

City University of Hong Kong

Department of Applied Social Studies

# **Psychology**

**BSS PSY 2007**

**Romantic relationship: Love styles, Triangular Love  
and Relationship Satisfaction**

Student Name: Tang Pui Tung

Supervisor: Dr. Cheng Christopher Hon Kwong

**SS 4708 Research Project in Psychology**

**A Thesis submitted for the Degree of Bachelor of Social Sciences with Honors in**

**Psychology at the City University of Hong Kong**

**April 2007**

### **Abstract**

**Objectives.** This study examined how the love variables (intimacy, passion, commitment and the six love styles) are differences between genders and relationship stages. In addition, associations between love variables and relationship satisfaction among local romantic partners were studied.

**Method.** Participants were eighty-two couples who have involved in a romantic relationship (dating or married). They completed questionnaire which assessed their love styles, level of intimacy, passion, commitment, and relationship satisfaction.

**Results.** Gender differences in love styles and stage effect on the triangular love components were found. Participants' scores on all love components were found to be positively related to satisfaction. Specific love styles, Eros was found to be positive predictor on satisfaction for men and women. Agape was found to be a positive predictor, but only for men. Ludus, was found as a negative predictor for satisfaction and commitment for both genders.

**Discussion.** Results suggested love styles, Eros, Storge and Agape, as well as intimacy, passion and commitment were positively related to satisfaction. A distinct finding of the discrepancy in passion leaded to higher satisfaction raise an interesting issue to be discussed.

## Table of contents

	Page
Abstract	2
Table of contents	3
List of Tables	4
Introduction	6
Literature Review	7
A general look at love theories	7
Styles of Romantic Love	8
Gender differences in Love styles	9
The Triangular Theory of Love	10
Time courses of love	11
Triangular love changes across stages	11
Association of Love Styles and Triangular Love	12
Love Styles predict Relationship Satisfaction	13
Intimacy, passion, commitment, and relationship satisfaction	14
Study overview	15
Method	18
Participants	18
Measurements	18
Procedure	20
Results	21
1. Internal reliabilities	22
2. Gender differences in love styles	22
3. Love styles differences across relationship stages	23

4. Triangular love changes across stages	24
5. Association of love styles and triangular love	25
6. Partners' similarity in love endorsements	28
7. Correlations of love styles and relationship satisfaction	28
8. Correlations between Triangular components and satisfaction	31
9. Correlations of discrepancies in love triangle and satisfaction	33
Discussion	34
Conclusion	42
Reference	44
Appendix	47

### List of Table

<b>Table 1</b>	Descriptive statistics of scales	22
<b>Table 2</b>	Paired sampled t-test for love styles among genders	23
<b>Table 3</b>	Means and F ratio for love styles across relationship status	23
<b>Table 4</b>	Means and F ratio for love components across relationship status	25
<b>Table 5</b>	Linear regression analyses testing love styles in love components	27
<b>Table 6</b>	Correlations of Love styles and Triangular love among couples	28
<b>Table 7</b>	Correlations among love styles and relationship satisfaction	29
<b>Table 7.1</b>	Linear regression analyses: love styles as predictors of relationship satisfaction among men and women	31
<b>Table 8</b>	Correlations of Triangular Love with men and women satisfaction	32

<b>Table 9</b>	Correlation of discrepancies in Triangle love with relationship satisfaction	33
<b>Table 9.1</b>	Linear regression of discrepancies in Passion onto relationship satisfaction	34

**Romantic relationship: Love styles, Triangular Love and Relationship Satisfaction**

There have been a number of theories of love emergence to study close relationships in recent decades. Based on love theories from the west, it is interesting to study romantic relationships in our local society. The purpose of the present study is trying to bring concepts from two dominate love theories, Lee's (1973) styles of love and Sternberg' (1986) Triangular theory of love, together. The present study is based on information obtained from local intimate couples, one goal is to examine how love is different across gender and relationship stages. Moreover, and the more important is to ascertain how love styles and components are associated with relationship satisfaction.

Love characterizes intimate relationship, despite the fact that the meaning and how people experience it, may vary across cultures, and individuals. Number of studies about romantic relationship showed that intimacy, passion and commitment vary across relationship stage and they are related to satisfaction. Men and women do show different in love beliefs. For most people, it is desirable to have a fruitful and intimate relationship. However, couples may find their love fade or alter with time. Those who find their loves differ with their past may influence their relationship. With more understanding of gender differences and love change across different stages may help romantic partners to understand their intimate relationships from more perspectives. Moreover, findings from a local perspective may help to contribute for professional field, such as pre-marital counseling and marital counseling.

## Literature Review

### *A general look at love theories*

Earlier publication, Colors of Love which was originally proposed by Lee in 1973, defined love as six different styles. These love styles include Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania and Agape. They are considered as attitudinal, and not mutually exclusive within a person (S. S. Hendrick & C. Hendrick, 1997). This multidimensional approach gives an inclusive framework to view individual differences in love. In a separate line of studying love, Sternberg's (1986) Triangular Theory of Love viewed love as a triangle, formed by three elements, which are intimacy, passion and commitment. He suggests different combinations of the three components yield different kinds of love. All three components are also associated with satisfaction in relationships and vary from time (Sternberg, 1986) and stage of relationship development (e.g., Acker & Davis, 1992; Gao, 2001). Lee's and Sternberg's theories are two comparable empirical approaches. Based on these two theories, we can study love from different perspectives and broaden the conceptions of love. Such as, romantic love is a kind of love characterized with intimacy and passion, it is also classified as Erotic love. Companionate love emphasizes intimacy and commitment, the love grown from committed friendship is also known as storgic love. The triangular theory of love views passion, intimacy, and commitment as essential components for love relationships, which is parallel to Hendrick's et al (1988) findings. Hendrick's finding shows Eros (romantic love), Agape

(companionate love) are positive love styles for relationship satisfaction. Lee's theory seeks for what love attitudes that a person adopts to constitute what sort of lover. Sternberg's theory seeks an integration of actions into love. Elements under both perspectives can be predictors for relationship satisfaction.

### *Styles of Romantic Love*

Lee (1973) proposes six love styles analogous to primary and secondary styles. He defines the three primary styles as (1) *Eros*, is a style of loving begins with strong physical attraction, it can be known as "love at first sight". Erotic lovers enjoy intense emotion and desire exclusivity with partner; (2) *Ludus*, is a love styles views love as a game. Ludic lovers are playful and refuse to commit the whole life to develop a love relationship; (3) *Storge*, is a love relationship developed slowly from friendship. Storgic lovers were often affectionate initially and finally settle down together. The secondary styles are derivatives of the primary styles, known as (4) *Pragma*, is a practical approach of love. Pragmatic lover is a combination of Ludus and Storge (Lee, 1988). This love style is not specially emphasis on intense physical attraction, but is a conscious search for compatible partner; (5) *Mania* is the style characterized by obsession and anxiety to the partner (Morrow et al, 1995). Although manic lover is possessive and jealous, people may get benefit from mania love experience. It is beneficial to realize how deeply and intensely one is capable of loving one another (Lee, 1988); (6) *Agape* is combination of Eros and Storge (Lee, 1988). It is a selfless, giving and



altruistic love. People with this style view it is a duty to love. Emotional intensity is described as vary across each love styles. Eros and Mania are in intense emotion, Agape is mildly intense, Ludus, Storge and Praga are low in intensity (C. Hendrick, S. Hendrick, 1986). The typology of six love styles stimulated the later research interests. Based on this typology, a set of forty-two items scale, known as Love Attitude Scale (LAS), was standardized by Hendrick and Hendrick (1986). It attempted at quantifying the love styles. Numbers of studies by using the LAS have explored gender differences in love beliefs and association between different love styles and relationship satisfaction (e.g., Hendrick, Hendirck, & Adler, 1988; Frazier & Esterly, 1990; Morrow, Clark & Brock 1995).

#### *Gender differences in Love styles*

Gender is intertwined with attitudes and behaviors in love, and also with regarding to social expectations. Although romantic partners always show similar patterns in love attitudes, there are gender stereotypes. Consistently, mens are found to be more endorsing of erotic love game-play love and agape while womens are more endorse with storgic, manic and pragmatic love (Frazier & Esterly, 1990, Hendrick & Hendrick, 2006). It may not be a particular phenomenon in western societies. In our culture, traditional men's roles are more sexually permissive and responsible to take care partner or as a bread earner in a family. Men also place more importance on sexuality within relationship, it causes them are more emotionally dependent on their partners. It is reasonable to believe Eros, Ludus and Agape are mens'

general traits. For women, they are expected to be less sexually permissive, but more friendship oriented regarding to their intimate relationship. It is also a cultural norm for women to choose a partner who can be a provider for living. In women's choice of partners, they may be more practical and rely on their partners in aspects of lives. Though present study examines intimate relationships in local culture, it is believed that local situation might also follow the gender traits found in previous studies.

### *The Triangular Theory of Love*

The second theory of interest in this study is Sternberg's (1986) triangular theory of love. It holds that love can be understood as three components that together to be viewed as vertices of a triangle (Sternberg, 1998). *Intimacy* involves feelings of closeness, connectedness, and bondedness in a romantic relationship. It includes feelings of experienced happiness with a partner, mutual understanding and intimate communication with the loved one (Sternberg, 1986). *Passion* involves drives that lead to romance, physical attraction and sexual consummation (Sternberg, 1986). Hatfield defines passionate love as the profound desire to be with another which through a combination of emotions and behaviors (Hatfield, 1988). It includes the most intense feelings. *Commitment* consists of two aspects, in the short term, is the decision to love someone, and in the long term, is the decision to maintain that love (Sternberg, 1988). This aspect includes the exclusivity and fidelity. These two aspects of commitment do not necessary go together. A person decides to love someone can without a

commitment to that love. A consummate, complete love is characterized as full combination of the three components. It is also difficult to maintain (Sternberg, 1986).

#### *Time courses of love*

An attained consummate love is no guarantee that it will last, because the three triangular love components are varying from different stage of relationship development. Levels of components are predictable with time course (Sternberg, 1986, 1988). To delineate how different which lovers experience their love across the relationship development is interesting. According to Sternberg's prediction (Sternberg, 1986), for example, if a relationship is to become a long-term one, level of commitment will be gradually increase and then speed up. If the relationship keeps on over the long term and even it does not begin to fails, the amount of commitment will generally level off. Passion develops rapidly is followed by fades with habituation. For the level of intimacy (Sternberg, 1988), he assumes that intimacy declines as a relationship develops over time. He also argues that in a successful relationship, although manifest intimacy declines, latent intimacy continues to grow. However, Sternberg's prediction was lack of a time frame. It is quite abstract to tell how the duration of a relationship is a long enough to show a specific pattern that he predicts.

#### *Triangular love changes across stages*

Acker and Davis (1992) reported partners in longer relationships showed less behavioral intimacy and less behavioral passion than those with shorter relationships. It supports

Sternberg's concept, which is decline in manifest behaviors with relationship development. In spite of taking relationship length as a measurement, they found that level of commitment is higher for married partners. Passion also follows the predicted pattern, it declines over time emerged, but only among women. Gao (2001) provides support to show changes in stage of romantic relationship are closely related to intimacy, passion and commitment. The study compared romantic partners from casual dating, serious dating and at engaged stage. These three component increase as the relationship becomes more serious. And these findings are significant in both US and Chinese cultures. In the light of the argument and previous finding, it can be argued that relationship stage is also an important factor as well as length in predicting love.

#### *Association of Love Styles and Triangular Love*

Lee's love styles and Sternberg's Triangular theory of love are different in nature, but can be a direction to study love and predict relationship satisfaction. Love styles are expected as internal attitude-based, which are personal and tend to be stable as one's relationship "theme" (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1997). People may simultaneously hold different love styles with two different partners (Hendrick et al, 2006). Triangular theory of love emphasizes on expressing intimacy, passion and commitment through action in order to maximize happiness (Sternberg, 1986). People's behaviors are changing with relationship dynamic. From a microscopic perspective, associations can be derived from those concepts. It is believed that

there are correlations between how one's beliefs and their actions. The present study tries to sort out which certain love styles might be associated with love components specifically.

Such as, Eros as described as intense emotional and strong physical attraction, undoubtedly, it is concerning the intimacy and passion. Agape is a love style placing loved person's welfare above one's own. Agape is consistently found to be higher in men. Men are more likely to treat their partners with their commitment of caring. It is believed that commitment plays a more important role on intimate relationship for men. On the contrary, commitment is predicted as increase with the passion die down across relationship stages, it give rises to companionate love which may bring to increase in storgic love. Although love components are hypothesized that increase across relationship development, there is not much empirical support for love styles will be also changed across stages. Love styles are linked with personal attitude and it is believed that they tend to be stable across stages for both genders.

#### *Love Styles predict Relationship Satisfaction*

The 42-item LAS (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986) is always used to examine the six love styles in research. Previous studies showed general associations between individuals' love attitudes towards relationship satisfaction. Relationship satisfaction is always found to be positively related to Eros and negatively related to Ludus for both men and women (eg. Hendrick et al., 1988; Frazier & Esterly, 1990). Morrow et al. (1995) also report similar findings. In particular, it shows Eros and Agape were also associated with higher levels of

commitment. In contrast Ludus was negatively associated with it. Moreover, these studies found relationship partners show similar attitudes regarding to love and certain relationship qualities, such as commitment. Similarities in attitudes are believed to be important in an intimate relationship. During the early stage of a romantic relationship, partners come together may be possibly due to physical attractiveness or similar interests. While relationship is developing, partners concern how they can meet other's needs, which involves commitment and investment. Therefore, romantic partners are expected to show similarity in their love attitudes, and indeed it was occurred from previous findings (e.g. Hendrick et al., 1988; Morrow et al., 1995).

Eros, Ludus and Agape are always found to have significant correlations on predicting relationship satisfaction and gender differences. One goal of the present study is to replicate these earlier findings, to examine if the predictive abilities of love styles on satisfaction are obvious and the gender differences in the local culture.

#### *Intimacy, passion, commitment, and relationship satisfaction*

Sternberg pictures love as a triangle, as the three components are the vertices of the triangle, he suggests that the larger the person's area of the triangle, the greater the amount of love can be experienced (Sternberg, 1986). It can be understood as the more the endorsement of the components, more love is experienced. To examine the predictive ability of the love components on satisfaction, Acker and Davis (1992) did the regression analysis and separate

analyses, showing that three components display a significant association with satisfaction. In particular, commitment is the most consistent and strongest predictor for both genders. Love as Sternberg describes as a triangle, but it does not only involve one triangle with an intimate relationship, because there are always involve two persons in a love relationship. Another consideration of this study is the “self and other triangles” (Sternberg, 1988). When comparing partner’s “triangle”, there may be discrepancies in shape (the balance of the three components) or in size (the amount of level of each component), Sternberg suggests that greater unmatched in three components endorsement tends to be associated with lesser satisfaction (Sternberg, 1986). Sternberg and Barnes (1985) study shows the absolute difference associated with lower satisfaction. Consider this study, which used the general scores of absolute differences of love scales as measurements. However it cannot show the how differences are the “self” and “other” triangles and disregard the gender difference. The effect from each component is not shown clearly. To more ascertain the contributions of each love components on relationship satisfaction, the present study will sort out and examine the discrepancies from each element and its effect on relationship satisfaction.

#### *Study overview*

Based on the previous findings and reasoning, the present study is divided into two areas. The first part concerns the love varies across gender and relationship stages. Gender differences of love styles will be tested following the previous directions which literature

offered, involving Eros, Ludus and Agape. Besides, gender differences in other love styles will be also explored. Concerning the time courses of triangular love, previous study is partially replicated. Gao (2001) reports all three components increased from state of casual dating, serious dating to engaged. In his study, participants' relationship length from 1 month to 5.5 years, ( $SD=1.29$ ). In the context of present study, participants' ranges of age and relationship duration are much wider. Participants with serious dating will be further divided as either "less than 2 years" group or "more the 2 years" group, in order to compare the effect from relationship stages as well as relationship duration. Although Sternberg predicts passion decline as time course, there is no clear time frame. It is unsure to make hypothesis regarding to the change in passion across stages in the present study. Compared with the triangular love, love styles are believed as personal love beliefs. Love styles are rather stable. To address these phenomenons, three hypotheses are made.

H1: Mens have higher scores than women on Eros, Ludus and Agape scales.

H2: There is no significant difference in scores of love styles scales across relationship stages.

H3: Level of intimacy and commitment increase across relationship stages.

The second area was about the association between the love styles as well as the love components with the relationship satisfaction. Before testing whether love beliefs were related to relationship satisfaction, the correlation between the love styles and the triangular



love was one of the interests. Previous research studied the characteristics either of the love styles or the triangular theory of love. It is seldom to examine the correlations between these two dominant love theories from a same group of participants. An individual's attitude is believed to affect one's performance or behaviors. It is strongly believed that the two theories are not just conceptually related but also could be shown by empirical findings. Furthermore, consistent with prior findings, three love styles, Eros, Ludus and Agape, will be tested for their predictive ability on relationship satisfaction. Following Sternberg's prediction, relationship satisfaction is related to the amount of the love components endorsed and affected by the matching of the triangles among the couples, present study also addressed this issue.

H4: There are correlations between love styles and love components between an individual.

H5: Eros, Agape are positively related to relationship satisfaction for both men and women.

H6: Ludus is negatively related to relationship satisfaction for both men and women.

H7: Intimacy, passion and commitment are positively related to relationship satisfaction for both men and women.

H8: Participant's love styles and love components are correlated to partner's scores.

H9: Discrepancies in level of intimacy, passion and commitment are negatively related

to relationship satisfaction both men and women.

## **Method**

### *Participants*

Participants were 82 couples who involved in a romantic relationship of either stage, which is in regular dating or marriage while they were involving in the study. Men participants ranged in age from 19 to 52 years ( $M= 27.3$ ,  $SD = 8.75$ ). Women participants ranged in age from 19 to 52 years ( $M= 25.95$ ,  $SD= 7.88$ ). The mean duration of their romantic relationship was 4.9 year ( $SD=6.35$ ). 75.6 percent of the couples were unmarried. 24.4 percent of couples were married.

### *Measurements*

#### *Background information*

This set of items collected information about participant's relationship, which include length of their relationship and relationship stage. Length of the relationship was asked for how many years and months. Relationship stage was initially determined by five categories, Casual Dating, Serious Dating, Engaged or Plan to get married, Cohabitation and Married Couple. Due to none of the participant was in the "Casual Dating" group, and a relative small number of them fall in the "Cohabitation" group ( $N=1$ ). Therefore, that particular couple was integrated into "Married" group. Moreover, the participants fall in the "serious dating" group was having their relationship length widely ranged from 1 month to 84 months. This group

was further split into 2 groups. The five categories were regrouping as four groups; they are “Serious dating with two years or less”, “Serious dating with more than two years”, “Engaged or Plan to get married”, and “Married”.

#### Triangular Theory of Love Scale (TTLS)

The Triangular Love Scale (TTLS) (Sternberg, 1988) is a 45-items scale measures the three components of love. Each component, intimacy, passion and commitment is measured by a 15-item subscale. Each scale is rated on 5-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree, 3= neutral, 5 = strongly agree). TTLS is reported with high internal consistency, alpha coefficients for three subscales are above .90 (Tzeng, 1993). The full scale is shown in Appendix1.

#### Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS)

Relationship Assessment Scale is a brief, appropriate measure for romantic relationship (Hendrick, Dicke & Hendrick, 1998). It is a 7-item scale measures relationship satisfaction. The scale is rated on 5-point Likert scale with different descriptions for each item. The scale reported the mean inter-item correlation of .49 and an alpha of .86 (Hendrick, 1988). The full scale is shown in Appendix 2.

#### Love Attitude Scales (LAS)

The Love Attitudes Scales (LAS) (Hendick & Hendrick, 1986) measures the beliefs about romantic relationships. It consists of six 7-item subscales to measure the six love styles:

Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania, and Agape. Each scale is rated on 5-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree, 3= neutral, 5 = strongly agree). Full scale is shown in Appendix 3.

Reliability analyses of LAS produced the alpha coefficient for the entire scale is .70, and coefficients for the six subscales are ranged from .62 to .84. (Tzeng, 1993). A Chinese version of LAS is translated with a reference of Dong's (2004) research in this study. In Dong's research, reliability coefficients of the six subscales were reported ranged from .55 to .76. In the present study, LAS consists of 39 items, with 5 items in Ludus subscale, 6 items in Storge subscales and 7 items for the rest of the subscales.

#### *Pilot study*

A pilot study was carried out on STLS, RAS and LAS to access if there was any technical problem when fill in the questionnaire. Thirty participants were recruited to do the questionnaire which was translated into Chinese scales. They were ranged in age from 20 to 25 year (SD= 1.76) with involving in a romantic relationship. Participants found the wordings in the questionnaire were easily understood. No major problem was found.

#### *Procedure*

82 couples were recruited by snowball sampling techniques. The initial participants were college students and friends of researchers. Participants with romantic relationships were approached directly by researchers. After the data collection, participants were asked for recommendations if they knew other romantic couples who might be also interested to the

study. Before the distribution of the questionnaire, participants were asked if they were having heterosexual romantic relationships. Questionnaires were enclosed in separate envelopes to keep confidentiality. All participants were instructed to fill in the questionnaire individually with their partners.

Participants were requested to fill in a questionnaire with four parts. The first part was about the background information. Following this were three scales, the 45-item Sternberg's Triangular Theory of Love Scale (Sternberg, 1986), the 7-item Relationship Assessment Scales (RAS) (Hendrick, 1988), and 42-item Love Attitude Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). The questionnaire was translated from English to Chinese with back-translation to ensure the equivalences. The questionnaires used in this study is shown in Appendix 4.

## **Results**

### *1. Internal reliabilities*

Reliability analysis of the scales was first conducted. Scales and subscales used in this study generally reported adequate reliabilities. The alpha coefficient for the entire scales used in this study are as followed, Triangular theory of love scale (.95), Relationship assessment scale (.82) and Love Attitude Scale (.81). Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for each subscale in both genders.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of scales.

Scale	Number of Items	Mean (SD)	Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ )
TTLS Intimacy (men)	15	4.23 (.48)	.91
TTLS Passion (men)	15	3.90 (.48)	.88
TTLS Commitment (men)	15	4.33 (.52)	.92
TTLS Intimacy (women)	15	4.23 (.48)	.91
TTLS Passion (women)	14	3.83 (.49)	.84
TTLS Commitment (women)	15	4.20 (.55)	.93
RAS (men)	7	4.10 (.50)	.80
RAS (women)	7	4.08 (.49)	.82
LAS Eros (men)	7	3.78 (.57)	.78
LAS Ludus (men)	5	2.50 (.58)	.52
LAS Storge (men)	6	3.62 (.64)	.62
LAS Pragma (men)	7	2.95 (.63)	.75
LAS Mania (men)	7	3.16 (.64)	.69
LAS Agape (men)	7	4.04 (.59)	.85
LAS Eros (women)	7	3.61 (.48)	.65
LAS Ludus (women)	5	2.39 (.59)	.58
LAS Storge (women)	6	3.68 (.66)	.75
LAS Pragma (women)	7	3.04 (.59)	.67
LAS Mania (women)	7	3.21 (.59)	.77
LAS Agape (women)	7	3.87 (.53)	.78

## 2. Gender differences in love styles

Regarding to the Hypothesis 1 claimed that men have higher scores on Eros, Ludus and Agape, it was supported by the present result (refer to Table 2). The positive *t*-value means the men score on these particular scales were higher than that of women. Men were more likely to endorse Eros ( $M = 3.78$ ) than women ( $M = 3.61$ ),  $p < .05$ . Men were also more likely to endorse Ludus ( $M = 2.5$ ) than women ( $M = 2.39$ ),  $p < .01$ , and also scored higher on Agape ( $M = 4.04$ ) than women ( $M = 3.87$ ),  $p < .05$ . For the other three love styles, Storge, Pragma and Mania, no significant difference was shown.

Table 2. Result of paired sampled t-test for love styles among genders

Love styles	Men		Women		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Eros	3.78	.573	3.61	.484	78	2.54	.013*
Ludus	2.50	.579	2.39	.598	78	2.82	.006**
Storge	3.64	.642	3.69	.665	76	-0.637	.526
Pragma	2.95	.628	3.03	.598	77	-1.021	.310
Mania	3.16	.647	3.22	.582	78	-0.67	.505
Agape	4.04	.592	3.87	.530	80	2.107	.038*

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed

### 3. Love styles differences across relationship stages

Consider the natures of the love styles are different from the triangular love components.

Love styles are sort of personal traits and expected they are rather stable. Contrary to the expectation for Triangular love, love beliefs were predicted to have no association with an individual's relationship status. Results from the analyses generally supported the predictions for men (refer to Table 3).

Table3. Means and F ratio for love styles across relationship status

(Men)	Love styles						
Variable	N	Eros	Ludus	Storge	Pragma	Mania	Agape
F- values		.868	1.33	2.260	1.001	2.097	1.427
Dating_2 years or less	33	3.70	2.61	3.47	2.84	3.19	3.96
Dating_ more than 2 years	22	3.75	2.55	3.55	2.91	3.08	3.95
Plan to marry	6	3.83	2.80	3.69	3.24	3.80	4.43
Married	21	3.95	2.32	3.91	3.06	3.04	4.14

(Women)	Love styles						
Variable	N	Eros	Ludus	Storge	Pragma	Mania	Agape
F- values		.467	.775	3.421**	1.126*	1.245**	.447
Dating_2 years or less	33	3.63	2.43	3.44d	3.00	3.33d	3.94
Dating_ more than 2 years	22	3.53	2.46	3.58d	2.81	3.27	3.79
Plan to marry	5	3.80	2.04	3.63	3.63	3.57	4.26
Married	20	3.59	2.34	4.22ab	3.20	2.86a	3.76

a= dating 2 years or less, b= dating more than 2 years, c= plan to marry, d= married

\* $p < .01$ , \*\* $p < .05$

For men, all love styles showed no difference between each relationship status. For women, Storge, Pragma and Mania were varies in certain degrees between stages. Married women showed more Storge and Mania endorsement, compared to dating couples. Regard to Pragma, women who planned to married ( $M=3.63$ ) scored higher than those who dating more than two years in a boundary level ( $M=2.81$ ) at  $p=.051$ .

#### 4. *Triangular Love changes across stages*

The next area of analyses examined the associations between love experience, love beliefs and stages. Significant stage effects involved intimacy and commitment emerged from the present analyses. Couples scored higher in level of intimacy and commitment across the stages from dating to married supported the hypothesis. Although there was no significant difference found in the Post Hoc Tests for intimacy, married couple ( $M= 8.78$ ) score marginally higher in intimacy than dating couple with 2 years or less ( $M= 8.17$ ) at  $p=.078$ . And there was no difference between married couples and dating couples with more than 2



years. The result reflected that there was underlying difference between dating couples with different duration. Regard to commitment, more obvious differences were shown between the relationship duration and status. For couple with their dating less than two years, their level of commitment was lower than those planed to married and married. However, for couples who dated for longer period, there were no significant difference was found. The findings showed that duration of relationship as well as the relationship status affected the love content.

Table 4. Means and F ratio for love components across relationship status

Variable	N	Love component		
		Intimacy	Passion	Commitment
F- values		2.795*	1.129	6.429**
Dating_2 years or less	32	8.17	7.57	8.13 <sub>cd</sub>
Dating_ more than 2 years	22	8.52	7.73	8.45
Plan to marry	6	8.777	8.11	9.26 <sub>a</sub>
Married	20	8.783	7.85	9.03 <sub>a</sub>

a= dating 2 years or less, b= dating more than 2 years, c= plan to marry, d= married  
\* $p < .01$ , \*\* $p < .05$

##### 5. Association of love styles and triangular love

In order to ascertain if there is association between the love styles and triangular love, correlations analyses was first computed separately for men and women. For men, Eros showed a strong positive correlation with intimacy ( $r = .674, p < .01$ ), passion ( $r = .698, p < .01$ ) and commitment ( $r = .61, p < .01$ ). In the meanwhile, Agape also showed a high correlation with intimacy ( $r = .591, p < .01$ ), passion ( $r = .684, p < .01$ ) and commitment ( $r = .581, p < .01$ ).

Storge and Mania showed moderate associations with love components. Positive correlations were found between Storge and intimacy ( $r = .377, p < .01$ ), passion ( $r = .363, p < .01$ ) and commitment ( $r = .347, p < .01$ ). Mania also showed correlations to all three components, with intimacy ( $r = .234, p < .05$ ), passion ( $r = .467, p < .01$ ), and commitment ( $r = .353, p < .01$ ).

Contrary to Ludus, Ludus showed one negative correlation with intimacy ( $r = -.227, p < .05$ ).

Pragma did not show any correlation regarding to one of the love components. For women, the association of love styles and triangular love was more obvious. Six love styles correlated with the love components in different degree. Eros was positively correlated with intimacy ( $r = .497, p < .01$ ), passion ( $r = .660, p < .01$ ) and commitment ( $r = .550, p < .01$ ). Correlations of Storge between intimacy ( $r = .458, p < .01$ ), passion ( $r = .301, p < .01$ ) and commitment ( $r = .479, p < .01$ ) was found. Agape also showed positive correlations with intimacy ( $r = .376, p < .01$ ), passion ( $r = .632, p < .01$ ) and commitment ( $r = .558, p < .01$ ). Mania only showed positive correlation with passion ( $r = .409, p < .01$ ) and commitment ( $r = .649, p < .01$ ). Pragma was positively correlated with their commitment ( $r = .228, p < .05$ ). Ludus, was negatively correlated with intimacy ( $r = -.441, p < .01$ ), passion ( $r = -.338, p < .01$ ) and commitment ( $r = -.522, p < .01$ ).

With a series of correlations between love styles and triangular love had been shown. It was worthwhile to ascertain how love styles affect individuals in experiencing love.

Regression analyses were computed to address this issue. Results showed the predictive

ability to love components varied across gender. (refer to Table 5).

Table 5 Linear regression analyses testing love styles in Triangular love components

Men	Intimacy ( $\beta$ )	Passion ( $\beta$ )	Commitment ( $\beta$ )
Eros	.454**	.366**	.332*
Ludus	-.194*	.023	-.124
Storge	-.038	-.028	.013
Pragma	.030	.061	-.085
Mania	-.052	.188*	.178
Agape	.361**	.418**	.299*
R <sup>2</sup>	.537	.641	.467
<i>df</i>	6, 66	6, 66	6, 66
F	12.74**	19.68**	9.63**
Women	Intimacy ( $\beta$ )	Passion ( $\beta$ )	Commitment ( $\beta$ )
Eros	.345**	.451**	.286**
Ludus	-.263**	-.174*	-.361**
Storge	.305**	.139	.280**
Pragma	-.054	-.008	.068
Mania	.133	.213*	.159
Agape	-.029	.189	.137
R <sup>2</sup>	.408	.609	.622
<i>df</i>	6, 68	6, 68	6, 68
F	7.82**	17.66**	18.67**

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed

For men, Eros and Agape showed stronger effect on prediction. These two love styles were considered as positive love styles, as both of them show they were positive predictors in intimacy, passion and commitment. Mania was a positive predictor in passion, showing that men who endorsed Mania beliefs reported they were more passionate. Contrary to Ludus, it was a negative predictor on intimacy among men. Men endorsed the game-playing love would be less intimate in their love relationship. For women, overall, Eros was a positive love style, whereas Ludus was a negative love style. Similar as men, Eros was a positive predictor

on intimacy, passion and commitment. Mania, the love style focus of obsessive love, it also gave an account of passion. With its nature, Storge did not link to passion. Storge was a positive predictor on women's intimacy and commitment. Ludus predicted lower intimacy, passion and commitment. It reflected the game-playing, uncommitted love would lead to women experienced lesser love from every aspect.

#### 6. *Partners' similarity in love endorsements*

In order to examine if partners endorsed similar love styles and love components, a series of correlations was carried out. With the exception of Mania and Agape, couples showed evidence of matching of love styles and all three love components. Positive correlations were found (refer to Table 6).N ranged from 77 to 81.

Table 6 Correlations of Love styles and Triangular love among couples

Men-Women	Correlation
Eros	.363**
Ludus	.830**
Storge	.497**
Pragma	.232*
Mania	.173
Agape	.138
Intimacy	.525**
Passion	.288**
Commitment	.476**

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , 2-tailed

#### 7. *Correlations of Love styles and relationship satisfaction*

The third part of this analysis was to assess the association between relationship

variables (love styles and love components) and relationship satisfaction. A series of correlations were calculated for love variables and relationship satisfaction for men and women. The results supported the first and second hypotheses, regarding to the Eros, Agape are positively related to satisfaction and Ludus is negatively related to it. Above from the hypotheses, storge was also found to be positively related to satisfaction in both genders. Respondent love styles, Eros, Ludus and Agape were consistently associated with their own relationship satisfaction. Previous studies reported the associations between love styles and satisfaction differ among genders (e.g. Morrow et al., 1995; Hendrick et al., 1988).

Concerning the association between satisfaction and partner love styles, Table7 shows these two types of association.

Table7. Correlations among love styles and relationship satisfaction

	Relationship satisfaction	
	Men	Women
Eros_M	.550**	.286*
Ludus_M	-.231*	-.471**
Storge_M	.345**	.091
Pragma_M	-.045	.039
Mania_M	.128	-.033
Agape_M	.479**	.101
Eros_F	.114	.551**
Ludus_F	-.338**	-.494**
Storge_F	.197*	.430**
Pragma_F	.072	.145
Mania_F	.154	.161
Agape_F	.130	.414 **

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed

For men, men satisfaction was positively related to their endorsement of Eros the most

( $r = .55, p < .01$ ), Agape and Storge, and negatively related to Ludus ( $r = -.231, p < .05$ ). Besides there were associations with their own endorsement, men satisfaction also showed some associations their partner's love styles. Men satisfaction was positively related to women's Storge and interestingly, more negatively related to women's Ludus than their own endorsement of Ludus ( $r = -.338, p < .01$ ). A similar pattern was obtained with regard to respondent love styles with satisfaction among women. As expected, regarding to relationship satisfaction, Eros, Storge and Agape showed positive association and Ludus showed negative association for women. Only men's Ludus showed negative association with women satisfaction ( $r = -.471, p < .01$ ). Storge, Pragma and Mania were obscure to predict satisfaction in previous studies. In present result, Storge showed significant correlation to both men and women satisfaction. For the sake of clarity, predictability of love styles on satisfaction was examined. Two sets of linear regression analyses were carried out for each dyad participant. The participant's 6 love styles were regressed onto the own satisfaction score and partner's satisfaction score. Table 7.1 shows the factors with significant result from the regression analyses separately for both genders.

The respondent's love styles scores were stronger predictors for relationship satisfaction. For men, as expected, Eros, Ludus and Agape showed the stronger effect on satisfaction. Although Storge showed correlation with men satisfaction, it didn't show its predictability. Eros, the strongest predictor and Agape were positive predictors, while Ludus was the only

negative predictor for men. Men satisfaction was less able predicted by partner's love styles.

None of the women love styles showed prediction for men satisfaction,  $F(6, 68) = 1.908$ ,

$p = .092$ . For women, Eros and Storge were positive predictors whereas Ludus was a negative

predictor on satisfaction. Ludus negative predictability was even stronger in women  $F(6, 68)$

$= -4.101$ ,  $p < .01$  than men  $F(6, 67) = -2.138$ ,  $p < .05$ . For women, regarding to the partner's

love styles, Ludus endorsed from men also caused women with less relationship satisfaction.

Table 7.1 Linear regression analyses: love styles as predictors of relationship satisfaction among men and women

Satisfaction	$\beta$	$t$	Multiple R	$R^2$	$df$	$F$
Men			.633	.400	6, 67	7.459**
Eros_M	.359	2.637**				
Ludus_M	-.212	-2.138*				
Agape_M	.311	2.180*				
Satisfaction	$\beta$	$t$	Multiple R	$R^2$	$df$	$F$
Women			.711	.506	6, 68	11.615**
Eros_F	.411	3.821**				
Ludus_F	-.373	-4.101**				
Storge_F	.211	2.313*				
Ludus_M	-.438	-3.957**	.502	.252	6, 67	3.756*

$p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed

#### 8. Correlations between Triangular components and relationship satisfaction

The triangular theory of love emphasizes the three components, intimacy, passion and commitment, are essential in a love relationship and associated with relationship quality.

Correlations among the three components with satisfaction were computed. All components were significantly correlated with the satisfaction for each dyad member in different degree,

ranged from .21 to .78. Generally stronger correlations were obtained from the respondents' self-rating scores. In another words, men's scores on the three components showed higher correlations with their own satisfaction than with women satisfaction. Similar patterns were also found from women results (refer to Table 8).

Table 8. Correlations of Triangular Love with men and women satisfaction

	Relationship satisfaction	
	Men	Women
Intimacy_ M	.78**	.45**
Passion_ M	.64**	.21**
Commitment_ M	.75**	.33**
Intimacy_ F	.52**	.68**
Passion_ F	.30**	.67**
Commitment_ F	.44**	.76**

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed

Intimacy was the strongest factor associated with both respondent's (for men,  $r = .78$ ; for women,  $r = .68$ ) and partner's satisfaction (for men,  $r = .52$ ; for women,  $r = .45$ ). Relatively, passion showed weaker correlations with partner satisfaction for men ( $r = .30$ ) and women ( $r = .21$ ). Commitment was also strongly related to respondent satisfaction,  $r = .75$  and  $r = .76$  for men and women respectively. And it was correlated with partner satisfaction moderately, for men ( $r = .44$ ) and for women ( $r = .33$ ). The findings implied the triangular components are mutually associated with partner's relationship satisfaction, especially regarding to the intimacy and commitment.



### 9. *Correlations of discrepancies in Love triangles and relationship satisfaction*

Consider the matching of involvement in a relationship associated with relationship dissatisfaction, it was examined by correlations between the absolute differences in the three components scores with satisfaction separately. The negative correlations represent absolute difference was associated with lower satisfaction. Discrepancies in individuals' triangles were partially associated with dissatisfaction and genders showed different patterns (refer to Table 9).

Table 9 Correlation of discrepancies in Triangle love with relationship satisfaction

	Relationship satisfaction	
	Men	Women
Intimacy Absolute Difference	-.201*	-.151
Passion Absolute Difference	.287**	.113
Commitment Absolute Difference	-.064	-.260*

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed

Discrepancy in intimacy among couples was only related to men having lower satisfaction, but not for women. On the contrary, effect from discrepancy in commitment with lower satisfaction was only found among women, but not for men. Surprisingly, difference in passion was associated with higher satisfaction for men. As it was not following our expectation and violated Sternberg's prediction, a further investigation was carried out for this specific curious aspect. To examine how the discrepancy in passion affecting on relationship satisfaction among couples, a regression analysis was computed. Instead of using the absolute value, the actual differences were used for comparison. Table

9.1 showed the effects of higher level of passion for men versus women on differences between their satisfactions.

Table 9.1 Linear regression of discrepancies in Passion onto relationship satisfaction

Men Satisfaction	$\beta$	$T$	Multiple R	$R^2$	$df$	$F$
Passion M > Passion F	.339	2.308*	.339	.115	1, 42	5.329*
Passion F > Passion M	.153	.927	.153	.023	1, 36	.860
Women Satisfaction	$\beta$	$T$	Multiple R	$R^2$	$df$	$F$
Passion M > Passion F	-.094	-.600	.094	.009	1, 40	.360
Passion F > Passion M	.572	4.180**	.572	.327	1, 36	17.470**

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed

The results indicated that for both men and women, the more passion involved by one of the members among a couple, the higher level of satisfaction would be brought to that member. And this effect was shown to be stronger among women ( $\beta = 5.72$ ) than men ( $\beta = .339$ ). For the side with lower level of passion, the discrepancy neither led to satisfaction nor dissatisfaction on them. Nevertheless, the discrepancy in passion was only linked to positive effect among couples.

## Discussion

This present study has addressed the following issues. First, to address to what extent gender and relationship status were different in love beliefs and their experienced love.

Second, was to examine how the love styles and love components were associated within an individual. Finally, was the most interest issue, which examined the association between love variables and relationship satisfaction.

Regarding the gender difference in love styles, the present data was generally consistent with the previous studies from the West. Thus, men are more game-play (Ludus), romantic (Eros) and Agapic (e.g. Hendrick et al., 1988; Frazier & Esterly, 1990). However, contrary to these studies, no gender differences in endorsing Pragma, Storge or Manic was found in this sample (see also Frazier & Esterly, 1990). Men with high level of Ludus may reflect one of the traditional gender traits, which is men, are more sexually permissive and place more importance on physical attractiveness with their partners. In contrary, women are less sexually-oriented in their romantic relationships. The analysis of the gender difference in Ludus endorsement may not only show the difference in their level, but both genders may give different account to Ludus within a relationship. The regression analysis of the love variables suggested that Ludus predicts the love components differently for men and women (refer to Table 5). The associations between the love styles and the love components will be discussed in later part. Men are scored higher in Eros and Agape suggests that they are more emotionally dependent on their partners. Social norms about dating may also foster these love styles differences. Women are more likely to appreciate their dating partners are more romantic than the other way round. Men are expected to be responsible to take care their

partners. They are more Agapic may also due to men view romantic relationship is different from women. Although men are found to be more game-playing towards romantic relationship, study showed that men were more satisfied if they were more involvement to their relationships, but women did not show this association (Sternberg& Barnes, 1985). Therefore, they may become more selfless and emotionally rely on their partners if they are involving in a right relationship.

Although literature suggests women are more friendship oriented and practical to their relationships, present data is not able to show a vivid love attitude for women. Analysis how the relationship stages effect on love styles may get insight to explain these results. It is interesting to find that love styles across relationship status are totally not significant for men, but women showed significant differences in Storge, Pragma and Mania, which were the love styles did not show any effect from the earlier gender comparison. Men from different relationship status share similar love beliefs, whereas women who have dating and those got married were having different love styles. It implied that men are more stable with their gender traits disregard their status. Thus, they have more vivid love styles for the overall gender comparison. For women, trends of increasing in Storge, Pragma and Mania across their relationship seriousness and duration were found. Hendrick et al. (1988) suggested that Storge may be a more important element of relationship quality for older and mature individuals. Regard this notion, married couples have showed more endorse in Storge than

dating couples in this study, it supports the Storge plays a role across relationship development is indeed exists. Consistent to the finding showed that women's Pragma scores varied across relationship status (Frazier & Esterly, 1990), present dating shows that couples who plan to marry are more practical than dating couples. The difference shown between these two stages suggests that plan to marry in a major transition for a relationship. Women are more likely to be realistic and practical to their relationship when they have to decide if their partners are the one to be committed for their later lives. Married women are less obsessive in love than dating couples, specifically with short period of time. It suggests that women's high emotion fade with the maturity of love. Relevant study also showed the lower Mania scores were found lower in older people (Morrow et al, 1995).

Relationship status were still of interest to study its effect on experienced love. Regard to the time courses predicted by Sternberg (1986), present data is partially support his prediction. Both intimacy and commitment show an increase pattern with the relationship seriousness. Intimacy was different between married couples and dating couples with two years or less, but was not found with those have their dating more than two years. Thus, both time effect and stage effect of intimacy emerged from the findings. Commitment shows distinct differences across relationship stages, from dating, plan to marry to married. As expected, the more developed relationships show higher level of commitment. Regard to the notion from Acker & Davis (1992), the increase in commitment across stages might be

caused by a mean of man-made. People who got marry or planned to marry manifest the importance of commitment with their partners. Therefore, they may report with higher commitment. These data suggest that it is worthwhile for further research to examine correlations between commitment to other relationship qualities, such as cost and satisfaction under different relationship stages. To ascertain the meaning of commitment whether is congruent for intimate partners. Relationship states and duration are considered as factors affecting the love component. Nevertheless, the significant differences found in this analysis are mainly from two extreme groups, married group and dating group. It is still abstract to tell how relationship dynamics may affect the experienced love.

Regression analyses of the love styles and love components for the sake of defining the relationships of each love styles on experienced love (Table 5). Moreover, it provides more details on gender differences. Eros overall is considered as to be contributive to every aspects of the triangular love for both men and women. Agape is also considered to be beneficial to experience love, but solely appeared for men. Storge is more likely to an important love belief for women. It is because women are more friendship-oriented, intimacy and commitment are major obtained from their deep friendships with their partners. Associations between love styles, intimacy, passion and commitment were briefly analyzed, showing that these associations are different between genders. A brief prediction can be drawn from the limited data. For example, men's commitment may due to their romance and self-less,

sacrificial mind. Whereas women's commitment may not be related to their self-less mind but rather their friendship. Further study on the predictability of love beliefs on these components may help to explain love behaviors more specifically for men and women.

Romantic partners in this study are found to have similar love styles, this result generally consistent with other studies (e.g. Davis & Latty-Mann, 1987, Morrow et al, 1995). Except Mania and Agape, partners in this sample have their scores in Eros, Ludus, Storge and Pragma are significant correlated. Moreover, this study tried to explore if romantic partners tend to have similarity in other love components. Result shows that partners tend to hold their love components in a similar pattern. Intimacy, passion and commitment are all related to satisfaction for men and women. As noticed, similarity prompts attraction and satisfaction within a relationship. Although they are holding their level of love variables are similar, men and women may be governed by these love elements differently. Eros, Storge and Agape are generally described as positive love styles, Ludus is considered as negative one (Hendrick, Hendrick, 1997). Regarding to the gender differences of the association between love styles and relationship satisfaction, satisfaction of men and women were predicted by different beliefs in this study. Men with their Eros and Agape would bring them with satisfaction, while Ludus would bring them less. Moreover, men satisfaction is not related to female love styles. For women, their satisfaction may come from their Eros and Storge, Ludus also bring them less satisfaction. Both parties in a relationship experience companionate love give rises

to higher satisfaction (Hecht, Marston, & Larkey, 1994). The present data only show the positive effect of storge endorsement on women. Besides, men's Ludus also cause them with less satisfaction. It brings a curious issue, women are affected by their partner's Ludic love, but men are not affected by their partners. Trace back to the associations between Ludus and different love components may get an explanation. Women's score of Ludus predicted more negative aspects of love. Women with ludus style lead to less intimacy, passion and commitment, whereas men with ludus style only cause less intimacy. Women may find less satisfaction from partner who is game-playing, because this love style affects every aspects of love for them. Men are more financially independent than women; men may not be dissatisfied with less committed women. One more gender difference is ascertained in this study. Regard to the other studies (Frazier & Esterly, 1990; Morrow et al, 1995), Agape is positively related to satisfaction for both genders, whereas agape was found to be positively related to men in this study. Storge was found to positively related to women solely. It shows vivid love styles for satisfaction in men and women. Men would be more satisfied with their more giving than receive to their partners. Women would be more satisfied in a relationship with more companions.

Data gave a strong support for the association of intimacy, passion and commitment with satisfaction. Individuals' relationship satisfaction was all significantly correlated with both their own scores and their partners' scores. Satisfaction was particularly correlated higher



with the reported scores. It shows that relationship satisfaction is more related with how one perceives his or her involvement, partner's involvement show a milder effect. In contrast to Sternberg & Barnes (1985) suggestion that discrepancies in triangles predict satisfaction. Unmatched triangles should correlate with dissatisfaction. However, the line of studying passion in this study contradicted this issue. Regression analyses showed that for both men and women, members who were more passionate within the relationship, were more satisfied for their relationship. It was a distinct finding concerning the couples' discrepancy in passion. It may due to the nature of passion bring with infatuated love, individuals are less realistic and more devoured. They may spend more time and energy focus on their relationships. Moreover, unlike a certain love style may bring negative effect, passion from one side also brings with the other parties satisfaction (refer to Table 8). The positive outcomes from passion may reinforce them to be more passionate. There is another possibility for this account. Gao (2001) suggested that Chinese couples reported lower level of passion than American couples, but no significant different in intimacy and commitment. It may be the reason that Chinese couples are less permissive to show their passion or they are really place less importance in passion in real lives. The mean scores in passion in this study were also obviously lower than the other two components and no difference across relationship stages. The limited data may not able to show consistent association between the discrepancies in passion with satisfaction. This distinct finding also suggests a direction for further study on

study close relationship from a culture perspective.

Previous studies about romantic relationship often used samples from college students. The sample used in this study was in a wider age range and with different relationship stages. It was strength for this study. The wider range of participants gave variety to understand this major encounter in human relationship. The major weakness of this study is limited to be carried out in cross-sectional design. Such design cannot provide sufficient data to study stage effect and age effect for relationship development. Present data was only enough to make comparison between different stage. Only longitudinal study can give full account for relationship development. Moreover, there are confounding variables are not considered in this study, which may be crucial for a relationship, such as financial situation, whether couple have their children, especially for married couples. The present study only focused the basic elements under the two theories, the six love styles and triangular theory of love.

### **Conclusion**

In sum, the present study showed a support for gender differences in love styles and love change with relationship stages, and little evidence on time effect. Associations of Love styles and relationship satisfaction are different in men and women. Concerning the intimacy, passion and commitment, this study, again provided evidence on the importance of these components on satisfaction. The most interesting finding among the analyses was the

discrepancy in passion correlated to higher relationship satisfaction. Further research on romantic relationship with a cultural perspective and if possible, with a longitudinal design is encouraged. Variables regarding to different aspects of daily lives may be confounded and should be concerned for future study for relationship development.

## Reference

- Acker, M., & Davis M. H. (1992). Intimacy, passion and commitment in adult romantic relationships: A test of the triangular theory of love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 9*, 21-50.
- Davis, K.E., & Latty- Mann, H. (1987). Love styles and relationship quality: A contribution to Validation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4*, 409-428.
- Frazier, P.A. & Esterly, E. (1990) Correlates of Relationship Beliefs: Gender, Relationship Experience and Relationship Satisfaction, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship 7*: 331-352.
- Gao, G. (2001). Intimacy, passion, and commitment in Chinese and US American romantic relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25*, 329-342.
- Hatfield, E (1988). Passionate and companionate love. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barenz (Eds.), *The psychology of love (pp. 191-217)*. New haven, CT: yale University Press.
- Hecht, M. L., Marston, P. J., & Larkey, K. L. (1994). Love ways and relationship quality in heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship, 11*, 25-43.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Social and personal Psychology, 50*, 392-402.

- Hendrick, C., Hendrick, S.S. & Alder, N. L. (1988) Romantic Relationships: Love, Satisfaction, and staying Together, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 54: 980-988.
- Hendrick, S. & Hendrick. C. (1995). Gender Differences and Similarities in Sex and Love. *Personal relationship*, 2, 55-65.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1997). Love and Satisfaction. In R. J. Sternberg & M. Hajjat (Eds.), *Satisfaction in close relationships* (pp. 57- 78). New York, Guilford Press.
- Hendrick, S.S., Dicke, A. & Hendrick, C. (1998). The relationship assessment scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship*, 15, 137-142.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. S. (2006). Styles of Romantic Love. In R. J. Sternberg & K. Weis (Eds.), *The New Psychology of Love* (pp.149-170). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lee, J. A. (1988). Love Styles. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 38-67). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Morrow, G. D., Clark, E.M & Brock, K.F. (1995) Individual and Partner Love Styles: Implications for the Quality of Romantic involvements, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, Vol. 12(3): 363-387.

Sternberg, R. J., & Barnes, M. (1985). Real and ideal others in romantic relationships: Is four a crowd? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 1586-1608.

Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A Triangular Theory of Love. *Psychological Review*, 93, 119-135.

Sternberg, R. J. (1988). Triangulating love. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 119-138). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tzeng, O. C. S. (1993). *Measurement of love and intimate relations: Theories, scales, and applications for love development, maintenance, and dissolution*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Dong, F. Q. 董福強 (2004) 高職學生愛情態度研究。國立中山大學教育研究所在職專班碩士論文。

## Appendix 1

### Triangular Theory of Love Scale (TTLS)

1. I am actively supportive of \_\_\_\_\_'s well-being.
2. I have a warm relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.
3. I am able to count on \_\_\_\_\_ in times of need.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ is able to count on me in times of need.
5. I am willing to share myself and my possessions with \_\_\_\_\_.
6. I receive considerable emotional support from \_\_\_\_\_.
7. I give considerable emotional support to \_\_\_\_\_.
8. I communicate well with \_\_\_\_\_.
9. I value \_\_\_\_\_ greatly in my life.
10. I feel close to \_\_\_\_\_.
11. I have a comfortable relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.
12. I feel that I really understand.
13. I feel that \_\_\_\_\_ really understands me.
14. I feel that I really can trust \_\_\_\_\_.
15. I share deeply personal information about myself with \_\_\_\_\_.
16. Just seeing \_\_\_\_\_ excites me.
17. I find myself thinking about \_\_\_\_\_ frequently during the day.
18. My relationship with \_\_\_\_\_ is very romantic.
19. I find \_\_\_\_\_ to be very personally attractive.
20. I idealize \_\_\_\_\_.
21. I cannot imagine another person making me as happy as \_\_\_\_\_ does.
22. I would rather be with \_\_\_\_\_ than with anyone else.
23. There is nothing more important to me than my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.
24. I especially like physical contact with \_\_\_\_\_.
25. There is something almost "magical" about my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.
26. I adore \_\_\_\_\_.
27. I cannot imagine life without \_\_\_\_\_.
28. My relationship with \_\_\_\_\_ is passionate.
29. When I see romantic movies or read romantic books I think of \_\_\_\_\_.
30. I fantasize about \_\_\_\_\_.
31. I know that I care about \_\_\_\_\_.
32. I am committed to maintaining my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.
33. Because of my commitment to \_\_\_\_\_, I would not let other people come between us.

34. I have confidence in the stability of my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.
35. I could not let anything get in the way of my commitment to \_\_\_\_\_.
36. I expect my love for \_\_\_\_\_ to last for the rest of my life.
37. I will always feel a strong responsibility for \_\_\_\_\_.
38. I view my commitment to \_\_\_\_\_ as a solid one.
39. I cannot imagine ending my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.
40. I am certain of my love for \_\_\_\_\_.
41. I view my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_ as permanent.
42. I view my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_ as a good decision.
43. I feel a sense of responsibility toward \_\_\_\_\_.
44. I plan to continue in my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_.
45. Even when \_\_\_\_\_ is hard to deal with, I remain committed to our relationship.





### Appendix 3

#### Love Attitude Scale

##### Eros

1. My partner and I were attracted to each other immediately after we met.
2. My partner and I have the right physical “chemistry” between us.
3. Our lovemaking is very intense and satisfying.
4. I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other.
5. My partner and I became physically involved very quickly.
6. My partner and I really understand each other.
7. My partner fits my ideal standards of physical beauty/ handsome.

##### Ludus

8. I try to keep my partner a little uncertain about commitment to him/ her.
9. I believe that what my partner doesn't know about me won't hurt him/ her.
10. I have sometimes had to keep my partner from finding out about other partners.
11. I could get over my affair with my partner pretty easily and quickly.
12. My partner would get upset if he/she knew of some of the things I've done with mother people.
13. When my partner gets too dependent on me, I want to back off a little.
14. I enjoy playing the “game of love” with my partner and a number of other partners,

##### Storge

15. It is hard for me to say exactly when our friendship turned into love.
16. To be genuine, our love first required caring for awhile.
17. I expect to always be friends with my partners.
18. Our love is the best kind because it grew out of a long friendship.
19. Our friendship merged gradually into love over time.
20. Our love relationship is the most satisfying because it developed from a good friendship.

##### Pragma

21. I considered what my partner was going to become in life before I committed myself to him/her.
22. I tried to plan my life carefully before choosing my partner.
23. In choosing my partner, I believed it was best to love someone with a similar background.
24. A main consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she reflected on my family.
25. An important factor in choosing my partner was whether or not he/she would be a good parent.
26. One consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my career.
27. Before getting very involved with my partner, I tried to figure out how compatible his/

her hereditary background would be with mine in case we ever had children.

#### Mania

28. When things aren't right with my partner and me, my stomach gets upset.
29. When my partner and I break up, I would get so depressed that I would even think of suicide.
30. Sometimes I get so excited about being in love with partner that I can't sleep.
31. When my partner doesn't pay attention to me, I feel sick all over.
32. Since I've been in love with my partner, I've had trouble concentrating on anything else.
33. I cannot relax if I suspect that my partner is with someone else.
34. If my partner ignores me for a while, I sometimes do stupid things to try to get his/her attention back.

#### Agape

35. I try to always help my partner through difficult times.
36. I would rather suffer myself than let my partner suffer.
37. I cannot be happy unless I place my partner's happiness before my own.
38. I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let my partner achieve his/her.
39. Whatever I own is my partner's to do as he/she chooses.
40. When my partner gets angry with me, I still love him/her fully and unconditionally.
41. I would endure all things for the sake of my partner.