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ABSTRACT

Socioeconomic status has been shown to have a pervasive impact on many aspects of an individual's life. However, while variables such as gender, age, ethnicity, and culture have been studied with regard to their effect on romantic love, little research has been conducted to determine if the all-encompassing construct of socioeconomic status also has an influence on romantic love. This study proposed to rectify this omission by asking respondents from various socioeconomic backgrounds to complete measures evaluating their experience of romantic love and their beliefs concerning romantic love. It was hypothesized that socioeconomic status would influence romantic love in specific linear directions. Though analyses provided no support for the stated hypotheses, they did suggest a possible curvilinear relationship between the two variables. Issues with the population sample are discussed together with ideas for future research.
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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

Romantic love, characterized by passion for another individual, has been studied in a variety of psychological domains generating a large volume of literature indicating the different ways individuals perceive and experience romantic love. From the initial distinction between liking and loving (Rubin, 1970), to the more comprehensive classifications of passionate and companionate love (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993) along with the unified theory of love schemas (Hatfield & Rapson, 1996), the scientific literature has illustrated the diversity in which people feel, think, and experience romantic love.

As there are many different types of love, it stands to reason that not everyone loves, feels love, or believes in love in the same way (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Many factors may play a part in determining why these discrepancies in the experience and beliefs of love arise. For example, researchers have examined how cultural membership and nationality can impact the experience of romantic love (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2002, p.359). Furthermore, much research has been conducted to ferret out supposed gender differences in romantic love (e.g., Sprecher & Toro-Morn, 2002; Davies, 2001; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1995). However, the all-important factor of socioeconomic status (SES) and its influence on romantic love has largely been ignored. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine how an individual’s resources, or lack thereof, complements or impedes upon their ability to love romantically and how SES may correlate with the individual’s beliefs about romantic love.
Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status (SES) has been defined in a variety of ways since Ward coined the term in 1883 (Oakes & Rossi, 2003). Notably, the definitions of SES usually include some information regarding the relative social standing of a person within their environment and is suitably described as “differential access to desired resources” (Oakes & Rossi, 2003). For example, researchers have argued that occupation, income, education (Duncan & Magnuson, 2002), neighborhood in which one lives (Muldoon & Trew, 2000; Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2002), community leadership roles, and material goods (Oakes & Rossi, 2003) can all be used to measure SES as these represent the basis from which to secure necessary and desired resources.

Though SES has not been widely studied in reference to romantic love, the influence of SES in other domains has been well established (Oakes & Rossi, 2003). For example, SES has been shown to negatively correlate with teen pregnancy (Belgrave, Marin, & Chambers, 2000), cardiovascular disease factors (Winkleby, Jatulis, Frank & Fortmann, 1992), children’s intellectual performance (Hoff, 2002; Gottfried, Gottfried, Bathurst, Guerin, & Parramore, 2002), and maladaptive behaviors (Muldoon & Trew, 2000).

Although the above effects of SES could be seen as tenuous links to how SES may influence romantic love (for instance, being pregnant at an earlier age may foster more pragmatism in romantic ideals), the influence of SES on expectations and aspirations in other domains may also shed some light onto how SES may relate to romantic love. Specifically, research carried out on educational aspirations and
expectations could illustrate how SES can affect both the beliefs and experience in a certain area of an individual's life.

Hanson (1994) and Marcus and Corsini (1978) found significant differences in the educational aspirations of adolescents and parents of preschoolers, respectively, as a function of SES. The researchers both concluded that individuals from lower SES backgrounds had significantly lower aspirations and expectations than their higher SES counterparts, irrespective of their abilities.

Though these findings do not necessarily prove lower SES individuals will have different aspirations and expectations of romantic love, they do hint at some possible differences that could be uncovered. For example, Hanson (1994) astutely remarked lower SES individuals had “universal high expectations” and eventual “cooling out of these aspirations”, whereas students with a higher SES upbringing did not experience the cooling out. It could be argued the “cooling out of these aspirations” might be the result of the children realizing the opportunities accessible to them were more limited as a consequence of their SES and so lowered their aspirations accordingly.

In relating these findings to romantic love, individuals from lower SES backgrounds may also start out with “universal high expectations” for their romantic relationships. However, after living in poorer neighborhoods and being witness to more divorce (Amato & Previti, 2003) and feeling the effects of absent parents (Piffner, McBurnett, & Rathouz, 2001), the individuals may become jaded from their experiences and consequently lower their expectations of romantic love, just as they disproportionately lowered their educational ambitions (Hanson, 1994).
Therefore, the question now is; if SES has been shown to relate to many important life domains, does SES also influence how a person experiences or perceives love? And if so, which types of romantic love and romantic beliefs are associated with the different SES?

*Passionate and Companionate Love*

Hatfield and Rapson's (1993) distinction between passionate and companionate is an often used classification to describe the emotion of romantic love (e.g., Kim & Hatfield, 2004; Hatfield, Brinton, & Cornelius, 1989; Doherty, Hatfield, Thompson, & Choo, 1994; Davies, 2001). It signifies the difference between the hot, intense passionate love that is often related to sexual desire (Hatfield, Rapson, & Martel, 2007) and the "heartier variety" of companionate love (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993) which is related to fondness (Fischer, Shaver, & Carnochan, 1990) and life satisfaction (Kim & Hatfield, 2004).

Not only does this classification provide two types of love that are conceptually distinct from one another, the classification also provides a way in which to investigate possible explanations for why people experience love differently. Specifically, Hatfield and colleagues (e.g., Hatfield et al., 1989; Hatfield et al., 2007; Kim & Hatfield, 2004; Choo, Levine & Hatfield, 1996;) have examined, and concluded that, a variety of variables, including ethnicity, culture, age, and gender may exert "a profound influence on how people view love, how susceptible they are to falling in love, and how passionate affairs work out" (Hatfield & Rapson, 1996, p. 11). However, in detailing these possible influences the authors failed to mention SES and its possible effects.
Nevertheless, how SES might influence both passionate and companionate love can be gleaned from some of the literature. For instance, Hatfield et al. (1989) alluded to the potential influence of SES on romantic love when they studied the relationship between passionate love and anxiety in young adolescents. They found adolescents who were either high in trait or state anxiety were more susceptible to passionate love, reasoning that fear and anxiety creates a desire to be affiliated with others. Since lower SES individuals tend to live in poorer, more criminal neighborhoods (Muldoon & Trew, 2000), these environments may help develop more anxiety and fear in individuals, and as "passionate love is fueled by anxiety and fear" (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993, p. 48), these environments could make the individuals more prone to passionate love.

In contrast to the "long and nearly universal history" of passionate love (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993, p. 34), companionate love has been proposed to be more of a modern commodity coming to consciousness after the Industrial Revolution (Stone, 1977). Stone (1977) proposes the harsh conditions encountered prior to the revolution were not conducive to the more intimate feelings characterized by companionate love. With the advent of industry, more resources were made available to more of the population resulting in an increase in living standards that Stone contends promoted closer, more intimate relationships. Therefore, Stone’s assertion suggests that the resources an individual has access to may influence the experience of companionate love. Thus, SES may relate to both companionate love (positively correlated) and passionate love (negatively correlated).
Love Schemas

Using Bowlby’s (1973) attachment theory, Hazan and Shaver (1987) suggested that individuals may possess different love schemas (mental representations of love). Specifically, they classified the experience and beliefs of love into attachment styles (Secure, Ambivalent, and Anxious). In an attempt to integrate the various models of attachment (Bowlby, 1973; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), Hatfield and Rapson (1996, p.74) argued that people fall into six love schema categories, distinguished by how comfortable they are with independence and closeness in relationships. They identified the following schemas: the Secure (those comfortable with both independence and closeness), the Skittish (those who are independent but feel smothered when relationships get too close), the Fickle (those who are never satisfied with what they have got), the Clingy (who desire a great deal of closeness), the Casual (those who do not invest time or effort into their relationships), and the Uninterested (people who are not interested in any romantic relationship).

To verify that these love schemas are indeed distinct from each other and do relate to the experience of love, Doherty and colleagues (1994) correlated the schemas with both the Passionate Love Scale and the Companionate Love Scale. They found the schemas correlated predictably with passionate love in that Clingy lovers scored the highest (as these were the ones who idealized their partners and yearned for the hot and intense passionate love); the Secure and the Fickle received intermediate scores; and the Skittish (as they fear getting too involved in relationships) scored the lowest. Furthermore, companionate love correlated with the schemas in the expected way: the
Secure had the highest score on the Companionate Love Scale (as these individuals trusted and respected their partner); the Skittish, the Casual, the Fickle, and the Uninterested (who all would probably not enter a successful serious relationship) reported the lowest scores.

As the thoughts and ideas about love do correlate well with the experience of love, understanding how love schemas develop is integral to understanding the experience of love. Therefore, when classifying the different love schemas, Hazan and Shaver (1987) proposed an explanation for why certain love schemas are endorsed. They explained that people hold different beliefs and expectations for love as a consequence of previous relationships.

Though all relationships affect future relationships to some degree, the attachment one forms with their parent/guardian as an infant is often cited as being the most important in shaping future relationships (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2007). According to Bowlby’s (1973) attachment theory, it is with this caregiver an individual learns whether they can trust, get support from, and feel secure in the presence of others. If the caregiver does provide these conditions, the infant will become secure in their relationships as adults. Conversely, if the caregiver is absent, unresponsive, moody, or withholding, the infant may not trust or feel safe with others and so become ambivalent or anxious about other relationships, leading them to possess one of the insecure love schemas (Birnbaum, Reis, Mikulincer, Gillath, & Orpaz, 2006).

As an individual’s environment, both growing up and as an adult is dependent upon their SES, the attachment of a child along with the associated love schema exhibited
as an adult may be influenced by their SES. Thus, if an individual grows up in a poorer neighborhood, surrounded by daily violence, without the presence of both parents, they may not develop a secure attachment or love schema. Instead, as they may be fearful about their situation and may not get to trust or feel love from many people, the individual with a low SES may be more susceptible to developing an insecure attachment, which could then translate into an insecure love schema in their romantic relationships. Conversely, those with higher SES may be more likely to have a secure relationship as they are more likely to have matured in safer environments more conducive to the promotion of secure attachments.

Romantic Beliefs

Along with differences in the experience of love and attachment within relationships, individuals also tend to accept particular romantic notions to varying extents. For instance, Sprecher and Taro-Morn (2002) have investigated how much different people (namely how different genders and races) believe in the romantic ideals. These ideals were: (1) the belief their partner is their one and only (there is only one true love), (2) love at first sight (love is possible soon after meeting), (3) love finds a way (love overcomes any obstacles), and (4) the idealization of their partner and relationship (both are perfect) (Sprecher and Metts, 1989). Interestingly, they found that just as individuals exhibit different love styles and experience passionate and companionate love to varying extents, different groups (gender and races) of people also have significantly different ideas about romance.
As personal characteristics such as gender and race have been shown to influence romantic beliefs, then the income, education, community in which they live, and the social roles an individual has, may also dictate how romantic he or she is. For example, having more resources effects your expectations in life (Hanson, 1994) and as a result may induce you to expect more in romance as well. Thus, just as SES may affect love schemas, and passionate and companionate love, this “all encompassing construct” (Gottfried, et al., 2002), has also been examined to find out how opportunities for social and economic resources may help to shape romantic beliefs.

Previous related research

Though the specific relationship between SES and romantic love has not been scrutinized in the literature, previous investigations into other variables and their effects on romantic love could be explained by the influence of SES. Notably, the proposed cultural/ethnic differences (Levinger, 1994) and gender differences (Kim & Hatfield, 2004) in romantic love could be argued to have arisen as a difference in SES rather than gender or culture.

Culture. Some researchers have proposed membership in certain cultural groups or ethnicities may affect the perception and experience of love (e.g., Hatfield & Rapson, 1996; Levinger, 1994). However, when examining the effects of culture, the findings have been very inconsistent with some studies finding no cultural differences (e.g., Kim & Hatfield, 2004; Doherty et al., 1994), whereas others have concluded culture to be an integral factor in how “love is experienced, expressed, and remembered” (Levinger, 1994). Therefore, deciphering whether culture influences love is particularly
troublesome. However if one considers the participants’ SES rather than their culture, these inconsistencies may be better explained.

As SES differs between nations, and individuals within cultures/ethnic groups vary enormously in regards to their SES, perhaps the mixed results are illustrative of these SES differences rather than cultural differences. For example, when cultural differences are found, perhaps it is because the people being compared are representative of their cultures’ SES (e.g., an average person from a poorer culture differs from an average person from a wealthier culture). Conversely, if no cultural differences are found, perhaps the participants’ are not representative of their cultures’ SES. For example, a wealthy university student from a poorer culture may be very similar to an average person from a wealthier culture, thus illustrating no “cultural” differences. Therefore, whereas cultural membership struggles to explain the mixed results, SES could explain both the lack of evidence, and support for, supposed “cultural” differences.

**Gender.** Similarly to cultural/ethnic differences, many researchers have proposed gender to be an important influence on romantic love (Kim & Hatfield, 2004), but again, evidence for the differences are somewhat mixed. Some have found no gender differences in love (e.g., Sprecher & Toro-Morn, 2002), whereas others have found significant differences in the level of romanticism (Sprecher & Metts, 1999), and the experience of companionate and passionate love (Kim & Hatfield, 2004).

As “cultural” differences could be argued to be a consequence of SES, “gender” differences could also be more indicative of the influence of SES rather than any gender effects. Indeed, when investigating gender differences and social desirability in love
styles, Davis (2001) noted any gender differences found might actually be the function of what he termed “economic subsistence” rather than gender. He suggested men and women may differ in the way they love, not because of their sex, but because they normally differ in their SES.

Furthermore, adding to Dion and Dion’s (1985) hypothesis, Davis (2001) reasoned individuals with more resources would not need a partner to improve their life as they are already self-sufficient. Instead, when looking for love, those with more resources (usually males) are free to be more idealistic in their choices of love. Conversely, according to Davis (2001), lower SES individuals (usually females) will look for partners who can improve their life by providing more resources and would therefore be more pragmatic and perhaps, as a result, be less romantic in their love choices than their wealthier counterparts.

Though Davis’ (2001) investigation did provide a stimulating explanation for hypothesized differences in romantic love between the two genders, the study did not actually examine the variable of SES or what Davis termed “economic subsistence”. However, a study that did touch upon how SES may be related to love was Sprecher and Toro-Morn’s (2002) examination into the beliefs of romantic relationships and love styles.

The study primarily explored gender differences within love styles and romantic beliefs. However, the authors also inspected how other “social groups”, in particular one’s racial and SES affiliation may influence love. Intriguingly, whereas the researchers concluded gender to be “overrated as a social group membership variable” in influencing
romance, social class (SES) was found to have a significant main effect for five of the relationship beliefs examined. Notably, middle/upper classes scored significantly higher on Sprecher and Metts (1989) Total Romanticism Scale and the Idealization component of romanticism, than their lower class counterparts, indicating higher SES groups were more romantic and more idealistic in love.

Although Sprecher and Toro-Morn’s (2002) research seems to establish a link between SES and romance, a methodological flaw when evaluating SES limits any conclusions that can be drawn. Specifically, to record social class, the participants were asked to self-select into the group that resembled their parental family during their adolescent and teenage years (the options were: upper, upper-middle, middle, lower-middle, working, and lower classes).

Though SES is a notoriously difficult variable to measure (Duncan & Magnuson, 2002; Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2002), the authors relied on the individuals to self-select into groups. This technique is known to have problems (e.g., would respondents know what ‘social class’ is? Were they embarrassed to report their true class in fear of being looked down on or being seen as pretentious?). Nor did the authors opt to utilize any other objective measure that could have lent more credence to their findings, such as Duncan’s Socio-Economic Index (Nakao & Treas, 1992). Irrespective of this methodological drawback, taken with Davis’ (2001) explanations for potential gender differences in love, Sprecher and Toro-Morn’s study (2002) suggests further investigation into the relationship between SES and romantic love may yield some noteworthy results.
Therefore, the important factors that have been previously studied in regards to love (culture, ethnicity, and gender) have not conclusively been linked to the experience or beliefs of romantic love. Instead, it is argued that SES may provide a better way of explaining these potential differences in romantic love. Nevertheless, interactions between these factors may also provide an illuminating explanation for the differences, thus this study was alert to any potential effects or interactions between gender, ethnicity, place of residence when growing up, and SES on romantic love.

Present Study

SES is an extremely broad construct that could conceivably affect the experience of romantic love through many mediating and moderating variables. Though we do not detail the exact pathways of how SES relates to romantic love, the fact that the construct is so pervasive in other areas of life, tempts us to posit some hypotheses about how SES may relate to the beliefs and experience of romantic love.

For example, higher status individuals, having resources in more abundance are more likely to live in safe neighborhoods, have access to better health care, have a better education, have a brighter outlook on life due to the opportunities afforded to them at all ages, and have a closer relationship to both their parents. These factors can all be thought of as products of an individual’s SES and probably affect romantic love in some way. Thus SES may have an overall effect on romantic love for a variety of reasons. Now let us turn to our hypotheses.
Hypotheses

**H1 Passionate Love.** Individuals with lower SES are more likely to experience passionate love.

**H2 Companionate Love.** Individuals with higher SES are more likely to experience companionate love.

**H3 Love Schemas. Secure.** Those with higher SES are expected to possess a more Secure type of schema in their romantic relationships.

**H4 Love Schemas. Fickle, Clingy, Skittish, Uninterested, Casual.** Those with lower SES are more likely to endorse the insecure and uninterested schemas.

**H5 Romantic Beliefs.** Those with higher SES are more likely to believe in all of the concepts cataloged by Sprecher and Metts (1989) (Love at first sight; One and Only Love; Idealization of partner and relationship; Love finds a way).

**Gender and Ethnicity.** Although gender, ethnicity and place of residence may shape people’s views of love, have an impact on SES, or interact with SES, no specific hypotheses for these factors were proposed.

**Purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent SES is related to the possession of different romantic love schemas (Hatfield & Rapson, 1996), and the intensity to which people experience Passionate and Companionate love (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993). As SES may also relate to the extent to which people assume romantic beliefs, such as those outlined by Sprecher and Metts (1989), to be true, romantic beliefs were also examined in relation to individual’s SES.
CHAPTER 2
Method

Participants

Participants (N = 299) were recruited from lower level psychology undergraduate courses from the University of Hawai’i education system. These participants were selected as they represented a wide range of SES backgrounds, were old enough to consent, and were old enough to have potentially experienced romantic love and formed ideas about romance. Participants were compensated with extra credit in exchange for participating in the study. As twenty participants failed to complete the entire survey, data from 279 participants were used as the study sample (200 women and 79 men). The mean age of the participants was 20.70 years (SD = 4.017), and the majority were raised in Hawai’i (59.1%; n = 165), with 31.2% from the U.S. mainland (n = 87), and 9.7% from a foreign nation (n = 27). The ethnicity of the sample was diverse and comprised of 29.7% of the participants indicating they were of Mixed ethnicity (n = 88), 23.7% Caucasian (n = 66), 19.4% Japanese (n = 54), 8.6% Filipino (n = 24), 7.9% Chinese (n = 22), 4.7% Korean (n = 13), 1.8% Pacific Islander (n = 5), 1.8% Other (e.g., Native American, Alaskan Native) (n = 5), 0.7% African American (n = 2), 0.7% Hawaiian (n = 2), 0.7% Hispanic (n = 2), and 0.4% Vietnamese (n = 1).

Design and Procedures

Following approval from the University of Hawai’i Institutional Review Board, students enrolled in undergraduate psychology courses were asked to participate in the online study in exchange for an opportunity to gain experience in psychology and to
further social psychology knowledge, whilst also earning extra course credit to be added to their final grade.

The survey was administered online as online questionnaires have been shown not to drastically differ from the more traditional paper and pencil tests historically employed by psychologists (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava & John, 2004). Although higher social classes are overrepresented in Internet studies, samples have been shown to include people from a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds that are probably not accessed from traditional methods (Gosling et al. 2004). Therefore, as online surveys have been argued to be “more user friendly” than traditional pen and paper methods (Burgess, Donnelly, Dillard & Davis, 2001), we put the survey online where it was accessed by many students from a wide range of SES backgrounds.

After logging onto the website, which was provided to them by their professors, the participants confirmed they were over 18 years of age and electronically signed the consent form. The participants printed the consent form and gave it to their professor, who used it to appropriate extra credit.

Following the consent form, the participants completed the demographic questions, the SES questions, the Passionate Love Scale, Companionate Love Scale, the Romantic Beliefs Scale, and the Love Schema Scale (see Appendix A). The four SES questions (SEL, household income, and the two parental educations) were included in the demographic questions asking for the participants’ age, gender, ethnicity, and place of residence when growing up, so as to address those variables that may influence the correlations. After completing the entire survey, the participants were redirected to a
webpage thanking them for their time and contribution. Contact information for the primary investigator of the study was also given to the participants in case they had any questions or comments regarding the study.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire. Participants were asked to complete questions regarding their age, gender, ethnicity, and place of residence where they grew up (Hawaii, U.S. Mainland, or foreign nation). This data was collected to identify other potential influential variables not addressed in the research question.

Socioeconomic Economic Index (SEI). Although there are various measures of SES in the literature, this study employed an updated version of Duncan’s (1961) original SEI (Nakao & Treas, 1992). The participants were asked to indicate, from an expansive list, the occupation of the person most financially responsible for them when they were growing up. If the occupation was not listed, participants were asked to type the occupation in the available space.

The occupation given provided a prestige score garnered from the SEI. The Nakao and Treas (1992) revised scores have been derived from over a thousand respondents’ evaluations of 503 occupations and have been very highly correlated with the three previous SEI, with coefficients between .93 and .97. Also, the SEI has been correlated with other prestige scores reaching coefficients of .84 to .89 (Nakao & Treas, 1992) illustrating that the measure evaluates prestige in addition to other constructs such as income and education.
As described above, SES can be comprised of many factors. However, by assigning participants a prestige score for the occupation of the person who was financially responsible for them, it was hoped that this score represented the participants’ SES as well. The prestige of an occupation takes into consideration the education required to get the job, the income generated from it, and how it is valued by society. Thus, this measure taps into many of the important components that illustrate a person’s ability to obtain resources and therefore represents a person’s SES. Not only this, since the information can be garnered from only one face valid question, this measure of SES is not subjected to potential fatigue and non-response issues other measures tend to encounter (see Hoffman, 2002; Duncan & Magnuson, 2002; and Muldoon & Trew, 2000, for discussion).

The occupation of the person who was financially responsible for the participant as a child was obtained as this has been highly correlated with their own future occupation (Duncan & Magnuson, 2002). Additionally, the occupation of the person who was financially responsible for the participants during their childhood also illustrates, to some extent, the participants’ access to resources during their formative years, and this in turn may have influenced their experiences and beliefs of love that they hold today.

*Education and income measures.* Heeding Winkleby and colleagues’ (1992) warning that SES is a highly complex phenomenon, and “using only one indicator of SES may yield misleading results or provide less information than using multiple measures”, the respondents were also asked to indicate the highest level of education both their parents attained and the household income per year during childhood. As education and
income are often noted as the most influential contributors to an individual’s SES, with these measures we hoped to provide a more in depth picture of how SES affects love while also giving feedback to how well the SEI measure taps into both these factors.

Household income was measured by asking the participants to indicate which income bracket their childhood household was best represented by. The household income brackets, taken from U.S. Census Bureau (2006), are depicted with their frequencies in Appendix B, Figure 1.

Parents’ education was assessed by asking the participants to note what level of education both their parents received. The specific levels were chosen as they are common categories (e.g., U.S. Census Bureau, 2006) and their frequencies are illustrated in Figures 2 and 3 in Appendix B.

Love measures

*Passionate Love Scale (PLS)*. Participants were asked to complete Hatfield and Sprecher’s (1986) Passionate Love Scale. The fifteen questions included in the scale were designed to indicate the extent to which respondents long for union with their partner or ex-partner by examining the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components of passionate love using a 9 point Likert scale (1 = Not at all true, 9 = Definitely true). The scores from these questions were combined to generate a total passionate love score, with a higher score indicating a more passionate experience of love.

Previously in determining the reliability of the measure, Hatfield and Sprecher (1986) concluded that it “is a highly reliable scale”, with a coefficient alpha of .91. In addition, in establishing the convergent and discriminant validity, the PLS was
significantly correlated with other measures of love and intimacy (Rubin’s “Love” scale, commitment satisfaction, and sexual satisfaction) more than scales which measure other theoretically different constructs (Rubin’s “Liking” scale and “Trust” scale). The scale has also been shown to have good external validity as it has been completed by a variety of people from different ethnic backgrounds (Doherty, et al., 1994) and through a wide range of age groups including young adolescents (Hatfield et al., 1989), college aged students (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986), and older women (Hatfield, Traupmann-Pillemer, & Sprecher, 1984). Thus, it is suggested the PLS is both a valid and reliable scale. In the present study the coefficient alpha was reported as .94.

Companionate Love Scale (CLS). In contrast to the PLS, the CLS (Sternberg, 1986) was completed by the participants to enquire about the respondents’ commitment and intimacy feelings for their partner or ex-partner. The scale comprised of five commitment questions and six intimacy questions. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which the questions were true of them utilizing a nine point Likert scale (1 = Not at all true, 9 = Extremely true of me).

To establish reliability and validity of this scale, Sternberg (1997) conducted two studies. In these studies, it was found that the scale has an overall coefficient alpha reliability of .97. Again, to establish convergent and discriminant validity, correlations with Rubin’s Love, Rubin’s Liking, and Rubin’s Satisfaction scales were obtained resulting in .60, .70, and .76 respectively. The coefficient alpha for the present study was .96.
Love Schemas. In order to classify the participants’ experiences in love, Hatfield and Rapson’s (1996) Love Schema Scale (LSS) representing their unified theory of love schemas was administered. Instead of conceptualizing attachment as a typology or a categorical construct and measuring the schemas with one statement as was done in the past (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993), the participants were given 26 statements, corresponding to the continuous variables of the six adult attachment styles (Secure = 4 statements; Skittish = 3; Clingy = 5; Fickle = 4; Casual = 4; Uninterested = 6). The participants were asked to consider how strongly they agreed with each one using a Likert Scale of 1 = “Disagree Strongly” to 7 = “Strongly Agree”.

The psychometric properties of this multi-item measure have been evaluated by Stephan, Singelis, Bachman, and Choo (1999). After numerous studies to establish the best items for each love schema, the final LSS, consisting of six intercorrelated but separate constructs measured by 26 statements, was shown to have good to excellent internal consistency (Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged from .79 to .85).

The scale’s convergent and divergent validity has also previously been assessed by comparing the measure to the related scales of Brennan and Shaver’s (1995) dimensions of adult attachment, along with Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) attachment styles scale. The measure demonstrated “excellent preliminary convergent and discriminant validity”, with each schema correlating with the other measures in expected ways. In addition to the good internal consistency and excellent validity, Stephan and colleagues (1999) found LSS to have good to acceptable test-retest
reliability, with scores ranging from .66 to .83. Alpha reliability for the present study ranged from .75 (Casual) to .91 (Uninterested).

Romantic Beliefs Scale (RBS). To assess the participants' beliefs regarding romantic love, Sprecher and Metts' (1989) 15-item Romantic Beliefs Scale was administered. The 15 items were divided into four subscales of romantic love beliefs: Love finds a way (and overcomes obstacles); One and only (there is only one true love); Idealization (partner and relationship are perfect); and Love at first sight (love is possible soon after meeting).

To represent each of the subscales, the respondents, on a seven point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”, identified how much they agreed with statements such as “If I love someone, I know I can make the relationship work, despite any obstacles”, (Love finds a way); “I believe that to be truly in love is to be in love forever”, (One and only); “The relationship I will have with my ‘true love’ will be nearly perfect”, (Idealization); and “I am likely to fall in love immediately if I meet the right person”, (Love at first sight).

In addition to the subscales (six items for Love finds a way and three items for the other dimensions), the RBS total score mean was computed to generate a statistic that represents an overall level of belief in romantic love. Therefore, to represent the participants' romantic beliefs, the RBS produced five statistics with higher scores indicating more romanticism.

The alpha coefficients for the total score have been identified as ranging from .76 to .81 (Sprecher & Toro-Morn, 2002), with the subscales ranging from .56 (Love at first
sight) to .82 (One and only) (Sprecher & Metts, 1999). In this study the alpha coefficient reached .86 for the entire survey, and the subscales ranged from .46 (Love at first sight) to .82 (Love can overcome obstacles). Test-retest reliability for all the scores of the RBS have also been measured by Sprecher and Metts (1999) and the correlations between time 1 and 2 (6 months apart) ranged from $r = .47$ for Love at first sight to $r = .72$ for Idealization.
Data management

The participants' data was exported from the website (www.surveymonkey.com) into Microsoft Excel where each of the measures used was reduced in the following way. For the PLS and CLS scales, the numeric points selected for the respective 15 and 11 questions, were summed giving a total score for each of the scales ranging between 15 to 135 for the PLS, and 11 to 99 for the CLS. With respect to the LSS, the mean of the individual’s agreement to the statements representing each of the six love schemas was calculated yielding a statistic ranging between 1 and 7 for all six schemas. The RBS was similarly reduced yielding an average score between 1 and 7 for the four Romantic Beliefs and a total Romantic Belief score. For the SEI statistic, the occupation given by the participant was checked against the list of SEI of occupations (Nakao & Treas, 1992). Scores ranged from 28.58 (Construction laborers) to 97.16 (Physician).

Statistical Analyses

For all the statistical analyses, data was exported from Microsoft Excel to the statistical software, SPSS version 15 for Windows.

Measure checks. To ensure the SES measures used in the study were tapping into the same proposed construct, Spearman correlations were obtained to examine the extent of relatedness between the SES measures. All four measures (SEI score, household income, paternal education, and maternal education) were significantly correlated with one another at $p < .05$ (see Table 1 in Appendix B for correlational data). The love measures were also correlated and are depicted in Table 2 in Appendix B.
Hypotheses Testing

**H1 Passionate Love.** The first hypothesis predicted that individuals with lower SES would have experienced more passionate love than their higher SES counterparts and therefore would report a higher score on the PLS.

Pearson ($r$) and Spearman ($r_s$) correlations were conducted to test the relationship between the dependent variable of the PLS score and the four independent SES variables and were as follows: household income, $r_s = .020, p = .743$; paternal education, $r_s = -.059, p = .327$; maternal education, $r_s = -.049, p = .419$; and SEI, $r = .019, p = .747$, all $ns$.

Analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) were conducted on the categorical SES measures (household income, paternal education and maternal education) to identify any differences between the mean scores of the PLS after removing some of the variability due to the other independent factors measured (age, gender, ethnicity, and the place of residence when growing up). No significant difference was found due to household income, $F(5, 273) = 1.801, ns$, nor maternal education, $F(6, 272) = 1.173, ns$. However, paternal education, $F(6, 272) = 2.643, p = .017$ was found to contribute to the experience of passionate love. As there was a significant interaction with gender and paternal education, $F(6, 272) = 3.613, p = .002$, further analyses discovered paternal education was only significant in influencing male's passionate love scores, $F(6, 78) = 4.420, p = .001$. No clear trend was established, as can be seen in Figure 4, Appendix B.

A multiple regression was conducted on the dependent variable of passionate love with the demographic variables and the SEI as predictor variables. Of interest to this
hypotheses, SEI did not significantly predict the passionate love score $\beta = .016$, $t(273) = .79$, ns.

**H2 Companionate Love.** It was predicted that those with higher SES would have more experience in companionate love and therefore score higher on the CLS. The same analyses employed for the first hypothesis (correlations, ANCOVAs and multiple regression) were also used to examine the relationship of the SES measures on another dependent variable, CLS.

Household income was not found to be significantly correlated with CLS, $r_s = .003$, $p = .956$, ns, and neither was paternal education, $r_s = -.044$, $p = .469$, ns, nor maternal education, $r_s = -.058$, $p = .332$, ns, nor SEI, $r = .021$, $p = .722$, ns.

ANCOVAs conducted to test the hypothesis also yielded non-significant results: household income, $F(5, 273) = 1.378$, ns, paternal education, $F(6, 272) = 1.383$, ns, maternal education, $F(6, 272) = .1159$, ns. A multiple regression exploring the relationship between SEI and Companionate Love yielded non-significant results; $\beta = .327$, $t(273) = .744$, ns.

**H3 Love Schemas. Secure.** It was proposed that individuals with higher SES would possess a more Secure type of schema in their romantic relationships. Correlations between the SES measures and the Secure love schema were; household income $r_s = -.046$, $p = .446$ ns; paternal education, $r_s = -.046$, $p = .441$ ns; maternal education, $r_s = -.085$, $p = .156$, ns; SEI, $r = .000$, $p = .998$, ns.

Analyses using ANCOVA revealed a significant relationship between the household income and the Secure love schema when partialing out variance from the
demographic factors, $F(5, 273) = 2.557, p = .028$. In addition, gender interacted with household income, $F(5, 273) = 2.316, p = .044$, and it was found that males' endorsement of the Secure love schema items was significantly influenced by their household income but female scores were not, $F(6, 78) = 3.792, p = .004$. The significant differences are shown in Figure 5, Appendix B, and no discernable trend can be seen. Paternal education, $F(6, 272) = .736$ and maternal education, $F(6, 272) = 1.148$, did not have a significant influence on the Secure love type. A multiple regression did not find SEI to be a predictor of the Secure love schema, $\beta = -.009, t(273) = .880, ns$

**H4 Love Schemas. Fickle, Clingy, Skittish, Uninterested, Casual.** In this hypothesis it was predicted that individuals with lower SES would be more likely to endorse the insecure and uninterested schemas. Although for the majority of the analyses no significant results were found, a contradictory result to the hypothesis was found in the relationship between the Fickle love schema and three of the SES measures. Paternal education was positively correlated with the Fickle love schema $r_s = .151, p = .011$; as was maternal education, $r_s = .140, p = .019$; and SEI, $r = .150, p = .012$. An example of the relationship between the three SES measures and the Fickle love schema is illustrated in Figure 6, Appendix B.

Further analyses using the ANCOVA technique found that paternal education significantly accounted for the differences in the mean agreement to the Clingy love schema, $F(6, 272) = 3.740, p = .001$. Again, there was an interaction between this love and gender, $F(6, 272) = 2.174, p = .046$, and further investigation revealed male Clingy scores to be significantly related to father's education, $F(6, 78) = 4.037, p = .002$. This
significant relationship also showed no explicit trend, as can be seen in Figure 7, Appendix B.

Additional ANCOVAs were conducted to examine if the SES measures accounted for any differences in the extent the other insecure love schemas were endorsed by the participants, all were ns.

Multiple regressions were conducted on the love schema dependent variables to examine the proportion of variance predicted by the SEI measure. The only significant result using this technique was found for the Fickle love schema, $R^2 = .047, F(5, 273) = 2.716, p = .020$, with the SEI $\beta = .159, t(273) = .008$.

**H5 Romantic Beliefs.** The final hypothesis asserted that higher SES individuals would be more likely to concur with all of the beliefs cataloged by Sprecher and Metts (1989) (Love at First Sight; One and Only Love; Idealization of Partner and Relationship; Love Finds a Way). Using correlational, ANCOVAs, and multiple regression techniques, only one significant relationship was found: paternal education was significantly related to the belief that love finds a way, $F(6, 278) = 2.489, p = .023$, most notably for males, $F(6, 78) = 4.277, p = .001$. The direction of this relationship is depicted in Figure 8, Appendix B.

**Supplemental analyses.** Further analyses were conducted in order to investigate the possibility that a curvilinear relationship existed between SES and romantic love. Though these analyses provided little support for such a relationship between the SES measures of household income, paternal education, and SEI with any of the romantic love measures, the weighted trend analyses of quadratic effects revealed a strong support for a curvilinear relationship between maternal education and nearly half of the romantic love
measures. The significant results suggest the participants' with mothers who attained the lowest and the highest education levels were more passionate, clingy, and believed in the majority of romantic beliefs significantly more than the participants' whose mothers were mid educated. Table 3 in Appendix B details the significant trend analyses and Figures 9 through 14 graphically illustrate some of the revealing curvilinear relationships found.
CHAPTER 4.
DISCUSSION

Previous research concerning romantic love has focused on differences in the experience and beliefs of this type of love due to age (e.g., Hatfield et al., 1989), gender (e.g., Hendrick & Hendrick, 1995), and ethnicity (e.g., Doherty, et al., 1994), yet only a few rare studies have considered the possibility that an individual’s socioeconomic status (SES) may also influence romantic love (e.g., Davies, 2001; Sprecher & Toro-Morn, 2002). Furthermore, the scarce studies which did suggest a possible SES influence on romantic love either did not measure their hypotheses directly (Davies, 2001), or only employed a single, two-category, measure of SES (high vs. low class) rather than a variety of more robust SES measures (Sprecher & Toro-Morn, 2002). This study attempted to test the prediction that the SES of an individual would account for some of the variance in the experience and thoughts of romantic love by using various statistical analyses to explore relationships between four measures of SES and 13 dimensions of romantic love.

The hypotheses of the study predicted: (H1) passionate love would be negatively correlated with SES; (H2) companionate love would be positively correlated with SES; (H3) the Secure love schema would be positively correlated with SES; (H4) the other five, insecure, love schemas would be negatively correlated with SES; and finally (H5) agreement to the Romantic Beliefs would be positively correlated with SES. Following numerous analyses, none of the hypotheses received support. Nevertheless, supplemental analyses did provide some interesting significant results that were not predicted in the study but may be important in uncovering a relationship between SES and romantic love.
Although the stated hypotheses were not supported in this study, significant differences were found in the experience of passionate love, the Clingy love schema, and Love Finds A Way across different levels of paternal education for males (though not females) in the sample. This may suggest that the education of a boy’s father may play a role in how that boy views certain kinds of love. However, due to the small number of males indicating their father’s education was “Some high school” \( (n = 5) \), the fact there was no trend to the results (see Figures 4, 7 and 8 in Appendix B), and no relationships between the other measures of SES suggests these relationships may just be anomalies. In addition, the significant finding that household income influences males’ Secure schema may also be an artificial result due to the same reasoning (see Figure 5).

A more robust finding in the study concerned the Fickle schema. Though \( H4 \) predicted a negative correlation between the Fickle schema and SES, it was found that the Fickle love type, characterized by individuals who are never comfortable with what they have, was significantly correlated with all but one of the SES measures in a positive direction when using simple correlations. Furthermore, a multiple regression indicated SEI predicted a significant proportion of the variance of the Fickle love schema which suggests there may, in fact, be a positive relationship between the Fickle love schema and SES. Thus, the significant relationships found in this investigation seem to imply higher SES individuals may be more fickle in their mental representations of love than their lower SES counterparts.

Given the finding of a relationship between the Fickle love type and three of the SES measures was contradictory to the hypothesis stated, a post-hoc explanation for the
relationship could be offered. It is possible that individuals who are high in SES have access to more resources (Oakes & Rossi, 2003) and so have more options available to them in a wider variety of domains. Having these choices may make the individual less sure of what they have and what they want, resulting in these individuals always looking for something different and never being satisfied with what they have in life in general, and specifically, for this argument, never satisfied with their romantic love. Conversely, lower SES individuals may feel limited in their choices and so become contented with what they have, thus they exhibit less fickle tendencies than the higher SES individuals.

Though the above findings were interesting, fascinating results were uncovered when supplemental analyses were conducted. Specifically, trend analyses revealed maternal education to be significantly related to passionate love, the Clingy love schema, and four of the five Romantic Beliefs. Participants whose mother had either the lowest or highest levels of education (some high school/high school graduate and Doctorate, respectively) reported higher scores on the six romantic love scales whereas the mid section of the maternal education (some college to Masters degree) scored significantly lower, indicating a significant curvilinear relationship (see Figures 9 through 14, Appendix B).

Being the “most frequently used SES measure in the literature” (Ensminger & Fothergill, 2002), maternal education seems to be regarded as one of the better ways to tap into SES. Therefore, to have maternal education so robustly related to the love measures, in particular romantic beliefs, is promising and deserving of more research.
Though this future research will hopefully explore the relationship much further, speculations regarding the findings of this study can be given.

Mothers who left high school before graduating and mothers who have Doctorates may differ in many ways, but they also may share an experience that may influence their children's romantic love; they both may be required to spend more time at work rather than with their children compared to their mid-educated counterparts. For example, mothers with little education may only qualify to perform menial, low paying jobs and therefore have to work more hours to make ends meet. Highly educated mothers, on the other hand, may have competitive, highly paid jobs that require them to work many hours to keep the prestigious job. In comparison, mothers who fall into the middle of the education brackets may be employed in occupations that pay fairly well but do not require them to be at work all the time.

As the lowest and highest educated mothers may have the most time-demanding occupations, they may be more absent in their child's life when they are growing up. Therefore, these children may yearn for more time and affection compared to the children whose mothers have mid-level educations/jobs and who had more time to spend with their children. As they do not get the time and affection from their mothers, the children may think a romantic relationship will bring them the closeness they want. Thus, in romantic relationships, when these children are adults they are more passionate about their partner, more clingy, and tend to believe in romance to a higher extent.

Furthermore, a mother's education and related occupation may also influence their own anxiety levels and perhaps even their marital relationship. As there are theories
about how parent’s relationships influence their children’s future relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987), it is conceivable that maternal education level, through many possible pathways (e.g., parents’ relationship satisfaction, time spent away from the home, stressful environments) may influence their children’s experiences and beliefs in romantic love. Nevertheless, it is imperative to remember this is purely speculation and it is necessary for more extensive research to be carried out to determine how a mother’s education influences her occupation and how this influences her time spent with her children which in turn may influence her child’s romantic love experiences and beliefs later in life.

Therefore, although the above relationships uncovered in this investigation lends credence to the thought that SES has a pervasive influence on many important aspects of individual lives (e.g., Hanson, 1994; Hoff, 2002), including romantic love, none of the study’s specific hypotheses were supported. Given the abundance of non-significant findings, the most parsimonious explanation for the results would be that the study’s hypotheses were simply incorrect. However, other extraneous factors affecting this particular study could also have hindered the study’s ability to support the hypotheses. 

Limitations of the Study

Though the population used for this investigation was diverse in some respects, for example there were many ethnicities represented and a range of SES was illustrated by the measures, it was still a relatively homogeneous sample of college students. As college students are not representative of the entire population in terms of age,
socioeconomic status, future expectations of SES, and experience with love, the external validity and generalizability of this study is limited.

Another limit to this study’s generalizability is the fact that it was conducted in the United States. Since the United States was founded on the idea that “All men are born equal” and has the reputation as being the “Land of Opportunity”, SES may not be that salient or important to the residents of this country. Instead, the population may just see SES as a way to better themselves and not as a barrier in accomplishing their dreams in life or in romantic love.

The questions asked of the students may also represent a methodological limitation. Some of the participants may not have known their SES when they were growing up and so may have guessed their response. This means there is a possibility that the responses given about their past SES may not be representative of their true SES. Additionally, no measure of present SES was used, thus, since SES may have changed since the time participants were growing up, including a question regarding current SES (e.g., what SES do you think you have?) could have increased construct validity.

Questions regarding love may have been susceptible to pressures for socially desirable responses. For instance, respondents may have wanted to look like an unselfish, caring lover who was not needy, clingy, or fickle, and so might have responded more willingly to the socially desirable love types.

**Strengths of the Study**

In previous research (e.g., Davies, 2001), the examination of the influence of SES has been an after thought, however this study’s aim from the outset was to explore the
potential influence SES has on romantic love. Therefore, one of the major
methodological strengths of this study is that it had the question of whether SES
influenced romantic love as its main focus. To concentrate on this question the study
employed more thorough techniques to measure this important variable than other
previous investigations (e.g., Sprecher & Toro-Morn, 2002). For instance, instead of just
asking the respondents to indicate what social class they belonged to, four commonly
used measures of SES were collected to garner a more comprehensive idea of the
participants’ SES and how each of these components uniquely contributed to the
experience and beliefs of romantic love. Additionally, numerous measures of love were
examined so as to obtain a broader perspective of both the experience and beliefs
individuals hold about romantic love. Therefore, using multiple measures to evaluate
both the dependent and independent variables helped to increase the construct validity of
this investigation, in addition to providing more means for evaluating possible
relationships and thus ensuring a more comprehensive examination of the potential
relationships between SES and romantic love.

Moreover, the inclusion of supplemental analyzing techniques not specific to the
hypotheses but to the issue as a whole enabled the study to reveal some intriguing
curvilinear relationships that may have otherwise been left undiscovered. By utilizing
trend analyses, significant relationships between maternal education and six of the 13
romantic love measured were found and provided impetus for this topic to be explored
further.
**Implications for Future Research**

Following the discovery of curvilinear relationships, it is sincerely hoped future studies will theorize about and thoroughly investigate the possibility that SES may be related to romantic love in a curvilinear fashion. Researchers should not only seek to replicate this study’s findings but discover through what pathways a mother’s education level may influence her child’s experiences and beliefs of romantic love.

Additionally, as an integral part of this investigation concerned socioeconomic status and its effect on individuals, future studies would be wise to explore this research question in different cultures and countries where class structure and SES are more salient than the United States. For example, investigations carried out in countries with histories of rigid class structure (e.g., England, India) may find different results in comparison to research conducted in a more socially mobile country, such as the United States.

Future studies should also seek to sample from the wider population so as to explore a wider variety of SES. For example, studies should ideally aim to sample individuals from the highest SES groups (e.g., royals) right through to the people with the lowest SES. Although this sample would be difficult to attain, having a more diverse sample would necessarily enable the researcher to examine the whole range of SES and thus examine its relationship with romantic love more thoroughly.

It may also be of benefit for future studies to include questions regarding the current SES of the participants to assess whether SES changes over time, if this change
effects romantic love, or if present SES is more influential in the experience and beliefs of romantic love.

**Conclusion**

Although the present study took steps to measure many aspects of both socioeconomic status and romantic love, it failed to confirm any of the hypotheses. Nevertheless, upon further investigation of the relationship between SES and romantic love, a curvilinear relationship was uncovered suggesting the level of maternal education may influence romantic beliefs, the Clingy love schema and passionate love; in that participant’s whose mothers had the lowest and highest education endorsed the romantic beliefs more, were more Clingy, and reported more passionate love. Therefore, it is hoped that discovering these suggestive results and by explicating some of the limitations of the methodology employed in this study (notably the sample used), future research can use some of the ideas generated to explore the potential relationship of SES and romantic love in different environments using a more diverse population.
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE
Passionate Love Scale

We would like to know how you feel (or once felt) about the person you love, or have loved, most passionately. Some common terms for passionate love are romantic love, infatuation, love sickness, or obsessive love.

Please think of the person whom you love most passionately right now. If you are not passionately in love, please think of the last person you passionately loved. If you have never been passionately in love, think of the person you came closest to caring for in that way.

Whom are you thinking of?

____ Someone I love right now.
____ Someone I once loved.
____ I have never been in love.

Try to describe the way you felt when your feelings were most intense. Answers range from (1) Not at all true to (9) Definitely true.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Not True</th>
<th>Definitely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would feel deep despair if _____ left me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel I can’t control my thoughts; they are obsessively on _____</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel happy when I am doing something to make _____ happy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I would rather be with _____ than anyone else.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I’d get jealous if I thought _____ were falling in love with someone else.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I yearn to know all about _____</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I want _____ physically, emotionally, mentally.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have an endless appetite for affection from _____</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. For me, _____ is the perfect romantic partner.

10. I sense my body responding when _____ touches me.

11. _____ always seems to be on my mind.

12. I want _____ to know me—my thoughts, my fears, and my hopes.

13. I eagerly look for signs indicating _____'s desire for me.

14. I possess a powerful attraction for _____.

15. I get extremely depressed when things don't go right in my relationship with _____.
Companionate Love Scale

We would also like to know how you feel (or once felt) about the person you love, or have loved, most companionately. Some common terms for companionate love are affectionate love, tender love, true love, or marital love.

Please think of the person whom you love most companionately right now. If you are not in companionate love right now, please think of the last person you loved companionately. If you have never been companionately in love, think of the person whom you came closest to caring for in that way. Try to tell us how you felt at the time when your feelings were the most intense.

Who are you thinking of?
  ___ Someone I love right now.
  ___ Someone I once loved.
  ___ I have never been in love.

Please indicate your feelings on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td>true of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I expect my love for _____ to last for the rest of my life.  
2. I can’t imagine ending my relationship with ______.  
3. I am certain for my love for ______.  
4. I am committed to maintaining my relationship with ______.  
5. I have confidence in the stability of my relationship with ______.  
6. I have a warm and comfortable relationship with ______.  
7. I have a relationship of mutual understanding with ______.  
8. I experience intimate communication with ______.
9. I receive considerable emotional support from _____.

10. I give considerable emotional support to _____.

11. I experience great happiness with _____.
Love Schema Scale

Please take a moment to think of the times you have been romantically and/or passionately in love. (It doesn't matter whether or not your feelings were reciprocated). Please read the following statements, and using the 1-7 scale, indicate to what extent each describes your feelings and experiences in romantic and passionate love affairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I've always felt secure in my relationships.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Relationships scare me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I like to keep my options open when it comes to love.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I'm willing to sacrifice everything for love.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I'm just not interested in relationships.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If love comes my way, I run.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I don't want to get too committed to anyone yet.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I feel trust in my romantic affairs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>People often say I'm secure in my relationships.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>People say I avoid close relationships.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. My feelings are very changeable in relationships.

12. My lover is the center of my universe.

13. I feel no price is too high to pay for love.

14. Love holds no interest for me.

15. When I’m in love, I’d do anything for my lover.

16. It’s too soon for me to get committed to any one person.

17. I’d give all that I have for my lover.

18. I can never make up my mind about love.

19. I’ve always felt safe in my romantic relationships.

20. I’m pretty casual about my relationships.

21. Dating is a waste of time.

22. I have no desire to have a relationship.

23. Love is not worth the hassle.

24. I frequently have mixed feelings about my lovers.
25. I always change my mind about my relationships.

26. Love doesn’t interest me.
**Romantic Beliefs Scale**

In addition to describing your experiences in both passionate and companionate love, we would like to know what beliefs you have about romance.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using this scale -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Totally Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I need to know someone for a period of time before I fall in love with him/her.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. If I were in love with someone, I would commit myself to him or her even if my parents and friends disapproved of the relationship.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Once I experience “true love”, I could never experience it again, to the same degree, with another person.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I believe that to be truly in love is to be in love forever.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. If I love someone, I know I can make the relationship work, despite any obstacles.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. When I find my ‘true love’ I will probably know it soon after we meet.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I’m sure that every new thing I learn about the person I choose for a long term commitment will please me.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. The relationship I will have with my ‘true love’ will be nearly perfect.

9. If I love someone, I will find a way for us to be together regardless of the opposition to the relationship, physical distance between us or any other barrier.

10. There will be only one real love for me.

11. If a relationship I have was meant to be, any obstacle (e.g., lack of money, physical distance, career conflicts) can be overcome.

12. I am likely to fall in love almost immediately if I meet the right person.

13. I expect that in my relationship, romantic love will really last; it won’t fade with time.

14. The person I love will make a perfect romantic partner; for example he/she will be completely accepting, loving, and understanding.

15. I believe if another person and I love each other we can overcome any differences and problems that may arise.
Socioeconomic Status Measures

*Household Income*
Approximately, what was your household income, per year, during your childhood and adolescent years?

- [ ] under $18,500
- [ ] $18,500 - $35,000
- [ ] $35,001 - $55,000
- [ ] $55,001 - $88,000
- [ ] $88,001 - $110,000
- [ ] over $110,000

*Parental Education Level*
What is the highest level of education achieved by your Father? Mother?

- [ ] Some high school
- [ ] High School graduate or equivalent
- [ ] Some College
- [ ] Associates Degree (e.g., A.A.)
- [ ] Bachelors Degree (e.g., B.A., B.S.)
- [ ] Masters Degree (e.g., M.A., M.B.A.)
- [ ] Professional or Doctoral Degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D.)

*Socioeconomic Index (SEI)*
What was the occupation of the person most financially responsible for you during your childhood and adolescent years?

- [ ] Accountant
- [ ] Actor or Director
- [ ] Actuary
- [ ] Administrative Assistant
- [ ] Aerospace Engineer
- [ ] Architect
- [ ] Art, Drama or Music Teacher
- [ ] Author
- [ ] Baker
- [ ] Bank Teller
- [ ] Bartender
- [ ] Billing Clerk/Payroll Clerk
- [ ] Biological Science Teacher
- [ ] Bus Driver
- [ ] Chemical Engineer
- [ ] Chemist
- [ ] Chemistry Teacher
- [ ] Civil Engineer
- [ ] Clergy
- [ ] Computer Systems Analyst/Scientist
- [ ] Construction Worker
- [ ] Dancer
- [ ] Dental Hygienist
- [ ] Dentist
- [ ] Dietician
- [ ] Economics teacher
- [ ] Economist
- [ ] Editor
- [ ] Elementary School Teacher
- [ ] English Teacher
- [ ] Financial Manager
- Firefighter
- Foreign Language Teacher
- Garbage Collector
- Hairdresser
- Health or Nursing Aid
- History Teacher
- Hotel Clerk
- Housekeeper
- Judge
- Lawyer
- Legal Assistant
- Librarian
- Licensed vocational or practical nurse
- Management Analyst
- Massage Therapist
- Mathematical scientist
- Mechanical Engineer
- Medical Scientist
- Middle School Teacher
- Musician
- Occupational Therapist
- Optometrist
- Personnel and Labor Relations Manager
- Petroleum Engineer
- Pharmacist
- Photographer
- Physical Education Teacher
- Physical Scientist
- Physical Therapist
- Physician (Medical doctor)
- Physician Assistant
- Physicist
- Pilot
- Police Officer or Detective
- Professional athlete
- Professor or Post-Secondary Teacher
- Psychologist
- Receptionist
- Registered Nurse
- Restaurant Server
- Sales worker
- Sheriff, Bailiff or other law enforcement
- Social Scientist
- Social Worker
- Sociologist
- Special Education Teacher
- Speech Therapist
- Statistician
- Tailor
- Taxi Cab Driver
- Teacher’s Aide
- Urban Planner
- Veterinarian
- Other (please specify)
Demographics

Which of the following describes your ethnic or racial identity? (Check all that apply)

- [ ] African American
- [ ] Caucasian
- [ ] Chinese
- [ ] Filipino
- [ ] Hawaiian
- [ ] Hispanic
- [ ] Japanese
- [ ] Korean
- [ ] Pacific Islander
- [ ] Vietnamese
- [ ] Other (specify)

Where did you spend the majority of your childhood and teen years?

- [ ] Hawai'i
- [ ] U.S. Mainland
- [ ] Foreign Nation

Please indicate your age: ___

Please indicate your gender:  _____ Female  _____ Male
### Table 1: Correlations of the SES measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Paternal Education</th>
<th>Maternal Education</th>
<th>Socioeconomic Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>.350*</td>
<td>.278*</td>
<td>.250*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.397*</td>
<td>.468*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.342*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Asterisked (*) items indicate correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*
Table 2. Correlations of the love measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Passionate Love Scale</th>
<th>Compassionate Love Scale</th>
<th>RBS One &amp; Only</th>
<th>RBS Love At First Sight</th>
<th>RBS Obstacles</th>
<th>RBS Idealization</th>
<th>Total RBS</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Skittish</th>
<th>Clingy</th>
<th>Fickle</th>
<th>Casual</th>
<th>Uninterested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passionate Love Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.603**</td>
<td>.126*</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>-.155**</td>
<td>.403**</td>
<td>-.173**</td>
<td>-.249**</td>
<td>-.284**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate Love Scale</td>
<td>.603**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.141**</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>-.255**</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>-.284**</td>
<td>-.277**</td>
<td>-.281**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBS One &amp; Only</td>
<td>.126*</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.546**</td>
<td>.508**</td>
<td>.774**</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBS Love At First Sight</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBS Obstacles</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.546**</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.818**</td>
<td>.685**</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td>.597**</td>
<td>-.135**</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.181**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBS Idealization</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td>.508**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.618**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.613**</td>
<td>.388**</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.140**</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RBS</td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.774**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.865**</td>
<td>.813**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.388**</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.578**</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.278**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>-.142**</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skittish</td>
<td>-.155**</td>
<td>-.286**</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.278**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.582**</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>.638**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clingy</td>
<td>.403**</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.597**</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>.576**</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fickle</td>
<td>-.173**</td>
<td>-.284**</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.136**</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.142**</td>
<td>.562**</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.572**</td>
<td>.523**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>-.249**</td>
<td>-.277**</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.140**</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.572**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.575**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninterested</td>
<td>-.284**</td>
<td>-.281**</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.181**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.636**</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.523**</td>
<td>.576**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2 tailed)
*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2 tailed)
Table 3

**Significant weighted trend analyses of quadratic effects for maternal education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Love Measure</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passionate Love Scale</td>
<td>4.041</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love at First Sight</td>
<td>5.466</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Finds a Way</td>
<td>5.247</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealization of Relationship</td>
<td>5.996</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Romantic Beliefs</td>
<td>5.480</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clingy Love Schema</td>
<td>8.822</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Asterisked (*) items indicate trend is significant at the 0.05 level.
Figure 1. Number of participants indicating their household income bracket when growing up.
Figure 2. Levels of education attained by participants' fathers.
Figure 3. Levels of education attained by participants' mothers.
Figure 4. Significant relationship between level of paternal education and passionate love for males.
Figure 5. Significant relationship between level of household income and the Secure love schema for males.
Figure 6. *An example of one of the three SES measures significant positive correlation with the Fickle love schema.*
Figure 7. The significant relationship between the level of paternal education and the Clingy schema mean score for males.
Figure 8. The relationship between level of paternal education and the mean belief that love overcomes obstacles for males.
Figure 9. Curvilinear relationship of the level of maternal education and the mean passionate love score.
Figure 10. Curvilinear relationship of the level of maternal education and the mean Clingy love schema score.
Figure 11. Curvilinear relationship of the level of maternal education and the mean agreement to Love At First Sight.
Figure 12. *Curvilinear relationship of the level of maternal education and the mean agreement that Love Overcomes Obstacles.*
Figure 13. Curvilinear relationship of the level of maternal education and the mean agreement that the relationship and partner are ideal.
Figure 14. Curvilinear relationship of the level of maternal education and the mean agreement to all of Sprecher & Metts (1989) Romantic Beliefs.
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