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ABSTRACT

Trust is ranked amongst the highest desired qualities when searching for a mate. Yet despite its importance to an interpersonal relationship, relatively little has been done in terms of researching this topic. Here, a viewpoint is expressed, two hypotheses created, and a survey conducted to test trust's validity with respect to gender. Included in this thesis are three components of trust: faith, dependability, and predictability. Faith is looked at in depth and is predicted as the most important component of trust for both genders. A likert-type scale replicating part of the trust scale created by Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna was used, and the results do not support the hypothesis that faith is more important to men than women in close interpersonal relationships. What is supported is the second hypothesis which states that faith is the most important component of trust in general for both genders. Delving into this unexplored topic will show the need for further attention.
INTRODUCTION

Trust is imperative to the success of a relationship. Trust is valued highly in interpersonal relationships as one of, if not the most, important values that create the foundation of a solid relationship. It is valued among love, honesty, faithfulness and respect. Everyone needs a certain amount of trust in a relationship in order for the relationship to function. C. Hendrick & S. Hendrick (as cited in Rempel, Holmes & Zanna, 1985, p. 95) states that “trust is certainly one of the most desired qualities in any close relationship. It is often mentioned in conjunction with love and commitment as a cornerstone of the ideal relationship.” Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna explored a study on interpersonal trust and concluded that “trust is related in important ways to the success of a close relationship. It is equally apparent that trust is a construct with a number of different elements and these elements do not all make equivalent contributions. The most important aspect of trust in close relationships appears to be faith: the belief that one's partner will act in loving and caring ways whatever the future holds” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 109).

The terms faith and faithfulness are used throughout this study. Faith alludes to the feeling or notion that your partner will make the right decision for your relationship in your absence. Faithfulness is the physical action of remaining sexually loyal to your partner. Without getting to intense, because this study does not address faithfulness a great deal, there is a sexual component to faithfulness and fidelity. This study does not go into depth of what constitutes as faithful and unfaithful, rather what is explored is the
importance of the concept and feeling of faith as a whole on the relationship. Faith and faithfulness are no doubt related, but the focus of this study is on the concept of faith. In the actual study, no conceptual or operational definition of faith or faithfulness was provided because this was a replication of the Rempel et al. study and no definition was provided in the original study.

Under the umbrella of trust fall many components such as predictability, dependability, and faith. With faith being so closely related to trust, and an indicator of success in close interpersonal relationships, this paper explored the component of faith and its importance to a relationship using a male versus female approach.

The purpose of this study was to explore in detail the topic of trust, and more importantly, faith, in interpersonal heterosexual romantic relationships. Moreover, it is explicitly to determine if there is a difference between men and women when placing importance on the concept of trust. Secondly, this study is to determine that faith is the most important component of trust.

A hypothesis stating that the faith dimension of trust is more important to women than men is explored. Furthermore, of the three components of trust-- faith, dependability, and predictability-- faith is the most important overall.

Deutsch (as cited in Rempel et al., 1973, p. 95) defined trust as "confidence that I will find what is desired from another, rather than what is feared." This operational definition of trust leads into the concept of faith, which "reflects an emotional security on
the part of individuals, which enables them to go beyond the available evidence and feel, with assurance, that their partner will be responsive and caring despite the vicissitudes of an uncertain future" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 97).

Without faith there can be no healthy relationship. Imagine not trusting your partner, or having faith that he/she will do and carry out the duties assigned to him/her. Imagine not having faith that your partner will pick up your children from school, or come home at night, or make a proper decision without you. Without faith there can be little basis for which to build a strong relational foundation. While dependability and predictability are important factors in the relationship building process, and are vital for analysis when you first meet someone and are trying to determine if he/she will have the same goals or meet your needs, faith is the component that will carry you though the relationship and let you have peace of mind when your partner is absent.

Faith deals with the intangible. It is not something that will have concrete evidence attached to it. Faith may be the hardest component to embrace, but with predictability and reliability, one can come to a conclusion on a degree of faith in their partner and for their relationship. Rempel et al. (1985, p.97) describe the components of trust best when they say:

The first two elements of trust, predictability and dependability, require a consideration of the impact of past experience and the reliability of previous evidence. In relationships, as in life, however, the future is filled
with novel situations and circumstances where past or present experience is not necessarily an accurate barometer. In times to come, a relationship may be faced with new stresses and forces, which could not have been anticipated and for which no past encounters reasonably correspond: people mature, goals and values can change, and feelings do not always remain constant. In order to capture the essence of a trust that is not securely rooted in past experience, we will use the term faith. In religious contexts faith describes the aspect of a belief that must go beyond the available evidence to accept a given supposition as truth. Beliefs are held in the presence of equally plausible alternatives, and pertinent but inconclusive evidence is acknowledged as insufficient to either conform or refute them. Convictions are thus held and acted on in the present, with the confident expectation that future events will prove them to be correct.

Based on the above review, I predict that faith will be more important to a woman than a man because many women will say that trust is one of, if not the most, important component to having a good relationship. Within the construct of trust, faith is the most highly desirable quality for a woman when searching for a mate.

In the methods portion of the thesis, a comprehensive and detailed explanation is provided concerning the method used to measure the importance of faith. The scale created by Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna was used, measuring faith in interpersonal relationships, and in addition questions were asked operationalizing importance and
gender. This study attempted to replicate part of the Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna study looking at gender and other variables of "importance." A comparative theoretical study on trust was also conducted by submitting a questionnaire to both males and females of adult ages.

The questions explored included: How important is trust, as a variable related to other characteristics such as emotions? How important is trust to love? Moreover, it was hypothesized that faith would be found to be more important for a woman than a man because faith allows a woman emotional security and hence establishes trust. A man, however, doesn't hold faith as an important precursor for emotional security and thus faith is not imperative to his formulating trust.
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Faith has many faces and definitions all of which are in accordance that it is a belief in something intangible, and not guaranteed... "there are no guarantees that the hopes and desires invested in a close relationship will ever be realized. Given that a successful relationship is not a guaranteed proposition, it follows that continuing commitment to, and belief in the relationship requires, to one extent or another, a "leap of faith"." (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 97).

The problem is that men and women bring to a relationship different expectations regarding faith. Women, who have been raised as children to believe in fairy tales, grandiose weddings, and imaginary future families and have practiced the art of creative imagination and believing in things that are not concrete, not guaranteed. We have been taught as girls that faith is part of our structure in how we make sense of the world. We have no problem in chasing after dreams, daydreaming, and having faith in the unknown. We are given Barbie dolls as children so that we can perpetuate those ideals of our society where women are to look beautiful, care for their children; marry Ken and stay home to tend to the house. "Barbie presents an unrealistic ideal of female beauty to young women (and men). She is outrageously tall, thin, and usually blonde. She has large breasts and very long and thin legs. Barbie also reinforces stereotypes about femininity and masculinity. She adores pink, feminine clothing, and dressing up to please her masculine boyfriend."(Fun with Feminism, 2007).
Compounding this cycle of rearing girls using Barbies as a role model, “Barbie was also the first "grown up" doll available to young people. Before Barbies, young girls (and some boys) played with baby dolls, pretending to be mommies and daddies. With Barbies, young children can imagine themselves as independent adults. They can play at having their own places to live, their own social lives, and their own careers.” (Fun with Feminism, 2007). There is no doubt that Barbies fosters creativity in young girls who play with them, “Barbie dolls encourage creativity and imagination.” (Epinions.com, 2002).

What may even have more impact on the formulation of young girls’ ideals, is fairytales. It is though fairytales that girls learn that they must be saved by their Prince Charming; i.e. men. Even further, you can only have the castle, and lavish lifestyle, and be beautiful if you stay with your prince, at all costs. Even it means sacrificing your emotional or physical well-being. Because, what princess has it all without a prince? And doesn’t every girl, and woman as a matter of fact, want to be a princess. Take a look at the example of “Beauty and the Beast. The guy clocks her across the head and she "stays with him." So she’s a princess because she stays and "he’ll change." And when Debbie Domestic violence victim shows up with a bruise on her face from getting hit, everyone wonders "why do you stay?"” (Epinion.com, 2002)

“Barbie dolls encourage the concept of different gender roles. Boys should be playing with monster trucks, not Barbie dolls. Boys should be aggressive, competitive, and mechanically-inclined. Right? And girls shouldn’t play with G.I. Joes. Girls should
be nurturing, peaceful, and fashion-obsessed." (Helium.com) Men, on the other hand, are
reared quite differently. They are given G.I. Joes and taught that you have to fight for
everything you want in life. Boys fight their G.I. Joes against each other with the idea
that only one of them is going to win. There is no fantasy about the interaction and a
very different kind of imagination is used in playtime, such as who is going to end up on
top as the winner. From a young age, males are taught to be the problem solvers and that
the world is black and white. They are taught the concept of survival of the fittest.
Having faith as part of that equation is not cultivated.

It is no wonder, then, that women tend to have more faith in a close interpersonal
relationship than a man, especially in the beginning. A woman, when getting involved
with a man romantically, will fantasize about all the options that that relationship could
have and all the possibilities it may hold. We immediately revert to the child who played
with our Barbie and conjured up the fairy tale of the rest of our life. We will look at a
man, and fantasize about our home with him, what our children will look like, where our
wedding will be, how much money we will have. We write our names over and over in
different styles of cursive, tagging his last name onto ours. We dream of the happily ever
after. All of these thoughts take place in our minds before the relationship even begins to
get serious. We are already steps ahead of the man in the pursuit of a relationship. These
fantasies are later translated into concrete desires as we come of age and we start to look
for the means in a man to provide for these desires. As supported by the Rempel et al
study, "an examination of the scores for men and women separately reveals that this
strong correlation of instrumental attributions with love is due largely to females, r = .62,
p < .001, with males exhibiting a noticeably weaker correlation, \( r = .37, p < .05 \)" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 108). For women, these instrumental attributions translate into variables such as money, stability, and having characteristics of being a good father and husband. From my experience, women in general look for the quality of faithfulness when selecting a mate. Men may not initially list this quality as criteria when searching for a mate.

Men are at a disadvantage from the beginning because a woman is already playing out the scene of "I DO", while the man is just simply asking for her phone number. She has already invested so much time and energy into the relationship and the momentum just continues to build, that she has so much more at stake emotionally when they finally get into a committed close relationship. Women, despite the emergence of more equalitative roles in contemporary times, I feel, still hold the ideal that a man is the breadwinner and head of the household. Because of this, women naturally slide into a role of dependency. We assume the position of damsel because in a relationship, there cannot be two chiefs. There always has to be a leader and a follower so that the relationship can move forward. Whether the lead role is a trade off between the male and female roles throughout the relationship, or the male secures himself as the lead for the duration, a woman will still have more at risk if the relationship goes sour. Much of the risk includes an emotional state, but in part, it also includes some financial threat.

The possibility of what we could lose, given a failed relationship, for many women is devastating. We could be left with the possibility of being a single mother, left
with financial debt and emotional baggage. This is not to say that men will or do not experience all of these same risks, it is to say that women place so much investment into the success of a relationship that they will tend to have more faith in its victory. Remember, we have the power of imagination, and we are taught that what we dream, we can achieve. So, to believe that the relationship will prove beneficial to us would mean having faith in the unknown, believing in the good of the circumstance, even to the point of dismissal of negative events.

Women, enter a relationship with great expectations and grandiose ideas of what a relationship, and marriage should look and feel like. Men enter a relationship with no prejudice, no preconceived, child dreamt notions of what should be. Men come with no expectations, fully open to what the relationship has to offer. Women get hurt because of their own expectations. If there is no expectation, there is no disappointment. Faith is sometimes all a woman has in the beginning of a relationship, and it is all she holds on to, to measure her worth. Many women feel that if a man cheats, it is because of her—something she didn’t do, something she didn’t wear or say. She allows herself to be defined by the actions of her man. In a study conducted on infidelity, results found that “women are less permissive of cheating, especially when it is emotional in nature.” (Quatroy, 2006) This finding suggests the value a woman places on emotional validation and closeness. Women have the need to feel desired and wanted by a man. They place a lot of value in emotional attachment. Men don’t usually do this. They have big egos that say if she cheats, well that’s her loss. There are big differences between
genders when it comes to the reason why faith is so important. If the area that separates gender is better understood, it would allow relationships to be more harmonious.
"Interpersonal trust is an aspect of close relationships which has been virtually ignored in social scientific research despite its importance as perceived by intimate partners and several family theorists" (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 595). Most of the research conducted in trust studies regarding interpersonal relationships has been defined by theoretical models. The model most important to my study with trust and the perspective of gender, particularly looking at the concept of faith, is a theoretical one presented by Rempel et al. in which three dimensions of trust: dependability, predictability, and faith, are identified. A Trust Scale was implemented to measure these components. Other scales were also incorporated to help define the validity of these components to the concept of trust and interpersonal motives. In the (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 95) study, "the perception of intrinsic motives in a partner emerged as a dimension, as did instrumental and extrinsic motives. As expected, love and happiness were closely tied to feelings of faith and the attribution of intrinsic motivation to both self and partner. Women appeared to have more integrated, complex views of their relationships than men."

A more current investigation by Larzelere and Huston (1980), "found that trust between partners was associated with love and with intimacy of self disclosure" (Rempel et al., 1985, p.97). When a couple is "close", meaning they have an intimate connection emotionally, they are more apt to trust each other. Self disclosure and the sharing of intimate thoughts and feelings help to create a bond between partners. Most partners
engage in this type of behavior when they feel that the other is trustworthy. Establishing trust entails the progression of three stages. Rempel et al. states that trust starts with predictability which is the consistency of recurrent behavior and the stability of the social environment, moves to dependability, where there is a shift from assessments involving specific behaviors, to an evaluation of the qualities and characteristics attributed to the partner, and ends with faith which is an emotional security that enables one to go beyond the available evidence, and feel with assurance, that their partner will be responsive and caring despite the vicissitudes of an uncertain future.

Trust is earned in stages according to Rempel and Holmes, two pioneers in the study of trust in interpersonal relationships. In the early stages of a romantic relationship, a couple is getting to know each other and experiences are usually centered around dates, romantic notions, and having fun. In this stage, the individuals involved are easy going, and each starts with a clean slate. It is only after a series of experiences that a couple will start to form judgments about their partner's character. Humans are creatures of habit and judgments about a person are usually made after a pattern of behavior is established. Moreover, trust is established after a pattern of behavior is established.

In the early stage Eidelson, 1980: Rusbult, 1983 (as cited in Holmes & Rempel, 1989, p. 192) declare that "the initial focus is on the rewarding qualities that make the relationship feel worthwhile." Then, "events conspire to feed their hopes and fantasies about the potential of the relationship. These hopes are projected onto the partner, filling in the gaps of an image constructed from fragments of information. The image may go
largely unchallenged at this stage because experiences are colored by self-presentation, selective positive interactions, and interdependence at more superficial, less conflictual levels. At this early stage, trust is often a little more than a naïve expression of hope” (Holmes & Rempel, 1989, p. 192). Trust will remain at this expression and stage until a behavioral pattern has been established leading to predictability.

Predictability, according to a study by Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna, is one of the three components of trust. Predictability is “influenced by a host of factors including such basic elements as the consistency of recurrent behavior and the stability of the social environment” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 96). A partner will base future decisions of a partner’s trust by their predictability record. “The forecast of a partner’s future actions relies heavily on knowledge relating to the consistency of responses in the past and an understanding of the reward contingencies underlying potential actions (Rotter, 1980)” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 96). If a partner establishes a pattern of behavior throughout the course of the relationship, then a prediction that the partner will engage in the same behavior is likely. This predictability factor is, however, altered if there are reward contingencies or circumstances which would specifically cause a reaction or behavior that is not of the normal.

A relationship progresses when predictability is established. From this stage a partner can formulate concrete ideas of how their partner will react to certain situations based on previous behavior. The next step to developing trust is dependability. This is a
more individualistic quality which allows a person to measure one’s integrity and how dependable you are.

Dependability is another component of trust which may be a better indicator of trust analysis. “As relationships progress there is an inevitable shift in focus away from assessments involving specific behaviors, to an evaluation involving the qualities and characteristics attributed to the partner. Thus trust is placed in a person, not their specific actions” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 96). As a relationship develops, a partner will have a better idea about how dependable their partner is. To measure dependability, one may ask “is the partner a reliable person, someone who is honest and can be counted on?” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 96). The first two components of trust are related, “dependability goes beyond a prediction based on the stability of recurrent behaviors and involves attributions about a particularly diagnostic set of those behaviors (Reeder and Brewer, 1979), such that they are seen to reflect the partner’s dispositional qualities of trustworthiness” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 97). While these two components rely heavily on one another, and seem to give one a concrete means by which to measure trust, the third component of trust—faith—is the most important factor when analyzing trust in a relationship.

Faith, as mentioned previously, is the ability to believe in the unknown. It is the component that is the toughest to measure. It relies solely on the unknown and all one can do at best is to hope that things will turn out the best way possible. It is probably for these reasons that there has been such little study on faith. So the problem remains, with
such little focus given to the research and discussion of trust and faith, and only a few key theorists concluding multiple aspects about this construct, more exploration needs to be done to make contributions to the understanding and development of trust and faith and its impact on relationships.
HISTORICAL SOCIETAL ATTITUDES TOWARD TRUST

Historically, while there may not be a substantial amount of information recorded about the importance of or percentage between males and females regarding trust in their relationships, some studies show that both males and females have similar results when tested on trust. In the Rempel, Holmes and Zanna study, “correlations for men and women separately showed remarkable similarity in the pattern of results” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 106).

In general, and in the predictions made by Rempel et al. when conducting their study, trust will go hand in hand with close relationships in that the closer two people are, the more trust they will give to the relationship. “We anticipate a strong positive correlation between feelings of faith and the perception that a partner is intrinsically motivated” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 100). Intrinsically motivated meaning that “intrinsic motives are hypothesized to be most strongly related to love and happiness, because they best reflect unselfish concern and caring for another without explicit expectations of direct personal gain. In fact, the perception that both self and partner are involved in the relationship because of its value in and of itself has been seen as a necessary step for feelings of love to occur (Kelley, 1979)” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 100).
HISTORICAL ATTITUDES TOWARD CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS

Historically, a close interpersonal romantic relationship usually meant an exchange of love, monogamy, trust, dependability, honor, and respect. The relationship is given value and meaning because of the engagement in these characteristics. In previous generations, close relationships often led to marriage, and within this union focus was placed on creating a family, caring for the home, being financially secure. Many times, women would look for qualities in a mate that could fulfill her ideal of what she dreamed would make her happy in the home. Many times, this meant stepping into the role of housewife and mother, meaning she would not be bringing home a paycheck. The qualities she would look for in a mate would therefore include how much he could bring home to sustain the family. The value of her worth, or how comfortable she would be, was directly related to her man’s worth. She would be dependent on him financially and emotionally, putting her at a disadvantage, almost crippling her self-image. She may feel stuck and trapped if the relationship did not work out because she would have no means of monetary income. If they had children, she would continue to fulfill the socially identified role of mother, yet have no support system to help with the rearing of the children. She would become wedged in a situation where her most attractive option was to stay in an unhappy relationship.

Things are different today. Divorce rates are at an all-time high and people are having children outside of marriage, by not only one partner, but by many. Much of the swing from one extreme to another has direct correlates with the amount of independence
a woman feels in today's society. Women today no longer feel completely dependent on men. Women go out and make their own money, buy their own homes, and raise families independent of men. Hence, the value placed on a relationship is different today than it was before. "Given that a person considers the relationship to be of value in and of itself, the question still remains, of value to whom? The individual may be motivated largely by the interpersonal rewards received from the partner, or, conversely, the relationship may be valued precisely because it is rewarding to both" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 99). This is not to say that an individual in a relationship will look for certain qualities in a mate that would be directly beneficial to the individual. In fact, many people are extrinsically, and instrumentally motivated. "Instrumental motives may be served by a host of more or less explicit rewards partners provide for each other, such as direct services, goods, praise, sex, and support" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 99). "The self-attribution of extrinsic motivations apparently served to undermine the value of the relationship, presumably through the use of discounting logic" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 99). In addition, "extrinsic reasons were related to rewards received from others, outside of the relationship, but mediated by involvement with the partner. Examples of these rewards include social status and respect, access to new opportunities and activities, and the acquisition of new friends or business connections" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 99).

Defining a relationship in these terms and dissecting and labeling the reasons for the relationship can tell a lot about how we have changed as a society in our thinking, accepting, and promoting close relationships. We are more tolerant of, almost desensitized to, the quick turnover in switching partners in close relationships.
Nowadays, if things don’t work out in a relationship, you just break up or get divorced. People have that option now, and it is socially accepted, whereas previously, people would stay in a relationship even if they were not happy and things were not working out simply because they felt trapped, and unable to be on their own, not to mention the stigma that society placed on couples who divorced.

We live in a society today that teaches us that if it doesn’t work out, oh well, life is too short, just move on and try it with someone else. There is no integrity in sticking it out to make things work. People have the means and ability to move, financially, emotionally, and even physically, that staying in a close relationship has less intrinsic meaning for partners.
BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

Trust, while not widely or deeply studied, can be validly argued the most important element in an interpersonal relationship. We need trust to function on a daily basis. For example, we trust that the sun will rise every morning. We trust in our relationships, that our partners will act in a way that befits the rules established within the relationship.

Deutsch (1973) has defined trust as “confidence that one will find what is desired from another, rather than what is feared” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 95). Scanzoni, in more recent theoretical statement (1979), “describes trust as Actor’s willingness to arrange and repose his or her activities on Other because of confidence that Other will provide expected gratifications” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 95). Moreover, “trust requires a willingness to place oneself in a position of risk and that trust is not likely to appear early in a relationship because there would be little basis in past experience for its development” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 95). Rotter (1980), defines trust outside of interpersonal relationships as “a generalized expectancy held by an individual that the word, promise, or statement of another individual can be relied on” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 95).

For operational means, we will use Deutsch’s definition of trust: “confidence that one will find what is desired from another, rather than what is feared” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 95). As suggested by Deutsch (1958), “trust is evident only in situations where
potential damage from unfulfilled trust is greater than the potential gains if trust is fulfilled. With this assertion, he has captured two themes that have pervaded research and thinking regarding trust ever since: Trust entails the assumption of risks, and some form of trust is inherent in all relationships” (Relational Models Theory, 2004, p. 287).

All of these definitions of trust make way for the recognition that trust is an important part of an interpersonal relationship.

Society dictates the way we view the world, and establishes the way a male and female find their place in social setting. We know what is appropriate and right for our gender by watching the way other people respond and the interaction people have. From a young age, girls are taught to be the nurturers; to care for and show love to the people around them. They are taught that showing emotion is okay. Boys, on the other hand, are taught to fight and defend what is theirs. Showing emotion is not encouraged, at least not in public. They are taught that they are to be the head of the household, and hence, they are the ones in control. The product of these lessons is a man who usually feels entitled, and if things don’t work in the relationship, well, it is okay. He is the one who earns the money, he is the one with the control, he will just go out and get another wife. Faith that the relationship will endure is not of crucial necessity to him.
IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

There is little research conducted in the field of interpersonal trust and an even smaller amount conducted on the topic of faith. Contributing to the study of trust, in general, will help to serve in the development of relationship analysis and diagnosis. Examining trust and the faith component will be especially helpful for therapists and psychologists who work with couples dealing with relationship issues. Relationships are the foundation of interpersonal communication exchange. Almost everyone will engage in a romantic interpersonal relationship in their lifetime. It is this type of relationship that will have the most rewarding and most detrimental effects. In addition the dynamics behind relationship principles will also be considered. By focusing in on trust and faith in particular, I believe that this one dimension of a relationship can contribute tremendously to its success or failure. I also believe this study is an important contribution to present research that considers the topic of trust and faith.

By researching the topic of trust, psychologists and therapists will benefit from findings in other related areas. Exploring trust also reveals important relational components such as love. In looking at the link between love and trust studies show a direct correlation. “Several findings indicate that dyadic trust is an important aspect of intimacy, worth further investigation in research studies. Such trust is strongly related to love and self-disclosure, especially for couples beyond the newlywed stage. Our cross-sectional data suggest that trust increases with commitment and declines when relationships are sundered. It has yet to be determined whether a drop in trust precedes
the termination of the relationship or whether persons redefine their former partners as untrustworthy after the relationship has been broken, or both" (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p.595).
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There is much to be desired in examining the topic of trust and how it affects close relationships. Little research has been conducted in this field and most of the studies performed are outdated. Being that trust is such an integral part of interpersonal relationships, further study of this construct would prove to be beneficial to the understanding of how relationship dynamics work. My interest with this topic--trust and its component, faith--goes beyond most of the published studies, with the focus on gender. While most of the studies containing gender, trust, and faith lead us into unchartered territory, I would like to offer a review of established theories and models surrounding trust.

The leading study for trust, with particular attention on faith, was published by Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna in 1983 titled Trust in Close Relationships. In this study, the authors collected data using 26-and-24 item questionnaires. They measured their results against Rubin’s Liking and Loving Scale, the Trust Scale, the Interpersonal Relationship Scale, and Motivation Scale. The brunt of trust studies comprise of these four scales. Each scale looks at different aspects of a relationship and measures different parts of trustworthiness of a partner. The Rubin’s Liking and Loving Scale for example, “is an 18-item instrument, with 9 items designed to measure love and the other 9 items created to measure liking (Rubin, 1973)” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 101). The Trust scale is a 26-item scale “designed to measure levels of trust within close relationships. Items were tailored to represent the predictability, dependability, and faith components…”
(Rempel et al., 1985, p. 101). The Interpersonal Relationship Scale (IRS) created by Schlein, Guerney, and Stover (Guerney, 1977), included a “7 point scale ranging from -3 (“strongly disagree”), through 0 (“neutral”), to 3 (“strongly agree”)” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 101), and measured responses of a person’s trustworthiness. The last scale, the Motivation Scale, “was created to assess participants’ perceptions of the reasons for their involvement in their relationship from the perspective of the intrinsic, instrumental, and extrinsic motivational categories” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 101). My study primarily used the trust scale because it incorporated the component faith, and the IRS which used a 7 point scale. The study itself is discussed in detail later.

Handbook of Interpersonal Commitment and Relationship Stability (1999) found that:

Most of the theoretical and empirical literature concerning trust has examined this construct as a personal disposition—as a relatively enduring, individual-level attribute that is assumed to yield considerable stability in cognition, affect, and behavior across a variety of situations, and across a variety of interaction partners. Typically, it has been assumed that (1) some individuals experience interpersonal histories that lead them to be relatively trusting of interaction partners; (2) individuals carry such tendencies into their relationships with new partners; and (3) this disposition leads individuals to feel relatively trusting of their partners. For example, Rotter (1980) developed an analysis of trust in which this phenomenon was characterized as a personality trait. And attachment
theory emphasizes the ways in which early attachment experiences with primary caregivers influence individuals’ mental modes of attachment, which in turn shape later inclinations to trust close partners (e.g., Collins & Read, 1994; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Kirpatrick & Hazan, 1994) (pgs. 441-442).

It is more appropriate, however, to move away from looking at trust as a personal attribute defined in terms of a characteristic that a person possesses, and develop the construct further by looking at trust from a relationship perspective.

The leading researchers in this field, are Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna (1985) who did work on Trust in Close Relationships, Seligman, Fazio, and Zanna who studied intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors, Driscoll, Davis, and Lipetz (1972) examined the link between love and trust, and Larzelere and Huston (1980) looked at dyadic trust between intimates. For Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna, they looked at trust under a microscope and dissected it into 3 components: predictability, dependability, and faith.

Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna (1985) proposed that the most basic type of information relevant to the development of trust concerns the partner’s behavioral predictability. People build their trust from the fabric of the interactions they experience. If the partner’s behavior appears volatile and unpredictable, expectations will be more frequently violated, causing anxiety and attributional ambiguity. In contrast, a stable, positive
orientation on the partner’s part contains messages about the couple’s convergent interests and the partner’s commitment to shared norms (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978). It is interesting to note that attachment theorists consider behavioral consistency to be a critical ingredient of responsiveness on the part of caregivers, one that helps to create a sense of security (Sroufe, 1983). As the focus shifts from behavior to the reasons behind it, people will interpret consistency in the partner’s behavioral profile in terms of more general dispositional qualities. Theorists have considered one component of trust to be a specific set of trait attributions that center on the partner’s tendency to be a responsive person. The relevant constellation of personal qualities resembles a dependability prototype (Rempel et al., 1985). In essence, a partner would be seen as more trustworthy if he or she were the type of person who could be counted on to be honest, reliable, cooperative, and essentially benevolent (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Rempel et al., 1985). People’s confidence in such trait inferences reflects their experiences in a limited set of situations involving personal risk and vulnerability, where trust is a salient concern (Holmes & Rempel, 1989, p. 191).

There is the possibility then, that a person who is dependable and trustworthy at all times, with no conflict or opportunity to prove their trustworthiness, will create a
relationship that has little means of measuring interdependence and a partner who may not appreciate trust and intimacy development.

Note that a partner who is consistently rewarding and virtuous in character may nevertheless fail to instill any sense of security about the future of the relationship. This can occur because the quality of the partner’s responsiveness needs to be seen as uniquely tied to his or her feeling of attachment to the relationship. The issue concerns not only whether the other is capable of being “nice”, but perceptions that the partner is acting that way because he or she “cares.” In summary, people’s convictions about a partner’s attachment will be displayed in interpersonal attributions, explanations for responsive behavior that focus on the partner’s special connection to them (Holmes, 1981; Newman, 1981) (Holmes & Rempel, 1989, p. 191).

In a nutshell, “the development of trust is argued to involve three stages, termed predictability, dependability; and faith. Predictability is the first and most basic requirement for the development of trust. Predictability rests on the consistency of a partner’s behavior; the partner must be observed to be behaviorally consistent before he or she can be regarded as trustworthy. But trust requires more than consistency per se; trust also rests on relatively more abstract inferences regarding the partner’s personal dispositions. Dependability is the second requirement for the development of trust. Dependability is defined as the degree to which the partner is judged to be reliable and honest. The more reliable and honest the partner is perceived to be, the more he or she
can be regarded as trustworthy. At the third and final stage in the development of trust, the individual makes a “leap of faith” and moves beyond the relatively visible evidence of trustworthiness based on the partner’s observed behavior and inferred dispositions. Faith represents conviction that the partner can be relied upon to be responsive to one’s needs and behave in a caring manner, now and in the future. The three stages of trust are not mutually exclusive; each stage is necessary for strong feelings of trust to develop” (Handbook of Interpersonal, 1999, p. 443).

“Over the course of long-term involvement, individuals inevitably confront situations in which personal interests are pitted against the interests of the relationship; that is, individuals encounter the sorts of interdependence dilemmas described earlier in the chapter. In such situations, the individual must make a choice: Should I put my partner’s needs before my own, or should I do what is good for me? Holmes and Rempel (1989) suggest that the emergence of trust rests on the manner in which individuals are perceived to behave during such episodes. Indeed, episodes of this sort are termed diagnostic situations in recognition of the fact that behavior in such situations is diagnostic of individual’s dispositions, values, and goals” (Handbook of Interpersonal, 1999, p. 442).

To further this interdependence theory, Rusbult et al., presents a theory of commitment and trust which suggests that “as partners develop greater trust in one another, they become willing to become increasingly dependant on one another; that is, they become increasingly satisfied, increasingly willing to forego alternatives, and
increasingly willing to invest in their relationships" (Handbook of Interpersonal, 1999, p. 445). This development in commitment and relationship occurs only after a pro-relationship interest has been established by the partner. This means that "perceived commitment rests in part on the belief that the individual's behavior was motivated by concern for the relationship well-being" (Handbook of Interpersonal, 1999, p. 444), and not for the interest of the individual. However, the displayed behavior has to be isolated from the norm.

For example, an individual who is kind to all persons may fail to instill trust. Thus, the individual's behavior must be seen to be uniquely inspired by concern for the relationship-or motivated largely by pro-relationship considerations-in order to be perceived as evidence of commitment. In addition, the partner must obtain evidence of reliable pro-relationship motivation in order to feel confident that the individual is committed. To regard pro-relationship behavior as a predictable, dependable reflection of the individual's longstanding motives, such behavior must occur repeatedly-on a predictable and dependable basis. Accordingly, when the individual fairly consistently foregoes direct self-interest and behaves in such a manner as to promote the interests of the partner or relationship, the partner develops enhanced confidence in the individual's benevolent motives. The product of such certainty is trust (Handbook of Interpersonal, 1999, p. 444).
The study of pro-relationship behavior has also sparked the interest of Wieselquist, Rusbult, Foster, and Agnew (1999), who theorize that “individuals come to trust their partners when they perceive that their partners have enacted pro-relationship behaviors, departing from their direct self-interest for the good of the relationship. The results of mediation analyses are consistent with a model of mutual cyclical growth in which (a) dependence promotes strong commitment, (b) commitment promotes pro-relationship acts, (c) pro-relationship acts are perceived by the partner, (d) the perception of pro-relationship acts enhances the partner’s trust, and (e) trust increases the partner’s willingness to become dependant on the relationship” (Wieselquist, Rusbult, Foster & Agnew, 1999, p. 942).

This idea of pro-relationship behavior and responding to situations with the consideration of the partner and relationship in mind, rather than one’s own personal benefit, brings us to another concept; dyadic trust. “Dyadic trust can be distinguished from generalized trust in that the former refers specifically to the benevolence and honesty of a significant other toward the individual making the judgment. Generalized trust, in contrast, refers to a person’s belief about the character of people in the aggregate (Rotter, 1967, 1971; Wrightsman, 1964)” (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 596). Dyadic trust, as studied by Larzelere and Huston, operate under the pretense that “dyadic trust would seem to be a prerequisite for commitment, with higher levels of trust necessary for higher levels of commitment” (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 596). Moreover, if a couple is happy, trust is high, and the couple will manipulate a situation to favor ideals of the relationship. Lazzelere and Huston found that “partners reciprocated trust more than
either love or depth of self-disclosure” (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 596). This theory is based on benevolent reciprocation, “the attributions that one’s partner is both benevolent and honest or sincere are important for assessing the future potential of a relationship. The more that the target person is seen as benevolent and honest toward the perceiver, the more likely the perceiver will be able to predict a favorable future for the relationship. Attributed benevolence allows a person to feel comfortable despite becoming more intimate and therefore potentially more vulnerable in a relationship” (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 596).

With the development of trust, and a more intricate relationship, inevitably comes love. Driscoll and Lipetz (1972), studied the link between love and trust. “Their concern was with the contrast between romantic and conjugal love. The authors hypothesized that romantic love progresses to a more mature form of conjugal love as trust evolves. According to their thinking, trust evolves through mutually satisfying interactions and increasing confidence in the relationship. Driscoll et al.’s 5-item Trust Scale, which is similar to the one used by Dion and Dion (1976) in subsequent research, consists of item dealing with areas of trust, the ability to count on one’s partner, and the partner’s considerateness” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 96). Let us not confuse this trust scale with the trust scale used by Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna, and partially replicated here. Rempel, et al. used a 26-item trust scale in their study “to measure levels of trust within close interpersonal relationships. Items were tailored to represent the predictability, dependability, and faith components discussed earlier” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 101). Further, “items constructed to measure faith are centered on feelings of confidence in the
relationship and the responsiveness and caring expected from the partner in the face of an uncertain future” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 101).

Going back to Driscoll et al., according to these authors, heterosexual relationships progress from romantic to “conjugal” love in which trust plays a critical role. To explore this idea, Driscoll and his colleagues obtained measures of reported love and trust from married and seriously committed, dating couples on two different occasions separated by several months. In accord with their hypotheses, love and trust were more strongly related in married than unmarried couples, and for the seriously committed, dating couples, love and trust tended to become more closely associated across the interval between testing sessions” (Dion & Dion, 1976, p. 187).

This comes as no surprise, that as a couple grows closer, and deeper in love, love moves from a romantic form to a conjugal one. It is the continued growth as a couple, and the display of less self actualizing behavior and more relationship oriented decisions, that allows for the fruition of trust in a relationship. This transformation from being personally motivated to making decisions based on the benefit of the couple, has been examined by Seligman, Fazio, and Zanna (1980) and titled extrinsic, intrinsic, and instrumental motivational factors. “In this research, dating couples were induced to perceive their motivations for involvement in their relationships as being dominated by either intrinsic or extrinsic rewards. Extrinsic reasons were related to rewards received from others, outside of the relationship, but mediated by involvement with the partner. Examples of these rewards include social status and respect, the access to new
opportunities and activities, and the acquisition of new friends or business connections.

Intrinsic explanations were defined as the set of rewards directly mediated by involvement with the partner” (Rempelet et al., 1985, p. 99). “Instrumental motives may be served by a host of more or less explicit rewards partners provide for each other, such as direct services, goods, praise, sex, and support” (Rempelet et al., 1985, p. 99).

Everyone has motivational factors behind their behavior in a relationship. It is understanding the reasons that motivate you toward a particular reason that make a person trustworthy. If I know that my partner is acting on behalf of our relationship even though it means that a decision was made extrinsically, to gain a business connection, for example, if I know it was done to better or relationship i.e., our financial status, and I can be assured by past behavior, that my partner is dependable, and predictable, then I can place a fair amount of trust in our relationship. I will have faith that my partner is working for the benefit of the couple and I can be a little more vulnerable because I have trust in the relationship, and faith that he will chose the best thing for the relationship, and this will ultimately, bring us closer and more in love.
RATIONALE FOR EXAMINING GENDER DIFFERENCES CONCERNING TRUST

Given some basic assumptions of this study, I was curious to see why relationships succeed or fail. In my experiences of failed relationships, I often blamed the male and his actions for causing the break up. Many of the issues which led to the dissolution of the relationship directly related to trust and faith. This study was conducted to attempt to answer to questions such as “what makes a man unfaithful,” and “is trust really as important to a male as a female?” In speaking to many of my friends, co-workers, and colleagues on this topic, I became very interested in finding the differences between gender regarding the topic of trust and faith. After many conversations (D. Ajala, personal communication, February 10, 2007) and a lot of contemplation, I have come to the following conclusions.

Women have more to lose if the relationship doesn’t work out and thus place more faith in a relationship because they. Women will put more emotional investment into a relationship especially when they have children. When the relationship breaks, a woman generally has more to lose because she has more at stake. Women get stuck with what’s left of a broken relationship and home. It’s more acceptable in this society for men to move on, have more children, to not be responsible for the upbringing and tending to of their children and the home and who wants a woman with children stuck to her side. We still live in a man’s world. Men are usually the larger wage earners putting women at a disadvantage. Women can become dependent on males for income and security, so
logically will put more faith into a relationship even when things aren’t working out
because that’s all they have.

Women are a stronger breed and have more faith in general to make things work.
We are the hopeless romantics who continue to chase the dream even when it’s dead. It’s
what we were taught as children by watching our mothers. It’s what we dream about our
whole lives—the wedding, marriage, being a mother.

In addressing relationships, however, it could be argued that men have more faith.
In speaking in depth to my friends, and by doing some soul searching on my own, I have
come to realize the following, which has ultimately led me to explore this topic as my
thesis. Men and women are wired differently. We are also, from the beginning of life,
bred differently. Men are bred to be problem solvers, to come up with solutions, and
make things happen. They want to fix and solve things. That is what they need to do to
feel needed. They need the emotional validation that they have purpose in this world and
can serve function. When they accomplish a task, they need to feel rewarded and praised
for the job they’ve done. A little appreciation is all they need.

Men deal with problems by taking actions, such as going out with their friends,
drinking to ease the pain, have extra-relational affairs to boost their confidence and ego.
They do not sit down and talk about their problems. They are not the communicators that
women are. The words “honey can we talk”... are the worst words they can hear. Men
do not like to tap into their emotional side by expressing their feelings to their male
friends. They don’t like to expose themselves. The only time they talk about things is when a problem occurs. They will not take the initiative to preplan the way a circumstance will turn out. They are reactors, not preventers. Women on the other hand, love to talk things out. They love to communicate with practically anyone who will listen. They love to partake in what I call the advice-sharing circle. This is why their girlfriends are so important to them. Women are the nurturers and we want to take care of men. Women overcomplicate things by reading too much into a conversation, situation, and actions. We take something simple like the ring of a phone and turn it into a plotted out scenario full of emotional attachments based on when the phone rang, how many times it rang, how many days passed since the last ring, etc. Men just view it as a call that meant they wanted to talk at that moment. Men are simple creatures of habit. They say what they mean and communicate with few words. We in turn manipulate those words, or lack thereof, into something we want to hear. Men give us all the signs and their communication is crystal clear and to the point, but we misinterpret things and convince ourselves otherwise. We read into signs that are not even there. Women are manipulators and will change a situation to best suit us because that’s the way we validate the world and make it safe for us. We live in our own heads and far too often it is a skewed concept of reality.

Women are planners. We love to play out the possibilities in our head so that we are prepared for whatever is thrown our way. We try to prevent things from happening by having a plan of defense. We worry about things that have not happened yet. Men are
the opposite. They worry only about what has happened and then make a plan then, on how to fix it.

Women are the nurturers; they want to take care of people. Men in turn need to feel needed and if they don’t feel needed, they feel out of place. Men it would seem, would be predicted to have more faith because they don’t worry about things until they happen. They can forget about things such as the pain of past relationships and start from the beginning, offering a clean slate. They don’t hold things against the new girl and trust her because they can forget old stuff. Men don’t typically carry baggage, while women usually do. Women have a need for communication and talking out problems in relationships, men don’t necessarily have that same need. They figure out the problem and move on.

What does this mean for faith and trust regarding gender? Well it shows the difference between what we need and what is important for each gender in a relationship, for one. It also leads to imply that while faith maybe more important to women overall, as I hypothesized earlier, it would seem to make sense, however, that men have more faith because they are able to forget, not hang on to baggage and move on. They are not jaded as many women are because women have a harder time letting go of past hurt.
REVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDIES ON TRUST IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS

There are only a few key players in the development research on trust. As noted, Rempel, Holmes and Zanna are pioneers in this field and have done the most research on this topic. Driscoll, Davis and Lipetz (1972) "examined the link between love and trust. Their concern was with the contrast between romantic and conjugal love. The authors hypothesized that romantic love progresses to a more mature form of conjugal love as trust develops. According to their thinking, trust evolves through mutually satisfying interactions and increasing confidence in the relationship" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 96).

More recently, there have been studies by Larzelere and Houston (1980) which "found that trust between partners was associated with love and with intimacy of self-disclosure. Their emphasis was on dyadic trust between intimates, which they defined as the extent to which a person believes the other to be benevolent and honest. The authors define benevolence as the extent to which an individual is genuinely interested in a partner's welfare and motivated to seek maximum joint gain. Honesty is, likewise, understood as the extent to which an individual's statements of future intentions are believable" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 96). Their findings show that "partners reciprocated trust more than either love or depth of self disclosure" (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 595).

Other theorists, such as Altman & Taylor (1974) and Rubin (1973), fall into the category of self-disclosure. They "emphasize the notion that trust is built gradually through repeated encounters involving the potential for rejection or ridicule" (Rempel et
Furthermore, as explained by Stickland (1958), “for someone to be able to make the attribution that another person cares and can be trusted, there must exist the possibility for the person the show that he or she does not care” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 97). Hence, “an emphasis on experiences that involve personal risk is essential in understanding the growth of feelings of security and trust” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 97).

Rubin contributed heavily to the development of trust studies when he created the love and liking scale. “The Rubin Loving and Liking Scale is an 18-item instrument, with 9 items designed to measure love and the other 9 items created to measure liking (Rubin, 1973)” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 101). In the Rempel, et al study, “results showed that those subjects who had been influenced to attribute their involvement to extrinsic reasons had lower scores on the loving scale. Those subjects who had been induced to attribute intrinsic reasons showed scores on the loving scale equal to the control group. Thus, the self attribution of extrinsic motivations apparently served to undermine the value of the relationship, presumably through the use of discounting logic” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 99). This has great meaning for trust studies because it looks at aspects of motivations regarding involvement in a relationship, and then scores its connection to the emotions of love and like. Presumably, if a person is in love or like with another person, they are invested for intrinsic reasons such as the welfare of the relationship, or their partner. They place the interest of their partner and relationship at the forefront when engaging in decision making. We might have seen more of this type of motivation in previous generations when people married more for love, and divorce was not such an exercised option. In this day, however, people are more apt to marry for reasons outside
or in combination with extrinsic motivations, and thus we see a rise in break ups and divorces. This is the direction in which the development of trust in relationships is headed.
REVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDIES ON FAITH IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS

Other theorists like Barry (1970), studied object-relations theory which “play a role in determining the degree to which someone is capable of trusting another. Personal security and self-esteem, for example, contribute to the extent to which a person is willing to take emotional risks in uncertain circumstances” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 98). Moreover, in regards to predictability, and dependability, “Faith does not fully subsume or contain these factors. Rather it is largely those elements of predictability and dependability that are seen to reflect the partner’s underlying motives of caring and responsiveness that will foster confidence and emotional security in the face of an objectively uncertain future” (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 98). Here, Barry is saying that there are other factors that can determine faith. Predictability and dependability foster confidence in a person and relationship, which can contribute to faith.
CORRELATION BETWEEN GENDER AND THE IMPORTANCE OF FAITH IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS

In looking at the dyadic trust theory, it is reasonable to conclude that “dyadic trust would seem to be a prerequisite for commitment, with higher levels of trust necessary for higher levels of commitment. Thus, newlyweds, on the average, should have higher trust than engaged or cohabitating partners, who in turn, should have higher trust than exclusively dating partners. The latter, then, should have more trust than casually dating partners” (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 595). Moreover, “since dyadic trust has little room to increase above the expected high level for newlyweds, those who do decrease in trust during marriage, even though they are a minority, should bring the average level of trust below the newlywed level” (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 595). All this is saying, is that if a couple is happy, trust is high, and a partner will manipulate a situation to favor the ideals of the relationship.
RELATIONSHIP OF TRUST SCALE TO GENDER ATTITUDES TOWARD FAITH

The trust scale designed in the Rempel et al. study and partially replicated here, was "to measure levels of trust within close interpersonal relationships. Items were tailored to represent the predictability, dependability, and faith components discussed earlier" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 101). Moreover, "items constructed to measure faith are centered on feelings of confidence in the relationship and the responsiveness and caring expected from the partner in the face of an uncertain future" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 101).

The trust scale was an instrument created to measure individual attitudes toward faith. Segregating the results of the sample population by gender gave a means to a comparative study. By looking at the strength of the relationship between gender and responses to the faith questions presented in the trust scale, we can begin to dissect what this means for the hypothesis.

Found in the Rempel, et al study was that in "the Trust Scale, the overall Cronbach alpha was .81, with subscale reliabilities of .80, .72, and .70 for the faith, dependability, and predictability subscales, respectively. In general, the three subscales were moderately correlated, as we expected (r = .46, p < .001 for faith and dependability, r = .27, p < .05 for faith and predictability, and r = .28, p < .05 for dependability and predictability). However, in this case the results for men and women showed distinct patterns. The three subscales were associated for women, in a relatively ordered fashion.
Faith and dependability were strongly correlated, $r = .61$, $p < .001$, as were faith and predictability, $r = .48$, $p < .001$, and dependability and predictability, $r = .44$, $p < .05$. For men, however, only a weak correlation between faith and dependability was apparent $r = .33$, $p < .05$. Essentially, it appears that the three aspects of trust are relatively autonomous for men but not for women" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 107).

The results of the Rempel, et al study supports the notion that women have more complex integrated views when addressing the topic of trust. For a woman, trust is a complex characteristic which depends on multiple factors such as predictability and dependability. For women, trust is earned and based on past experiences within the relationship. If a male proves himself to be trustworthy and has a pattern of dependability, it will be easier to extend the concept of trust to him and the relationship. Men, on the other hand, do not rank and decipher the construct of trust in the same manner. It seems that men are more able to just group all these aspects together and formulate one general concept of trust based on all factors combined. The results of the Rempel et al study just goes to show how each gender is wired differently. Males are in general, more simple creatures with simple patterns of thinking. Women are different in that in general, they are the thinkers, the emotional analyzers which make sense of the world by deciphering every aspect of their relationship and life by attaching a meaning to it.
HYPOTHESES

Based on the previous review of literature, the following are the hypotheses.

(Hypothesis 1) The faith dimension of trust is more important to women than men.

(Hypothesis 2) Further, of the three components of trust--faith, dependability, and predictability--faith is the most important overall.

METHODS

Data for this study was gathered by using a questionnaire replicating the Faith portion of the Rempel, Holmes and Zanna study. Specific questions about faith in interpersonal relationships and questions on importance were added and the findings separated based on gender. The subjects used in this study were taken from a pool of my co-workers, both males and females and selected randomly within this pool. The instrument used was a 16-question questionnaire utilizing a 7-point Likert-type scale.

SUBJECTS

The survey was randomly distributed to Hawaiian Airline Flight Attendants, my co-workers pooled from a group who I knew were heterosexual and either involved or recently involved in a romantic relationship. From this group, I passed out 60 surveys, 30 to males and 30 to females. I continued to pass out surveys individually toward the end of my data collection until I received responses from a total of 20 males and 20 females.
INSTRUMENT

The instrument used was a questionnaire taken from the Rempel, Holmes and Zanna study looking at trust in close relationships and focusing primarily on their questions concerning faith in interpersonal relationships. Of the 16 questions utilized in my questionnaire, 10 are extracted from the Rempel, Holmes and Zanna study on trust. Six questions of my own were formulated to measure importance of faith and gender. The 16 questions measured faith and its importance to gender. The questionnaire is attached below. The variables used measured gender and importance and specific questions were asked to measure the difference and importance of faith to each gender.

The questions are listed here:

All questions are based on a numeric 7 point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree), through 4 (neutral), to 7 (strongly agree).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. When we encounter difficult and unfamiliar new circumstances I would not feel worried or threatened by letting my partner do what he/she wanted.

2. Even when I don't know how my partner will react, I feel comfortable telling him/her anything about myself; even those things which I am ashamed.

3. Though times may change and the future is uncertain; I know my partner will always be ready and willing to offer me strength and support.

4. In my relationship with my partner, the future is unknown which I worry about.

5. Whenever we have to make an important decision in a situation we have never encountered before, I know my partner will be concerned about my welfare.

6. Even if I have no reason to expect my partner to share things with me, I still feel certain that he/she will.
7. I can rely on my partner to react in a positive way when I expose my weakness to him/her.

8. When I share my problems with my partner, I know he/she will respond in a loving way even before I say anything.

9. I would never guarantee that my partner and I will still be together and not have decided to end our relationship 10 years from now.

10. When I am with my partner I feel secure in facing unknown new situations.

11. Of the three components of Trust: Faith, Dependability, and Predictability, Faith is most important to me.

12. I would continue to have faith in my relationship even if things are not going well.

13. I believe trust in my relationships leads to relationship stability.

14. In my relationship, I believe Faith is more important for a woman than a man.

A. How important is trust in your romantic relationship?

B. How important is faith in your romantic relationship?

PROCEDURE

A total of fifty (50) subjects were randomly chosen from a pool of 1000 flight attendant employees and questionnaires were distributed to them. Of those 50 participants, forty (40) responses were considered (20 male and 20 female) that fulfilled my criteria of being in an interpersonal and heterosexual relationship. I did not have enough subjects to fulfill my criteria from the 50 randomly selected subjects, so I administered questionnaires in increments of 10 until I found 40 qualified subjects.

After collecting the entirety of the data, statistics were run to compare the findings in my study to those of the original study by Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna. I was
particularly interested in the differences and correlations between the two studies concerning faith and gender.

REFINEMENT OF THE TRUST SCALE

The instrument was refined with the omission of questions 4 and 9. Question 4’s face validity seemed questionable in that it seemed to target anxiety instead of faith. Question 9 posed some problems and some of the subjects found it hard to understand because it included a negative, so it too was omitted (as was omitted by the Rempel et al. study).

My findings are reported in the subsequent sections.

HUMAN SUBJECT CONCERNS & APPROVAL FOR THE STUDY

Within the questionnaire was an informed consent waiver approved by the IRB committee at the University of Hawai’i at Manoa, allowing myself to conduct this study on humans. They approved my study and deemed it safe. The study was completed by each individual and placed back into my personal file at work. Gender of each participant was self-reported on each questionnaire; however, their anonymity remains intact as subjects were not required to print their name on the questionnaire, only to sign the agreement of waiver. (see appendix)
RESULTS

HYPOTHESIS 1:

The general finding was not significant and the hypothesis was not supported. The single measure of Faith 2, however, was supported. To identify the variables, trust is the dependent variable and gender is the independent variable.

In general, the t test shows that for the composite question, Faith 1 through Faith 10, the difference was not significant and thus hypothesis 1 was not supported. In this test, which was partly an imitation test to the Faith portion of the Rempel, et al study, the t test showed that it was hard to find a standard value. With a sample size of 40, the generalization of findings to men and women was limited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith Composite Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.2105</td>
<td>11.92839</td>
<td>2.73656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.3684</td>
<td>12.76371</td>
<td>2.92820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis is that faith is more important for a woman than a man in a close interpersonal relationship, measured by Faith 14 "I believe Faith in a relationship is more important for a woman than a man." Based on the t test, there was not evidence to support the hypothesis based on response. Although women in general had a higher mean of 4.0 compared to men who reported a mean answer of 3.8, there was not a
significant difference, therefore, I can't reject the null hypothesis. Thus, my research hypothesis is not supported.

Another addition to the measurement was the inclusion of a variable labeled composite Faith, by combining questions Faith 1 through Faith 10. This composite Faith, reports as a single variable measuring faith.

A t test was also done on the means of Faith 1 through Faith B (excluding Faith 4 and Faith 9) for men and women. The results show that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78.3500</td>
<td>13.35458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79.6000</td>
<td>13.76647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Faith:

The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 78.35, SD = 13.35, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 79.60, SD = 13.77, N = 20), t(38) = -1.25, p = .772.

Faith 2 was the only question which produced a significant difference. Based on t-test with p < .05, one item found, Faith 2 was at alpha level .017 for males and .018 for females. For Faith 2, women were more comfortable disclosing things they were ashamed of, and felt comfortable telling their partner anything, even when they didn't know how their partner would react. Men, on the other hand, did not feel as comfortable disclosing information that they were ashamed of. On average, women had a mean of 6.3
of 7, and men a 5.1. The results of this question reinforce popular findings regarding self-disclosure. "Self-disclosure research has indicated both that females engage in more self-disclosure than males (e.g., Jourard and Lasakow, 1958; Morgan, 1976; Pedersen and Higbee, 1969; Rivenback, 1971) and that there is no difference between male and female disclosure patterns (e.g., Certner, 1973; Ricker-Ousiankina and Kusmin, 1958; Weigel, Weigel, and Chadwick, 1969). These findings are further complicated by Chelune's (1976) observation that observers consistently overestimate the amount of males' self-disclosure while underestimating the amount of females' self-disclosure behavior" (Advances in Gender, 1987, p. 175).

HYPOTHESIS 2:

The second research hypotheses, measured by Faith 11, "Of the three components of trust: Faith, Dependability, and Predictability, Faith is most important to me," measured the importance of faith overall as compared to other components of trust. To take a further look at the statistics for Faith 11, a chi square test was used and significance found. Chi square gave a better probability that either significance or no significance may be found, by measuring the significance in frequency of people responding in the 7 scale points. By using frequency distribution, one can see the percentage of people who agreed and did not agree with the question. The results were plugged into a formula to find chi square. Chi Square is a non-parametric test which can test a hypothesis and tell "whether or not two different samples (of people, texts, whatever) are different enough in some characteristic or aspect of their behavior that we
can generalize from our samples that the populations from which our samples are drawn are also different in the behavior or characteristic” (GraphPad Software, 2002).

The results of the chi square test for Faith 11, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row #</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>14.350%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>14.275%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>14.275%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>14.275%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>14.275%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>14.275%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>14.275%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-square test results**

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equals 32.940 with 6 degrees of freedom.
The two-tailed P value is less than 0.0001
By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The P value answers this question: If the theory that generated the expected values were correct, what is the probability of observing such a large discrepancy (or larger) between observed and expected values? A small P value is evidence that the data are not sampled from the distribution you expected.

The statistically significant findings support the original hypothesis that faith is the most important component of trust and rejects the null hypothesis. “The null hypothesis is that the observed data are sampled from a population with the expected frequencies. We need to combine together the discrepancies between the observed and
expected, and then calculate a P value answering this question: If the null hypothesis were true, what is the chance of randomly selecting subjects with this large a discrepancy between observed and expected counts?" (GraphPad Software, 2002) The 6 degrees of freedom, represent the amount of categories minus 1.

In this study, even though the means for each gender differ, there is no support for gender and the link to importance of faith. The findings of no significance means that the differences of means for each gender is no larger than what you would expect by chance, and if the study is replicated, chances are just as good that the means would differ the other way around.

While significance was not found for this particular sample group, there may still be some validity for other kinds of people like those who participate in a relationship where they see each other face to face everyday and are accountable for each other’s actions. It is possible that for this particular sample group, that faith is so important to the success of their relationship, you get what is called a ceiling effect. Faith is so important that there is not much opportunity for gender differences. Faith is important to both men and women because of the problem of not being around your partners all the time. Further, if you went to an environment where faith wasn’t so important, then you might actually start to get more gender differences. Then, generally speaking, one may see that women actually do put more faith in faith. In this study, however, where the sample group consisted of a specific and unique type of couple, and perhaps even for other groups of couples where physical separation in a component in their relationship, faith is so critical to the relationship for both participants, the woman and the man, that
you do not get a gender difference. Where as if you put men in a situation where you do not have to rely so heavily on faith, then hypothetically speaking, they may fall back on their more stereotypical tendency not to value faith as much.

To further the research in this field first and foremost begins with awareness. While I may have had many limitations in this study, if I have brought just a little bit more attention to this topic, then I have helped to further its study, and ultimately its understanding. In an ideal situation where money and time is not an issue, having the Rempel et al. study replicated based on different demographics but continuing to focus and interpret the results of the study based on gender, would be of significant contribution to advancement of trust research.
Conclusion

Given the importance of trust in close interpersonal relationships, I continue to believe that faith holds more importance for a woman in many situations, even though in this particular study, with this particular group, support was not found. For the sample group, and perhaps for other similar groups of couples, regardless of gender, faith is important to the sustenance of a relationship, and support was found that faith was the most important component of trust. In agreement with Stinnett and Walters (1977), "trust increases security in a relationship, reduces inhibitions and defensiveness, and frees people to share feelings and dreams" (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 595). Also in accordance, O'Neill and O'Neill (1972) describe trust as "a prerequisite for marital partners to open their marriage to their full potential for personal and interpersonal growth" (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 595).

While I did not find the support for hypothesis 1 and the gender effects I expected with this sample group, this may be in part due to the specific nature of this group. Trust and faith is important to this group because they are away. Further, while there did not appear to be gender differences in this group, that is not to say that there are not gender differences in other groups. It is not only flight attendants that have this unique situation. There are other groups of couples that have to depend heavily on trust and faith. Groups like service personnel, international business people, couples who are married that live in separate places or cities because of their jobs, are all different in occupation, but are similar in having the inability to surveil their spouse because they are not there with them.
While the findings were not supportive of the gender side of the hypothesis, keep in mind, this is a particular group of people. Maybe this is indicative of this particular sample group, but in reality, there are other groups of people who have similar cultures or situations. Flight attendants are not the only people in the world like this, but they are away from their partners a lot which is different than the majority of the population who are involved in relationships where their partners are around day to day and know whether they are being unfaithful. This particular sample group does not have that advantage. It almost rings on the note of mental sanity. Groups such as the sample group and the like, have to put faith in faith because it is all they have. Short of hiring private investigators, there is nothing else they can do to remain in a healthy functioning relationship where their thoughts do not consume them with the unknown.

I may have found support with a different group of people. Even with this sample group, however, the results of this test are useful to know because this sample group is similar to other groups. Those who hold faith as important as this group may similarly not find big gender differences.

In regards to faith, I continue to believe that faith holds more importance for a woman even if not considerably significant. I am not arguing if faith being more important for a woman than a man is right or wrong, each gender has its own benefits and detriments that come with giving faith importance. It is clear, though, that men and women speak different languages, are wired differently, reared differently, and have different ways of achieving similar goals.
While many may argue that my thought process is traditional, we have come a long way as an American society to break barriers and goals of relationship reciprocity. I continue to believe that what creates us, governs us, meaning we live what we learn and what we are taught as children, we will in turn teach our children. Case in point, G.I. Joes are still sold in stores and we still buy them for our children, just as our parents bought them for us. We buy Barbie dolls for our girls. Boys fight their G.I. Joes and girls play nicely in their fairytale houses with their Barbie dolls. We perpetuate and teach the same things we were taught as children.
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There were many limitations to this study with the first being sample size. Using 40 subjects produced a data pool that would cause for more significant findings by a single impact on the alpha number. As seen in question Faith 14 which specifically targets hypothesis 1, the findings, while not significant, still show that the mean score was higher for women. This suggests that women believe that faith is more important to a woman in a close interpersonal relationship, but that men may not feel that faith is as important or even more important for a woman than a man. With such a small sample size, it is really hard to tell if men truly feel that way, or if it’s just that each of the subjects has so much weight in the outcome of results because there are not that many of them. While this study did produce support both in favor of and against the hypotheses, the limitation of sample size does not allow for a generalization to the public or to a demographic other than Hawaiian Airline flight attendants. The next limitation is demographics. Because I was using a sample pool from an already established base of people: Hawaiian Airlines Flight Attendants, there really were no specific demographics that linked them other than having the same employer, and being heterosexual. While all of the subjects were adults with at least a high school diploma, they all varied in age, educational background, place of residence, status: single, married or divorced, and ethnicity. The next time this study is run, it would be interesting to compare the differences in results using more selective demographics. In addition, using a sample of flight attendants in and of itself could be viewed as a limitation and even borders the line of a qualification. The narrow focus on this group of people creates specific results that
may hold true only for people with similar situations. This group could be expanded to include military families, international business people, and couples who work and live apart from each other. These types of groups may have similar results to the test group because they experience a similar lifestyle where at least one partner is physically away from the other creating a heightened need of faith. Flight attendants are special people in that we do not have normal 9 to 5 day jobs. Much of our work takes us away from our families and place of residence. The concept of trust and faith may be skewed and a bit different from the normal person whose trust and faith construct are not strained by extraneous circumstances. For a couple to survive when either one or both of the partners is a flight attendant there has to be a high level of trust and faith. Flight attendants do not necessarily come home every night, nor are they there all the time physically or even by phone communication to make daily decisions. Regarding decision making, much of a flight attendant’s relationship is based on the trust of the partner who is at home. In return, the partner who is at home has to place a lot of trust in the partner who is away, hoping that he/she will be trustworthy. And of course, all of this compounded with our unique culture here in Hawaii makes for a possible further limitation of not only being a flight attendant, but being a Hawaiian Airlines flight attendant. The findings may have relevance for flight attendants and even for the other groups listed above and though the generalizing ability and external validity may be limited to those in these groups, it may not allow us to generalize to those who create the greater majority of the population where couples are physically near to one another. The last limitation was not providing an operational definition of trust and faith when conducting the survey. I chose to follow the original study by Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna in which an operational definition was
not used. This may have left some room for error, and a true test of faith may not have been actualized because of the differences in each subject's own definition of trust and faith.
IMPLICATION OF THE RESEARCH

This study may not mean much to the study of trust and faith, in general, however, it does contribute to the very small body of research that is out there, and is lacking in attention. If this study accomplishes anything, it will be to catch the eye of readers interested in this topic, and then they too, will hopefully be inspired to contribute to the study of this topic.

There are some correlations between this study and the study conducted by Rempel et al. First, both studies conclude that Faith is the most important component of trust overall, across gender, and second, that "women appear to have more integrated, complex views of their relationships than men" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 95). This conclusion was drawn directly from looking at the result statistics. In Rempel et al.'s study "the correlations for men and women separately showed remarkable similarity in the pattern of results" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 106). While this study was not exactly the same as Rempel, et al.'s, the section on faith which was replicated, is indicative of similar findings. For the most part, responses to specific questions pertaining to faith produced similar responses for both gender.

This study supported the hypothesis that faith is the most important component of trust. Therapists working with people in couple counseling really need to understand that trust is a big implication.
In addressing the question of how important love is to trust, Rempel et al. found that "love was expected to be strongly related to the faith component of trust, less so to the dependability measure, and weakly, if at all, to predictability. To a large extent these predictions were supported. There was a strong correlation between love and faith, \( r = .46, p < .001 \), a weaker correlation between love and dependability, \( r = .25, p < .05 \), and no correlation between love and predictability" (Rempel et al., 1985, p. 108).
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APPENDIX A

Consent Handout Sheet

Agreement to Participate in Relationship Trust Study

Tonia Smith
Primary Investigator

This research project will be used to complete a thesis for a Master's degree. The purpose of the project is to learn the differences between men and women regarding trust in romantic relationships. You are being asked to participate because you were randomly selected from a pool of co-workers.

Participation in this project will consist of filling out a questionnaire about your feeling on trust. Questions will focus on personal viewpoints concerning trust and faith in your relationship. Data from this questionnaire will be summarized and findings will be generalized into categories. No personal identifying information will be included in the research results. Completion of the questionnaire should take no more than 15 minutes. Approximately 40 people will participate in the study.

The investigator believes there is little or no risk to participating in this research project. However, there may be a small risk that you will experience psychological pain when closely examining your feelings of trust.

Participating in this research project may be of no direct benefit to you. It is believed, however, the results from this project will help further the understanding of interpersonal relationships.

Research data will be confidential to the extent allowed by law. Agencies with research oversight, such as the UH Committee on Human Studies, have the authority to review research data. All research records will be stored securely until the completion of this project. All research records will be destroyed upon completion of the project.

Participation in this research project is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time during the duration of this project with no penalty, or loss of benefit to which you would otherwise be entitled.

If you have any questions regarding this research project, you may contact the researcher, Tonia Smith.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the UH Committee on Human Studies at (808) 956-5007.
APPENDIX B

HUMAN SUBJECT COMMITTEE RESEARCH APPROVAL

MEMORANDUM

April 6, 2006

TO: Tonia Smith
   Principal Investigator
   Communications Department

FROM: William H. Dendle
      Executive Secretary

SUBJECT: CHS #14315- “The Difference Between Men and Women When Discussing the Importance of Trust and Faith in Interpersonal Relationships”

Your project identified above was reviewed and has been determined to be exempt from Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regulations, 45 CFR Part 46. Specifically, the authority for this exemption is section 46.101(b)(2). Your certificate of exemption (Optional Form 348) is enclosed. This certificate is your record of CHS review of this study and will be effective as of the date shown on the certificate.

An exempt status signifies that you will not be required to submit renewal applications for full Committee review as long as that portion of your project involving human subjects remains unchanged. If, during the course of your project, you intend to make changes which may significantly affect the human subjects involved, you should contact this office for guidance prior to implementing these changes.

Any unanticipated problems related to your use of human subjects in this project must be promptly reported to the CHS through this office. This is required so that the CHS can institute or update protective measures for human subjects as may be necessary. In addition, under the University’s Assurance with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the University must report certain situations to the federal government. Examples of these reportable situations include deaths, injuries, adverse reactions or unforeseen risks to human subjects. These reports must be made regardless of the source funding or exempt status of your project.

University policy requires you to maintain as an essential part of your project records, any documents pertaining to the use of humans as subjects in your research. This includes any information or materials conveyed to, and received from, the subjects, as well as any executed consent forms, data and analysis results. These records must be maintained for at least three years after project completion or termination. If this is a funded project, you should be aware that these records are subject to inspection and review by authorized representatives of the University, State and Federal governments.

Please notify this office when your project is completed. We may ask that you provide information regarding your experiences with human subjects and with the CHS review process. Upon notification, we will close our files pertaining to your project. Any subsequent reactivation of the project will require a new CHS application.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or require assistance. I will be happy to assist you in any way I can.

Thank you for your cooperation and efforts throughout this review process. I wish you success in this endeavor.

Enclosure
APPENDIX C

SUBJECT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Aloha,

I have randomly selected you to participate in a survey about trust in a romantic relationship. I hope you will help me by completing this questionnaire and returning it to my file. All responses will be reported as anonymous. Please take a moment to complete this and help me toward finishing my Masters. I need this back by April 15. I really appreciate your help!

Sincerely,
Tonia Smith

Please sign:

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and your answers will remain anonymous and confidential. The duration of this study is only the length of this questionnaire meaning there will not be any follow up or other contact with you after this study is completed. There are no foreseeable risks in completing this questionnaire, however, if you feel you are jeopardizing your health or emotional state in any way, you may stop the questionnaire. Refusal to participate in this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits, and you may discontinue participation at anytime. Your contribution to this study will assist in the exploration of the topic of trust in relationships, a topic that needs more understanding. If you have any questions, you may contact me by phone at (808)--- ----.

Please sign your name.
Please circle one:

lama

MALE

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE

I am currently in a heterosexual relationship

YES

NO

All questions are based on a numeric 7 point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree), through 4 (neutral), to 7 (strongly agree).

1. When we encounter difficult and unfamiliar new circumstances I would not feel worried or threatened by letting my partner do what he/she wants.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Even when I don't know how my partner will react, I feel comfortable telling him/her anything about myself, even those things which I am ashamed.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Though times may change and the future is uncertain, I know my partner will always be ready and willing to offer me strength and support.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. In my relationship with my partner, the future is unknown which I worry about.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Whenever we have to make an important decision in a situation we have never encountered before, I know my partner will be concerned about my welfare.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. When we encounter difficult and unfamiliar circumstances I would not feel worried or threatened by letting my partner do what he/she wants.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. In my relationship with my partner, the future is unknown which I worry about.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Even if I have no reason to expect my partner to share things with me, I still feel certain that he/she will.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I can rely on my partner to react in a positive way when I expose my weakness to him/her.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. When I share my problems with my partner, I know he/she will respond in a loving way even before I say anything.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I would never guarantee that my partner and I will still be together and not have decided to end our relationship 10 years from now.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. When I am with my partner I feel secure in facing unknown new situations.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. Of the three components of Trust: Faith, Dependability, and Predictability, Faith is most important to me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I would continue to have faith in my relationship even if things are not going well.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I believe trust in my relationships leads to relationship stability.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. In my relationship, I believe Faith is more important for a woman than a man.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
The following questions are based on a numeric 7 point scale with 1 (not important), to 4 (neutral), to 7 (very important).

A. How important is trust in your romantic relationship?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

B. How important is faith in your romantic relationship?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX E

STATISTICS
T TEST STATISTICS FOR INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

For Faith 1:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 5.1, SD = 1.62, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 4.9, SD = 1.95, N = 20), t(38) = .25, p = .66.

For Faith 2:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 5.1, SD = 1.74, N = 20) was significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 6.3, SD = 1.26, N = 20), t(38) = -1.2, p = .017.

For Faith 3:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 5.7, SD = 1.69, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 6.0, SD = 1.56, N = 20), t(38) = -.35, p = .50.

For Faith 4:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 2.8, SD = 1.77, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 3.5, SD = 2.35, N = 20), t(38) = -.30, p = .65.
For Faith 5:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 5.8, SD = 1.8, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 5.6, SD = 1.98, N = 20), t(38) = .15, p = .80.

For Faith 6:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 5.4, SD = 1.88, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 5.7, SD = 1.53, N = 20), t(38) = -.30, p = .58.

For Faith 7:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 5.6, SD = 1.64, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 5.6, SD = 1.57, N = 20), t(38) = .00, p = 1.0.

For Faith 8:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 5.3, SD = 1.45, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 5.2, SD = 1.64, N = 20), t(38) = .05, p = .92.
For Faith 9:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 3.9, SD = 2.40, N = 19) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 3.9, SD = 2.38, N = 19), t(36) = .00, p = 1.0.

For Faith 9(reversed):
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 4.1, SD = 2.40, N = 19) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 4.1, SD = 2.38, N = 19), t(36) = .00, p = 1.0.

For Faith 10:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 5.5, SD = 1.76, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 5.4, SD = 2.09, N = 20), t(38) = .05, p = .94.

For Faith Composite (Faith 1 – Faith 10):
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 47.2, SD = 11.93, N = 19) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 48.7, SD = 12.76, N = 19), t(36) = -1.16, p = .77.
For Faith 11:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 5.8, SD = 1.41, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 5.5, SD = 1.67, N = 20), t(38) = .25, p = .61.

For Faith 12:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 5.9, SD = 1.21, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 5.5, SD = 1.64, N = 20), t(38) = .40, p = .39.

For Faith 13:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 6.6, SD = 1.35, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 6.6, SD = 1.15, N = 20), t(38) = .05, p = .90.

For Faith 14:
The mean measurement of faith using gender Male (M = 3.8, SD = 2.42, N = 20) was not significantly different from that using gender Female (M = 4.0, SD = 2.05, N = 20), t(38) = -.20, p = .78.
For Faith A:

The mean measurement of faith using gender Male ($M = 6.9$, $SD = .31$, $N = 20$) was not significantly different from that using gender Female ($M = 7.0$, $SD = .00$, $N = 20$), $t(38) = -.10$, $p = .15$.

For Faith B:

The mean measurement of faith using gender Male ($M = 6.2$, $SD = .99$, $N = 20$) was not significantly different from that using gender Female ($M = 6.5$, $SD = .94$, $N = 20$), $t(38) = -.30$, $p = .33$. 
### APPENDIX F

**STATISTICS**

**GROUP STATISTICS**

#### Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith 1</td>
<td>Male 20</td>
<td>5.1000</td>
<td>1.61897</td>
<td>.36201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 20</td>
<td>4.8500</td>
<td>1.95408</td>
<td>.43695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith 2</td>
<td>Male 20</td>
<td>5.1000</td>
<td>1.74416</td>
<td>.39001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 20</td>
<td>6.3000</td>
<td>1.26074</td>
<td>.28191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith 3</td>
<td>Male 20</td>
<td>5.6500</td>
<td>1.69442</td>
<td>.37888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 20</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>1.55597</td>
<td>.34793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith 4</td>
<td>Male 20</td>
<td>2.7500</td>
<td>1.77334</td>
<td>.39653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 20</td>
<td>3.0500</td>
<td>2.35025</td>
<td>.52553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith 5 Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.7500</td>
<td>1.80278</td>
<td>.40311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.6000</td>
<td>1.98415</td>
<td>.44367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith 6 Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4000</td>
<td>1.87504</td>
<td>.41927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.7000</td>
<td>1.52523</td>
<td>.34105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith 7 Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.5500</td>
<td>1.63755</td>
<td>.36617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.5500</td>
<td>1.57196</td>
<td>.35150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith 8 Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.2500</td>
<td>1.44641</td>
<td>.32343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.2000</td>
<td>1.64157</td>
<td>.36707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith 9 Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8947</td>
<td>2.40127</td>
<td>.55089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8947</td>
<td>2.37802</td>
<td>.54555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith 9رع Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.1053</td>
<td>2.40127</td>
<td>.55089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.1053</td>
<td>2.37802</td>
<td>.54555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith 10 Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4500</td>
<td>1.76143</td>
<td>.39387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4000</td>
<td>2.08756</td>
<td>.46679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith Composite Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.2105</td>
<td>11.92839</td>
<td>2.73656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.3684</td>
<td>12.76371</td>
<td>2.92820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith 11 Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.7500</td>
<td>1.40955</td>
<td>.31519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.5000</td>
<td>1.67017</td>
<td>.37346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith 12 Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.9000</td>
<td>1.20961</td>
<td>.27048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.5000</td>
<td>1.63836</td>
<td>.36635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith 13 Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6000</td>
<td>1.35336</td>
<td>.30262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.5500</td>
<td>1.14593</td>
<td>.25624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith 14 Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td>2.41922</td>
<td>.54095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>2.05196</td>
<td>.45883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith A Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.9000</td>
<td>.30779</td>
<td>.06882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith B Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.1500</td>
<td>.98809</td>
<td>.22094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.4500</td>
<td>.94451</td>
<td>.21120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>