respect, attachment avoidance and anxiety (Brennan et al., 1998), and positive and negative partner valence (Benet & Waller, 1995), as in Study 2. We also added measures of liking and loving (Rubin, 1970) and relationship satisfaction (Hendrick, 1981, 1988) because it seemed possible that liking and loving would be closely related to respect, and because we wanted to examine the relative predictive power of respect, attachment variables, IPC subscales, and liking and loving vis-à-vis relationship satisfaction. To reduce the potential effects of agreement response bias on the respect measure, we rewrote half of the respect items in a negative, or reversed, form. Our main hypothesis in Study 3 was that respect would contribute uniquely to the explanation of relationship satisfaction.

Method—Study 3

Participants

A total of 319 students (92 men, 226 women, 1 who did not specify gender) in introductory psychology classes participated in this study. Two hundred fifty-six (80.5%) of the participants were students at UCD; sixty-one (19.4%) were friends recruited by UCD

participants at a variety of west-coast universities. The participants ranged in age from 16 to 30 (median age: 19), with 97% of the participants aged 19 to 23 years. Regarding ethnicity, 50.3% of the students described themselves as Caucasian, 25.3% as Asian, 9.5% as Hispanic, 5.4% as Pacific Islanders, 4.7% as Middle Eastern, 4.1% as African American, and less than 1% as Native American. Fifty-three percent of the participants were involved in a relationship at the time of testing; median relationship length was 16 months.³

Materials and procedure

Each student filled out the same demographics sheet used in Studies 1 and 2, with the addition of several questions asking about relationship status. The students then completed a questionnaire packet including measures of the following constructs: relationship satisfaction, respect, liking and loving, attachment orientation, and positive and negative partner valence. Four orders were created for the materials and randomly assigned to participants.

Relationship satisfaction was assessed with the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick, 1981, 1988). The RAS consists of eight Likert-type items (e.g., “How well does your partner meet your needs?”) each rated on a 5-point answer continuum specific to that item. The scale’s alpha coefficient in the present sample was .80.

The Respect for Partner Scale (RPS) contained 45 items, each rated on a 7-point (*disagree strongly* to *agree strongly*) scale to indicate how well it applied to a current or most important previous romantic partner. In contrast to the scale devised in Study 2, in Study 3 every other item on the RPS was reverse-worded (see the Appendix). The resulting alpha coefficient was still high, .95.

The liking and loving scales (Rubin, 1970) consisted of 26 items, 13 measuring each construct, rated on a 7-point (*disagree strongly* to *agree strongly*) scale. The liking scale included items such as “I think that _____ and I are quite similar to each other.” The loving scale included items such as “I would do almost anything for _____.” Coefficient alpha for the liking scale was .90; for the loving scale, .88. The attachment scales and the measures of positive and negative valence were as described in Study 2. Alphas in Study 3 were as follows: avoidance, .93; anxiety, .90; positive valence, .88; negative valence, .85.

Results and Discussion—Study 3

Respect for partner scale and other predictors of relationship satisfaction

Correlations between the RPS and all other variables in the study are shown in Table 3. The RPS correlated significantly and in the expected directions with relationship satisfaction and the other predictor variables. Moreover, all of the potential predictors were significantly related to the RAS and to each other, with the exception of anxiety.

We conducted a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses predicting relationship satisfaction. In each analysis, relationship satisfaction was predicted as follows: (i) first by relationship status (i.e., reporting on a current vs. a prior relationship, which was significantly associated with RPS scores in Study 2), (ii) second by a pair of variables from one of the three conceptual frameworks included in the study (i.e., attachment theory, Rubin’s liking and loving framework, and the personality valence framework), and (iii) third, by respect.⁴ The *B* and *β* coefficients

3. Two methods of participation were available to students. Those with access to the Internet were asked to complete the questionnaires online; the remaining participants were provided with a packet of questionnaires. There were no significant differences in responses based on method of participation, and the results reported below were essentially the same for the two groups.

4. We also conducted analyses in which the interactions between relationship status and the other predictor variables were included in a fourth step. Relationship status never interacted significantly with respect, and the few significant interactions between relationship status and other predictor variables did not change the superiority of respect as a predictor or alter any of the other patterns we describe here. Therefore, the interactions are not described in Table 4.

Table 3. Correlations among respect and all other variables involved in regression analyses

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Respect	—	.75**	.53**	-.39**	-.24**	.61**	-.50**	.73**
2. Liking		—	.69**	-.42**	-.07	.67**	-.36**	.67**
3. Loving			—	-.61**	.14*	.56**	-.21**	.64**
4. Attachment avoidance				—	.09	-.41**	.27**	-.56**
5. Attachment anxiety					—	-.08	.07	-.23*
6. Positive valence						—	-.33**	.54**
7. Negative valence							—	-.33**
8. Relationship satisfaction								—

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

and t -test results for these analyses are shown in Table 4.

For the hierarchical analysis involving the two attachment variables, avoidance and anxiety, both variables contributed significantly to the prediction of relationship satisfaction at step ii, $R^2 = .45$, $F(3,303) = 83.44$, $p < .001$. The beta coefficients for both avoidance and anxiety were significant. When respect entered at step iii, R^2 rose to .65, a significant change, $F_{\text{change}}(1,302) = 176.38$, $p < .001$. In the final hierarchical model, only the beta coefficients for relationship status, respect, and avoidance were significant. Thus, respect significantly enhanced the prediction of relationship satisfaction in comparison with the two attachment scales, and anxiety no longer contributed significantly to the equation after respect was added.

For the hierarchical analysis involving the liking and loving scales, both variables contributed significantly to the prediction of relationship satisfaction at step ii, $R^2 = .57$, $F(3,304) = 134.66$, $p < .001$. The beta coefficients for both liking and loving were significant. When respect entered at step iii, R^2 rose to .65, a significant change, $F_{\text{change}}(1,303) = 72.77$, $p < .001$. In the final hierarchical model, only the beta coefficients for relationship status, respect, and loving were significant. The beta for liking fell almost to zero, indicating that its predictive capacity was redundant with and exceeded by respect. This outcome, which is attributable to Rubin (1973) having defined liking in

terms of respect, is discussed in greater detail below.

In the analyses involving positive valence and negative valence, both variables contributed significantly to the prediction of relationship satisfaction at step ii, $R^2 = .46$, $F(3,300) = 84.68$, $p < .001$. The beta coefficients for both positive and negative valence were significant. When respect entered at step iii, R^2 rose to .61, a significant change, $F_{\text{change}}(1,299) = 113.28$, $p < .001$. In the final hierarchical model, only the beta coefficients for relationship status, respect, and positive valence were significant. Thus, respect substantially increased the prediction of relationship satisfaction over and above partner valence, and negative valence no longer contributed significantly to the equation after respect was added.

A similar analysis was conducted in which relationship satisfaction was predicted from relationship status at step i, adding all three pairs of variables (attachment avoidance and anxiety, liking and loving, and positive and negative partner valence) at step ii, and adding respect at step iii. After the second step, $R^2 = .64$, $F(7,296) = 74.30$, $p < .001$, and the beta coefficients for relationship status (.21, $p < .001$), avoidance (-.15, $p < .01$), anxiety (-.20, $p < .001$), liking (.30, $p < .001$), and loving (.24, $p < .001$) were all significant. Those for positive valence (.05) and negative valence (-.07) were not, their predictive power having been usurped by more powerful, correlated variables. When respect entered at step iii, R^2 rose to .69, a significant change,

Table 4. Hierarchical regression analyses predicting relationship satisfaction from one of the three conceptual frameworks (entered first) and respect (entered second)

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>t</i>
Attachment			
Step i			
Relationship status	.74	.54	11.24**
Step ii			
Relationship status	.50	.37	7.86**
Attachment avoidance	-.25	-.40	-8.55**
Attachment anxiety	-.09	-.15	-3.52**
Step iii			
Relationship status	.28	.20	5.20**
Attachment avoidance	-.17	-.27	-6.96**
Attachment anxiety	-.04	-.06	-1.62
Respect	.45	.53	13.28**
Liking and loving			
Step i			
Relationship status	.74	.54	11.26**
Step ii			
Relationship status	.38	.28	6.50**
Liking	.28	.40	7.66**
Loving	.15	.24	4.31**
Step iii			
Relationship status	.27	.20	5.07**
Liking	.06	.09	1.45
Loving	.16	.25	5.17**
Respect	.38	.45	8.53**
Personality valence			
Step i			
Relationship status	.74	.54	11.19**
Step ii			
Relationship status	.54	.40	8.79**
Positive valence	.45	.37	7.94**
Negative valence	-.26	-.13	-2.88*
Step iii			
Relationship status	.37	.27	6.70**
Positive valence	.15	.13	2.73*
Negative valence	.09	.05	1.09
Respect	.48	.56	10.64**

* $p < .01$. ** $p \leq .001$.

$F_{\text{change}}(1,295) = 49.05$, $p < .001$. Only the coefficients for relationship status (.16, $p < .001$), respect (.40, $p < .001$), avoidance (-.16, $p < .001$), anxiety (-.13, $p = .001$), and loving (.22, $p < .001$) were significant, and the one for respect was largest. The second largest coeffi-

cient was for loving, harking back to Gottman's (1994b) observation, quoted in the introduction, that most couple members are looking mainly for love and respect. In this analysis, the coefficient for liking was .11, *ns*, suggesting again that liking was sufficiently redundant

with respect to lose its unique predictive power when respect entered the equation.

Respect and liking

As shown in Table 3, respect correlated very highly with liking ($r = .75$), and in every analysis where respect and liking were entered together as predictors of relationship satisfaction, liking was removed from the equation. To explore the content of the liking items that accounted most strongly for the overlap with the RPS, we correlated the RPS with all 13 liking items. Among the 7 items with the largest correlation coefficients (average $r = .57$), one explicitly included the word *respect*: “I think that _____ is one of those people who quickly wins respect.” Another liking item included the word “admiration”: “It seems to me that it is very easy for _____ to gain admiration.” Others included phrases such as “exceptionally mature,” “good judgment,” and “the sort of person whom I myself would like to be.” These characteristics are very similar to features of respect listed by participants in Study 1. Among the 6 liking items with the lowest correlations with the RPS (average $r = .43$), none mentioned respect or admiration. Therefore, although all of the items on the liking scale correlated significantly with the RPS, the ones most responsible for the high correlation between the two scales either explicitly or implicitly referred to respect, suggesting that Rubin’s (1970) liking scale is largely a scale that measures respect. Cramer (1992) also came to this conclusion after conducting a large factor analysis that revealed that Rubin’s (1970) love items loaded on a love factor that included the item “I really like you,” whereas Rubin’s (1970) liking items loaded on a respect factor that included the item “I really respect you as a person.” A look back at Rubin’s (1973) conceptual and empirical work suggests that he may have operationally defined liking in a way that approximated respect in order to help distinguish liking from loving—the two constructs he was attempting to distinguish. To the extent that the liking scale and the RPS both measure respect, the RPS does so in a way that accounts for more

variance in romantic relationship satisfaction. All of the RPS items are designed to measure respect, whereas the items on Rubin’s (1970) liking scale are a mixture of respect and liking items. Moreover, in line with Rubin’s guiding insight, respect as measured by the RPS is not the same thing as love.

General Discussion

The program of research described here began with the observations that people often mention respect spontaneously when talking about why their relationships function well or poorly, and that relationship researchers (e.g., Gottman, 1994b) often refer to respect when discussing their findings but usually do not measure it explicitly or reliably. Our purpose was to delineate the everyday concept of *respect in close interpersonal relationships* using a prototype methodology and to create a Respect for Partner Scale based on the results. A secondary purpose was to understand whether respect is important to relationship success, and perhaps uniquely so.

Study 1 produced a number of consensual features of respect—or, more specifically, of a respectable relationship partner. Many of these features—loving, caring, understanding, honesty, loyalty, listening openly, not abusive or judgmental, and considerate—seemed to refer to psychological qualities that allow a person to serve as a security-inducing attachment figure. The Respect for Partner Scale, which we created based on features generated by Study 1 participants, was tested in Studies 2 and 3 and found to be unidimensional and highly internally consistent, indicating that these features are aspects of a single concept.

In Study 2, participants rated the features listed by Study 1 participants for degree of centrality to the concept *respect*. The features with the highest centrality ratings corresponded well to those most frequently mentioned by Study 1 participants, indicating agreement between the two samples on the definition of a respectable relationship partner. In addition to rating highly the features listed prominently in Study 1, Study 2 participants also rated the following

as highly central to respect: being trustworthy and reliable, being sensitive to feelings, following the Golden Rule and being respectful of others' views, being accepting of the other, being open and receptive, and being capable of mutuality. The centrality ratings of the features were similar across demographic groups defined by ethnicity and gender, although there were sex-role-consistent gender differences in ratings of a few features.

The definition of respect embodied in the Study 1 prototype and the Study 2 centrality ratings is similar to definitions found in the writings of contemporary social scientists. In a summary of her book, *Respect: An Exploration* (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2000b), Lawrence-Lightfoot (2000a) delineated the six qualities that make particular individuals respectable to their peers: *dialogue* ("real communication"), *attention* ("being fully present"), *curiosity* (being "genuinely interested in others—their thoughts, feelings, and fears"), *healing* ("nourishing feelings of worthiness"), *empowerment* (enabling others to "make their own decisions," nurturing their "self-confidence and self-reliance"), and *self-respect* (helping others "feel good about themselves"). These six qualities fit well with our empirically derived concept of respect, which included being honest, being truthful, listening to the other and hearing the other's viewpoint, being accepting, and fostering the other's freedom and development. Also, the idea that respect is often reciprocal underlies many of the features listed by our participants and by Lawrence-Lightfoot. She reported that, although respect is "commonly seen as deference to hierarchy, often driven by duty and based on a person's position, age, gender, race, class, or accomplishments" (implying an unequal relationship), her research led her to "propose a different view of respect—one derived from equality, empathy, and connection in all kinds of relationships, even those often seen as unequal, such as parent and child, teacher and student, doctor and patient" (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2000a, p. 13). Thus, although we focused on respect in romantic relationships, we may have hit upon a definition that is more widely applicable. The range of applicability remains to be explored.

Although respect, as defined by our study participants, overlaps conceptually and empirically with other relationship constructs, such as attachment, liking, moral goodness—and possibly trust and intimacy, which were not measured here—there appears to be something unique about respect. Intuitively speaking, respecting and trusting a person may both be based on attributes of the person such as honesty, loyalty, and reliability, but simply trusting the person seems not to depend on viewing him or her as having admirable talents and skills. The latter is more characteristic of respect. Teasing apart the partially overlapping concepts of respect, trust, liking, love, attachment, and the perception of one's partner as moral or ethical will require additional research. A good model of such research, which unfortunately neglected the concept of respect, has been provided by Fletcher, Simpson, and Thomas (2000).

Study 3 showed that respect for partner is substantially correlated with all of the other variables we examined, but that the RPS correlated higher than the other predictor variables with relationship satisfaction and made the largest independent contribution to its prediction. We conducted a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses in which three pairs of scales from different research domains—attachment, personality valence, and liking and loving—were compared with the new RPS scale as predictors of relationship satisfaction. In each case, the RPS significantly increased the prediction of relationship satisfaction and yielded the highest beta coefficient, while some of the other variables no longer made significant contributions. These results suggest that respect is an important determinant of relationship quality.

Given that respect, as measured by the RPS, was so highly correlated with relationship satisfaction ($r = .73$), one has to wonder whether respect for partner and relationship satisfaction are two different psychological constructs or two aspects of a single phenomenon. Certainly, viewing one's partner as honest, loyal, and a follower of the Golden Rule does not seem to be the same as viewing one's relationship as having few problems. But it is possible that being satisfied with one's

relationship and being pleased with a partner's moral qualities are intertwined in couple members' minds. Future studies should examine this matter in depth.

One limitation of these initial studies is their cross-sectional nature. Many of the remaining questions about the role of respect in close relationships require longitudinal research. Also, we included only one member of each couple in our studies. Future research should include responses from both members of romantic couples, not only to provide a reality check on participants' perceptions but also to examine, in a longitudinal design, the purported reciprocal nature of respect.

Although we made efforts to examine associations between respect and other relationship constructs, some important constructs remain to be studied in relation to respect, especially trust (Holmes & Rempel, 1989), commitment (Drigotas, Rusbult, & Verette, 1999), and partner idealization (Murray & Holmes, 1997). It will be important not only to determine whether and how much these several constructs differ, but also, if they differ, how they develop together, either in tandem or in a characteristic causal sequence. Another matter that deserves study is the association between the respect scale and relational *behavior*. As mentioned earlier, Gottman (1994b) called attention to respect in some informal comments on his research, but he seems to have measured only the presumed opposite of respect, *contempt*, in the laboratory. It will be important to determine whether behaviorally observable contempt really is the opposite of respect as we measured it—that is, whether contempt can be predicted from low RPS scores. If so, then a self-report measurement of respect might, for some purposes, stand in for a more expensive behavioral measurement of contempt. Additional questions that should be examined include: Does lack of respect lead to relationship dissolution or is lack of respect a result of relationship disintegration caused by other factors, such as sexual infidelity? Does a respectful stance toward a partner increase the likelihood of experiencing a positive outcome following relationship conflict? Does the level of respect differ as a

function of stage in a relationship or degree of relationship experience?

Concluding Comments

The research reported here is the first systematic examination of the concept of respect in close relationships. In a set of three studies we defined respect in close interpersonal relationships; created a reliable, balanced scale with which to measure respect for one's partner; examined associations between respect and other relationship constructs; and demonstrated that respect contributes uniquely to the prediction of relationship satisfaction. Beyond accomplishing these specific goals, our studies may have wider implications. This focus on respect, a concept related to recognizing a partner's moral character, is in keeping with a growing trend in psychology: the move toward a *positive* or morally sensitive science. Respectworthiness is closely related to moral integrity. A respectable partner is, according to our study participants, admirable and trustworthy by virtue of being honest and sincerely concerned about others' welfare. To focus on a concept so close to the moral realm might have seemed inappropriate to social scientists a decade ago, but psychologists now seem to be redirecting research and theoretical development away from negative or pathological states and toward positive and moral states. They are also questioning the wisdom of ignoring moral and ethical concepts while pursuing value-neutrality. A recent issue of the *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* (Vol. 19, No. 1, edited by McCullough & Snyder, 2000) was devoted to research on virtues such as hope, forgiveness, humility, and wisdom and to *character* rather than the more morally neutral concept of *personality*. A recent issue of the *American Psychologist* (Vol. 55, No. 1, edited by Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000a) focused on positive psychology, which Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000b) claim has been neglected. Studying respect and respectworthiness in addition to liking and loving may help to revive the notion of moral character and reveal its importance to satisfying, successful relationships.

Appendix: Item-Total Correlations for the Respect for Partner Scale (with suggestions for a briefer scale)

	Item-total correlation	Scale item
1.	.56	S/he is a genuinely good person.
2.	.28	S/he is not trustworthy, responsible, reliable. (R)
3.	.57	S/he is willing to listen and hear my viewpoint.
4.	.55	S/he does not foster a relationship involving mutual care. (R)
5.	.61	S/he is inspiring, motivating, admirable.
6.	.57	S/he cheats on or betrays me. (R)
7.	.65	S/he shows interest in me, has a positive attitude, is willing to spend time with me.*
8.	.54	S/he does not respect my views and opinions; insists on his/her own wishes. (R)*
9.	.66	S/he is helpful, supportive, present when needed; tries to fulfill my needs.*
10.	.51	S/he does not promote compromise. (R)
11.	.58	S/he is available, accessible, generous with her time.
12.	.44	S/he is not loyal and faithful. (R)
13.	.71	S/he is sensitive and considerate to my feelings.*
14.	.49	S/he does not have admirable or respect-worthy talents, abilities, accomplishments. (R)*
15.	.62	S/he shares ideas, feelings, resources.
16.	.60	S/he is not loving; s/he does not provide unconditional love. (R)*
17.	.54	S/he fosters a relationship in which we can be good friends, pals.
18.	.55	S/he is not open and receptive. (R)*
19.	.23	S/he is not abusive or violent.
20.	.39	S/he does not accept me as is, respect my 'space', or foster my freedom and development. (R)
21.	.53	S/he is altruistic, selfless, willing to sacrifice.
22.	.46	S/he is constraining, controlling, demanding. (R)
23.	.68	S/he is thoughtful, courteous.
24.	.44	S/he is not forgiving. (R)
25.	.33	S/he is a member of a respect-worthy social category (for example, experts, authorities, prize-winners, successful people).
26.	.52	S/he is not nice, kind, considerate. (R)*
27.	.61	S/he fosters good, open, two-way communication.*
28.	.56	S/he is not honest and truthful. (R)*
29.	.71	S/he fosters mutuality and equality.*
30.	.52	S/he is not someone I appreciate, feel grateful towards. [I do not appreciate him/her; do not feel grateful towards him/her.] (R)
31.	.73	S/he is caring, compassionate.*
32.	.54	S/he does not have admirable or respectworthy moral qualities (such as dignity, humility, self-control, good judgment, dedication). (R)*
33.	.68	S/he calms me, puts me at ease, makes me feel comfortable.*
34.	.45	S/he is not gentle and kind-hearted. (R)
35.	.39	S/he is not judgmental, questioning, disapproving.

(continue on next page)

Appendix: (continued)

	Item-total correlation	Scale item
36.	.42	S/he does not have certain qualities that foster respect (appearance, personality, gestures/mannerisms). (R)
37.	.61	S/he follows the Golden Rule (treats others as others wish to be treated, or as the person him/herself would like to be treated).*
38.	.61	S/he is cruel or hurtful. (R)*
39.	.65	S/he is concerned, protecting.*
40.	.56	S/he is not committed to me. (R)*
41.	.61	S/he is someone I look up to, am proud of, believe in.*
42.	.53	S/he is not open-minded. (R)
43.	.38	S/he is not degrading, humiliating, contemptuous.
44.	.69	S/he is not understanding and empathic. (R)*
45.	.66	S/he is generous, giving.

Note. (R) = reverse-scored item. Items marked with an asterisk are recommended for use in a 20-item version of the scale. Item selection was based on corrected item-total correlations, breadth of content, and positive versus negative phrasing. The following instructions can be used for either version of the scale: "The following statements concern how you think about your romantic partner. If you are currently involved in a romantic relationship, please think of your partner in that relationship while responding to these statements. If you are not currently involved in a romantic relationship, please think about your partner in your most important previous relationship while responding to the statements. Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it. Write the number in the space provided, using the following rating scale:" [1 to 7 scale with the endpoints labeled "disagree strongly" and "agree strongly" and the middle point (4) labeled "neutral/mixed"].

References

- Adams, J. M., & Jones, W. H. (Eds.). (1999). *Handbook of interpersonal commitment and relationship stability*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: Assessed in the strange situation and at home*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Aron, A., & Westbay, L. (1996). Dimensions of the prototype of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 535–551.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 226–244.
- Benet, V., & Waller, N. G. (1995). The big seven factor model of personality description: Evidence for its cross-cultural generality in a Spanish sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 701–718.
- Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. T. (1998). Attraction and close relationships. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*, 4th ed. (Vol. 2, pp. 193–281). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2, Separation: Anxiety and anger*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46–76). New York: Guilford Press.
- Cramer, D. (1992). Nature of romantic love in female adolescents. *Journal of Psychology, 126*, 679–682.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*, 281–302.
- Crowell, J. A., Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (1999). Measurement of individual differences in adolescent and adult attachment. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 434–465). New York: Guilford Press.
- De Wolff, M. S., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1997). Sensitivity and attachment: A meta-analysis on parental antecedents of infant attachment. *Child Development, 68*, 571–591.
- Drigotas, S. M., Rusbult, C. E., & Verette, J. (1999). Level of commitment, mutuality of commitment, and couple well-being. *Personal Relationships, 6*, 389–409.
- Fehr, B. (1988). Prototype analysis of the concepts of love and commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 557–579.
- Fehr, B., & Russell, J. A. (1984). Concept of emotion viewed from a prototype perspective. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 113*, 464–486.
- Fehr, B., & Russell, J. A. (1991). The concept of love viewed from a prototype perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 425–438.
- Fletcher, G. J. O., Simpson, J. A., & Thomas, G. (2000). The measurement of perceived relationship quality compo-

- nents: A confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 340–354.
- Gottman, J. M. (1994a). *What predicts divorce?* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gottman, J. M. (1994b). *Why marriages succeed or fail . . . and how you can make yours last*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gottman, J. M. (1996). *The heart of parenting: How to raise an emotionally intelligent child*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Griffin, D. W., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Models of self and other: Fundamental dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 430–445.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1981). Self-disclosure and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 1150–1159.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 93–98.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Close relationships: A sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holmes, J. G., & Rempel, J. K. (1989). Trust in close relationships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 10, *Close relationships*, pp. 187–220). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kellenberger, J. (1995). *Relationship morality*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (2000a, February 13). How to command respect. *Parade Magazine*, pp. 12–13.
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (2000b). *Respect: An exploration*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Markman, H., Stanley, S., & Blumberg, S. L. (1994). *Fighting for your marriage: Positive steps for preventing divorce and preserving a lasting love*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCullough, M. E., & Snyder, C. R. (Eds.). (2000). Special issue: Classical sources of human strength: A psychological analysis. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19 (1).
- Murray, S. L., & Holmes, J. G. (1997). A leap of faith? Positive illusions in romantic relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 586–604.
- Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization* (pp. 27–48). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16, 265–273.
- Rubin, Z. (1973). *Liking and loving*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (Eds.). (2000a). Happiness, excellence, and optimal human functioning [Special issue]. *American Psychologist*, 55 (1).
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000b). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5–14.
- Shaver, P., Schwartz, J., Kirson, D., & O'Connor, C. (1987). Emotion knowledge: Further exploration of a prototype approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1061–1086.
- Shaver, P. R., & Clark, C. L. (1994). The psychodynamics of adult romantic attachment. In J. M. Masling & R. F. Bornstein (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on object relations theory* (pp. 105–156). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Singer, I. (1994). *The pursuit of love*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Hojjat, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Satisfaction in close relationships*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Ballantine.
- Tavris, C. A. (1992). *The mismeasure of woman*. New York: Simon & Schuster/Touchstone.
- Tellegen, A., & Waller, N. G. (1987). *Reexamining basic dimensions of natural language trait descriptors*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago.
- Tzeng, O. C. S. (1993). *Measurement of love and intimate relations: Theories, scales, and application for love development, maintenance, and dissolution*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Weiselquist, J., Rusbult, C. E., Foster, C. A., & Agnew, C. R. (1999). Commitment, pro-relationship behavior, and trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 942–966.