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Abstract

Objectives

The current study aimed at investigating the impact of religion and religiosity on the three components of love (i.e. intimacy, passion and commitment) in Sternberg’s Triangular Theory of Love and relationship satisfaction. Most pervious studies were focused on the relationship between romantic relationship and other variables, such as gender, attachment, and pervious romantic experience. Thus, this study was carried out to understand the influence of religion and religiosity. Only Christianity was considered in this study because the doctrine of it emphasizes more love than the most popular religion – Buddhists and Taoists in Hong Kong.

Methods

435 young adults were participated in the current study. Slightly more than a half of them were Christians who have attended church for nearly 7.9 mean years. Convenience and snowball sampling were used to distribute questionnaires. Intimacy, passion and commitment were measured by the Intimacy, Passion and Commitment Scale (Lemieux and Hale, 1999, 2000). Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) (Hendrick, 1988) and Religiousness Scale (Strayhorn, Weidman & Larson, 1990) were adopted to investigate the quality of romantic relationship and the religiosity respectively.
**Results**

The results identified that Christians had less passion and more commitment than people without religion (PWOR). Besides, Christians with higher religiosity were found to have more commitment in romantic relationship than those with lower religiosity. Regarding relationship satisfaction, no religious difference was found between Christians and PWOR whereas a significant relationship between religiosity and the satisfaction was revealed.

**Conclusions**

The current study implicated the effect of religion and religiosity on the components of romantic relationship and relational satisfaction. Some limitations of this study were addressed. For future studies, it is suggested to use longitudinal design to investigate the causal relationships among religion and religiosity, the three components of love and relationship satisfaction.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review

Interpersonal relations are a profound wisdom among human beings. Family relations, friendship and romantic relationship are all important throughout our lifespan but the nature of romantic relationship is significantly different to the others. Romantic relationship consists of intimacy, passion and commitment while family relations and friendship do not regard passion as one of the elements (Sternberg, 1986, 1988, 1998). Romantic relationship is also powerful. Some people spend a large number of money in order to increase their physical attractiveness for their romantic partner (Robbins, 1996). Some people feel distressed and even attempt to commit suicide after breaking up with their partner. In contrast, some people can live longer because of having a happier and healthier romantic relationship (Robbins, 1996). These variations of romantic relationship can be explained by personal attitudes and beliefs which are affected by gender (Stafford & Canary, 1991), age (Collins, 2003), parental relationship (Howells & Stewart, 2003), religion (Reiter & Gee, 2008) and religiosity (Larson & Goltz, 1989), childhood attachment and prior romantic relationship (Collins, 2003; Robbins, 1996). In fact, many researchers considered gender, age, parental relationship, attachment and dating history into the studies of romantic relationship. However, few studies were focused on the relationship among religion, religiosity and romantic relationship so the current study is going to investigate the relationship among religion, religiosity and the attitudes towards the three components of romantic relationship (i.e. intimacy, passion
and commitment). Apart from this, it will also examine whether religion and religiosity associate with the quality of romantic relationship.

In this study, only Christians will be taken into account among different religions. The reasons of choosing it only are going to discuss as follows. According to the statistics of Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (2008), approximately 43% of the whole population is religious people in which 700,000 of them are Buddhists and Taoists and 320,000 of them are Protestant Christians which is the second main religion in Hong Kong. However, it is believed that Buddhism and Taoism do not have many impacts on romantic relationship because their doctrines do not focus too much on love and romantic relationship. Even mentioned, they take a somewhat negative position of it (Reuben, 1985). On the contrary, the doctrine of Christianity mentions more about love and romantic relationship. “God is Love” is the fundamental belief in Christianity (Reuben, 1985). The value of love and romantic relationship among Christians are influenced by what Bible teaches and the commandments of God (Young & Adams, 2005). Therefore, it is believed that Christianity has a significant impact on romantic relationship.

Triangular Theory of Love

Basic concepts. Sternberg believed love can be formed by three components as a triangle. Thus, he suggested a theory of love, called Triangular Theory of Love, in 1986. In this theory, he suggested intimacy is the top vertex of the triangle while passion and
decision/commitment are the left and right vertices of the triangle respectively. Intimacy, viewed as an emotional investment in the relationship, is the feelings of closeness, connectedness and bondedness. These feelings accomplish the “warm” experience in a close relationship. In 1984, Sternberg and Grajek used five different instruments to understand the nature of love. They identified three general factors of love (i.e. emotions, motivations and cognitions) and their features. Sternberg (1986, 1988, 1998) later, based on the findings of the above research, identified ten specific features of intimacy, including the (1) motive of advocating the well-beings of the loved one, (2) delighted experiences with the loved one, (3) high respect for the partner, (4) ability of leaning on the loved one in times of need, (5) reciprocal understanding between the couple, (6) mutual sharing and possessions within the couple, (7) getting emotional support from the loved one, (8) giving emotional support to the loved one, (9) intimate interaction and (10) regarding the loved one as one’s life. Passion, regarded as a motivational involvement in the relationship, is the drive leading romance, physical attraction and sexual consummation in an intimate relationship (Sternberg, 1986, 1988, 1998). Not only including sexual needs, passion also comprises the needs of self-esteem, self-actualization, nurturance, affiliation, dominance and submission (Sternberg, 1986, 1988, 1998). It was described as a “hot” component in the relationship (Sternberg, 1986, 1988, 1998). Decision/commitment, related to cognitive decision and commitment in the relationship, is to make decision to love someone in short run and to commit to
maintain that love in long run (Sternberg, 1986, 1988, 1998). These two aspects do not necessarily occur together in one’s loving relationship. Some people can decide to love but not commit to maintain that love while other people may commit to the love without falling in love with the others (Sternberg, 1986, 1988, 1998). However, in general, decision will precede commitment. This component was regarded as the “cold” one (Sternberg, 1986, 1988, 1998).

**Interaction of the components.** Sternberg (1986, 1988, 1998) indicated that intimacy, passion and commitment highly correlated to each other. Intimacy is followed by passion if the romantic relationship is developed from close friendship. Two close friends of the opposite sex, for example, develop passion when their intimacy achieves a certain level. However, passion may be sharply and immediately aroused after the development of intimacy. “Love at first sight” is an example of this condition. The individuals may be fascinated after a while that they meet the right person. On the contrary, the relationship of intimacy and passion may also negatively correlate to the other. Some people may not be able to attain intimacy and passion simultaneously. When they attain more intimacy, it may interfere with their attainment of passion. Apart from the above associations, the decision/commitment component also plays an important role in a loving relationship. This component may, in general, result from the involvement of intimacy and passion. Most people have emotional and motivational investment before they decide to love each other and commit to the relationship.
Nonetheless, in some cases, commitment precedes the intimacy and passion components. For instance, people were arranged to marry someone who have never seen before. Their loving relationship started from the marital commitment and might be able to foster intimacy and passion. However, the decision/commitment component does not always facilitate the emotional involvement and passionate arousal. For example, a married individual has intimate and passionate feelings towards another person but he or she cannot commit to this relationship because he or she has already got married. People can control their cognitive mind but may have difficult to control their emotions and arousals. Thus, having the decision/commitment component, the married person can prevent to have further development in this affair.

Sternberg (1986, 1988, 1998) also suggested the properties of the three components in different stages of close relationship. To have a relative stable relationship, for example, intimacy and commitment significantly involve while passion relatively contributes to an unstable and unpredictable relationship. Besides, he also found that passion plays the most important role in short-term relationship while intimacy plays a moderate role and decision/commitment barely plays any role in it. However, in long-term relationship, intimacy and decision/commitment are more important than passion which may moderate and decline over time.

Interestingly, these three components of love are not limited to the romantic relationship. Sternberg (1986, 1988, 1998) uncovered that intimacy is the core of many
kinds of relationships, such as parent-child relationship, relationship among siblings, friendship and romantic relationship. Nevertheless, passion tends to exist in only certain kind of close relationships, especially romantic relationship. Additionally, decision/commitment highly varies in different kinds of relationships. It can be high in martial relationship and low in “hi-and-bye” friendship.

*Kinds of love.* Sternberg (1986, 1988, 1998) used these three components of love to identify eight kinds of love (shown in Table 1). Firstly, nonlove refers to absence of intimacy, passion and decision/commitment components. It simply describes the casual interactions in the majority of our interpersonal relationships. Secondly, liking refers to presence of intimacy while passion and decision/commitment are absent. Liking does not simply describe the feelings towards casual acquaintances or passers-by. Instead, it refers to a set of feelings in particular relationships, such as feeling of warmth in friendship. Thirdly, infatuated love only involves passion. In other words, intimacy and decision/commitment are absent in this kind of love. This kind of love is also known as “love at first sight”. Turning up suddenly and quickly, infatuation tends to trigger one’s psychophysiological arousal, such as increased heartbeat, hormonal secretions and erection of genitals. Fourthly, empty love is a kind of love which consists of decision/commitment only. Under different cultures, empty love can be the end of a relationship or the beginning of a relationship. At the final stage of a long-term relationship, it is believed that intimate involvement and physical attraction have lost
with years. However, in ancient China, marriages were arranged by parents or matchmakers so some couples started their relationship with marital commitment and tried to love each other after marriage. Fifthly, romantic love is a combination of intimacy and passion. Alternatively, this kind of love includes not only physical attraction but also emotional involvement. However, decision/commitment is not a necessary part of romantic love. Sixthly, companionate love includes intimacy and decision/commitment components of love. It describes a relatively long-term and committed friendship which is usually found in martial relationship. Most romantic relationships may become companionate love eventually because passion will be replaced by commitment over time. Seventhly, fatuous love combines passion and decision/commitment components. It describes the sense that a commitment is based on passion without intimate feeling. Fatuous lovers easily commit to a relationship with passion and terminate that relationship since the psychophysiological arousal is gone. However, intimate feeling can be developed in fatuous love relationship which may become a chance of transformation to another type of loves. Finally, the most desirable love is consummate love which refers to the full combination of the three components of love. Being difficult to reach, consummate love is even harder to maintain in romantic relationship. However, most people tend to attain and keep their romantic relationships as similar as consummate love.
Table 1

*Eight Kinds of Love*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intimacy</th>
<th>Passion</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-love</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infatuated love</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty love</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic love</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companionate love</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatuous love</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consummate love</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ✓ = present component, × = absent component.

**Religious Views towards Sternberg’s Love Theory**

As Lee (1988) said, love styles can be influenced by ideologies which are sets of ideas developed over time to satisfy the individual’s needs of understanding the world. Christianity is one of the involvements in ideology. Most people learnt a particular religious ideology towards their love styles when they were growing up, especially for those who studied in the schools with religious background in their childhood and adolescence.

*Intimacy.* According to Brady (2003), two kinds of love are promoted in Christianity: *philia* and *agape*. Both *philia* and *agape* are related to intimacy which is one of the components in Sternberg’s triangular theory of love. *Philia* which is primarily a fellowship among Christians refers to the relationship of a couple in which a person regards their partner as the unique and particular attached figure. This type of love can bond people from any association together regardless of the type of associations. *Philia* also suggests that mutuality and sharing are the important elements in relationship.
Agape is the divine bestowal of love (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1992). In general, it represents the unlimited love of God for all creation in the world. To specific, it refers to a free giving without consideration of return among human beings. It also relates to affection, benevolence, fondness and contentedness (Brady, 2003). People with agape tend to concern for the well-being of the loved one. Besides these types of love, Bible has also mentioned the attitude towards love which is somewhat similar to intimacy. “Love is never tired of waiting; love is kind; love has no envy; love has no high opinion of itself, love has no pride; love's ways are ever fair, it takes no thought for itself; it is not quickly made angry, it takes no account of evil; it takes no pleasure in wrongdoing, but has joy in what is true; love has the power of undergoing all things, having faith in all things, hoping all things” (1 Corinthians 13:4-7, in BBE, 1964). Thus, Christians should have higher intimacy whichever in romantic relationship or in other interpersonal relationships, like friendship and family relationship, in Sternberg’s triangular theory of love.

Passion. In the Bible, there is a clear direction towards passion. God created human beings with passionate love in order to not only reproduce the next generations but combine the husband and the wife as a whole (Genesis 2:18-25, in BBE, 1964). However, sexual immorality and premarital sex are unaccepted. “And that when I come again, my God may put me to shame among you, and I may have grief for those who have done wrong before and have had no regret for their unclean ways, and for the evil
desires of the flesh to which they have given way” (2 Corinthians 12:21, in BBE, 1964). This Scripture points out that people being lascivious and fornicated with others without any regret will be shamed. Another two Scriptures mention that, as a Christian, fornication and all uncleanness have to avoid, “but evil acts of the flesh and all unclean things, or desire for others' property, let it not even be named among you, as is right for saints” (Ephesians 5:3, in BBE, 1964) and “for the purpose of God for you is this: that you may be holy, and may keep yourselves from the desires of the flesh” (1 Thessalonians 4:3, in BBE, 1964). Apart from these, there are many Scriptures taking about passion and all of these are promoting abstinence. However, the only acceptable form of sexual relations, marital sex, is suggested in Hebrews 13:4 (in BBE, 1964), “let married life be honoured among all of you and not made unclean; for men untrue in married life will be judged by God”. Therefore, in view of Christianity, passion, especially the sexual part, plays the tiniest role among unmarried Christians in Sternberg’s love theory.

Decision/Commitment. According to the doctrine of the Bible, love is a decision rather than a feeling (Schultz & Schultz, 2002). People should deeply consider the relationship before making decision to love or being loved. Young and Adams (2005) suggested, on biblical basis, the ten commandments of dating. One of them is “thou shall take it slow” which remind people should spend more time to understand each other before engaging in dating relationship. Regarding commitment, marriage is an
important commitment to maintain love between the couples. Based on the biblical view, marriage is an everlasting commitment to the loved one which should be made once throughout our life. In additional, marriage is priceless because it is one of the gifts that God bestow on human beings ([1 Corinthians 7:7](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1%20Corinthians%207%3A7&version=BBE), in BBE, 1964). Lambert and Dollahite (2008) found that religious couples had higher commitment in marital relationship as they regarded God as an essential part of their marriage. Besides, being strongly discourage, divorce (i.e. breaking commitment) is rarely found among religious people (Lambert & Dollahite, 2008). Thus, the component of decision/commitment in Sternberg’s theory is extremely important among Christians.

Religiosity and Components of Love

Religiosity, being a wide concept, is defined by different scholars in different dimensions. However, in general, it relates to religious commitment, religious belief and religious behavior (Cunningham & Pitcher, 1986). Religious belief is a cognitive component in religiosity while religious commitment and behavior are, respectively, an affective component and a behavioral component in religiosity (Cunningham & Pitcher, 1986). Mol (1977) argued that religious commitment is important to maintain religious identity which emphasizes emotion and emotional attachment to a particular identity. Thus, religious commitment is an affective component instead of cognitive one. The behavioral component, religious behavior, includes attendance of church, donation to church, frequency of private prayer and bible study and so on (Cunningham & Pitcher,
Apart from this, religiosity can also be classified into two modes: private and public (Cunningham & Pitcher, 1986). In the private mode, believers feel and commit to God and have some religious behaviors such as pray personally, help the poor and encourage others to believe in God. In the public mode, believers accept the beliefs of the uniqueness of a sect and attach to a particular church. They usually participate in worship services and religious ritual.

Some studies found that religiosity has impacts on the components of love, especially on decision/commitment component. Few studies were interested in investigating intimacy and passion with religiosity. One study (McDonald, 2000) tried to find out the predictors of intimacy fear. They obtained a result that intimacy as a marital attitude was positively related to religiosity. Another study was about passion and the effect of intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity (Heinrichs, 1994). They found a negative correlation between intrinsic religiosity and sexual attitudes and behaviors which was due to the attendance at worship services. Most of the research interests were to investigate the relationship between religiosity and martial commitment instead of decision/commitment in dating relationship. Larson and Goltz (1989) carried out a research about marital commitment and religiosity. They found that commitment was positively correlated to church attendance which is one of the elements in public religiosity. They also discovered spouses have deeper commitment as long as their religion emphasizes the importance of marriage. Christianity is one of the religions...
emphasizing the sacredness of marriage. Thus, deeper commitment should be revealed among Christians. Mahoney, Pargament, Jewell, Swank, Scott, Emery and Rye (1999) were the first research group to study the relationship between religiosity and marriage perception. They pointed out that marital commitment was determined by how believers perceived marriage (i.e. marriage is sacred and a manifestation of God) which was interfered by the degree of religiosity.

Factors affecting Relationship Satisfaction

Components of love. The three components of love (i.e. intimacy, passion and commitment) in Sternberg’s theory do not only have interaction effects with each other (1986, 1988, 1998), but also mediate the satisfaction in an intimate relationship (e.g. Hendrick, Hendrick & Adler, 1988; Kisler & Christopher, 2008; Santtila, et al., 2008; Zimmer-Gembeck & Petherick, 2006). In Zimmer-Gembeck and Petherick’s study (2006), they found a significant correlation between intimacy dating goals and relational satisfaction. Alternative speaking, people having more intimacy goals in the dating reported to have greater relational satisfaction. Besides, intimacy dating goals could encourage people to have more intimate interactions which further enhanced the satisfaction (Sanderson and Evans, 2001). Kisler and Christopher (2008) have done a study to examine sexual exchange and relationship satisfaction. They adopted the Interpersonal Exchange Model of Sexual Satisfaction (IEMSS) in their study to found the relationship between the two variables. In the model, four factors (i.e. the balance of
sexual rewards to sexual costs, the comparison level between sexual rewards and costs, 
sexual rewards equality and sexual costs equality) are suggested to influence sexual 
satisfaction which can affect relationship satisfaction. Based on their result, it indicated 
that the four factors could foster sexual satisfaction which was also able to enhance 
relational satisfaction. Another research focused on sexual desire, sexual activity and 
relational satisfaction (Santtila, et al., 2008). They found that people having higher 
“kissing and petting” and “vaginal intercourse” desires more satisfied with the intimate 
relationship whereas some desires, like “masturbation”, were the moderators of 
relational satisfaction. Commitment was also found to have positive correlation with 
relational satisfaction (Hendrick, Hendrick & Adler, 1988). In this study, they found that 
commitment could promote the satisfaction not only of the person but also of their 
partner in a romantic relationship.

Religiosity. Religiosity is also believed to facilitate relationship satisfaction. 
Dudley and Kosinski (1990) studied the relationship between religiosity and marital 
satisfaction. They discovered that people having religious beliefs and performing 
religious duties have higher marital satisfaction. Orathinkal and Vansteenwegen (2006) 
also implemented a study about religiosity and marital satisfaction. They defined 
religiosity as the frequency of attending religious service, the importance of religious 
belief, the frequency of seeking spiritual comfort and the perception of religious identity. 
And, they found a positive association between marital satisfaction and religiosity.
Apart from marital satisfaction, Fincham, Beach, Lambert, Stillman and Braithwaite (2008) worked on studying the relationship between spiritual behaviors and relational satisfaction. They discovered that prayer for one’s partner can increase future relationship satisfaction. It was suggested that prayer could reduce conflicts between the couples and increase commitment in the relationship.

**Covariates**

**Gender.** Having a great influence on romantic relationship, gender difference was addressed by many scholars. Hook, Gerstein, Detterich and Gridley (2003) investigated the differences of intimacy between men and women. They found that women emphasize love and affection and personal validation (i.e. sense of acceptance). However, men emphasize actions rather than feelings (Gilligan, 1982). Men perceived togetherness as an activity instead of a state of being. Besides, it is found that women wanted to have more intimacy than men (Lang-Takac & Osterweil, 1992). Some researchers were interested in studying gender difference in passion, especially in the sexual dimension. They investigated that men had more desired and actual sexual behaviors, including sexual fantasies, masturbation, oral sex, and vaginal intercourse (Santtila, et al., 2008). Kisler and Christopher (2008) also found gender difference in sexual behaviors. They reported that single women had less intercourse due to high sexual costs which consisted of pregnancy risk, sexual diseases infection and risk of sexual aggression. Sanderson and Kurdek (1993) studied the relational commitment and
satisfaction between men and women. They found a significant gender difference in commitment and satisfaction which related to independence, individual differences and problem-solving.

Overview and Hypotheses

Based on Sternberg’s studies of love and the doctrine of Christianity, Christians are taught to concern the well-being of everyone (e.g. Brady, 2003), abstinence (e.g. Genesis 2:18-25, in BBE, 1964) and take commitment serious (e.g. 1 Corinthians 7:7, in BBE, 1964). Thus, high level of intimacy and decision/commitment and low level of passion in the triangular theory of love should be found among Christians compared with people without religion (PWOR). In view of this, the first hypothesis is made:

H1: Christians would have higher level of intimacy and decision/commitment and lower level of passion than PWOR.

Besides, it is suggested that religiosity has impacts on the love components. Both intimacy and commitment were positively correlated to religiosity (e.g. Larson & Goltz, 1989; McDonald, 2000) and passion was negatively correlated to it (e.g. Heinrichs, 1994). Therefore, the second hypothesis is set:

H2: Christians with higher religiosity would have more intimacy, less passion and deeper commitment in romantic relationship than those with lower religiosity.

Finally, it was suggested a number of factors affecting relationship satisfaction, such as the three components of love and religiosity. Intimacy, passion and commitment
were found to facilitate relationship satisfaction (e.g. Hendrick, Hendrick & Adler, 1988; Santtila, et al., 2008; Zimmer-Gembeck & Petherick, 2006). Theoretically, high relational satisfaction should be found among Christians because they should have high intimacy and commitment. However, the doctrine of Christianity emphasizes abstinence very much so unmarried Christians cannot enjoy sexual satisfaction which increased relationship satisfaction. Thus, it is assumed that there is a compensation effect on relationship satisfaction among Christians leading no difference of it between Christians and PWOR. And, it showed that religiosity positively correlated to relationship satisfaction (Dudley & Kosinski, 1990; Orathinkal and Vansteeneugen, 2006). So, the third and fourth hypotheses are formed:

H3: There would be no difference of relationship satisfaction between Christians and PWOR.

H4: Christians with higher religiosity would have high relational satisfaction than those with lower religiosity.
Chapter 2: Methodology

Design

Cross-sectional design was adopted to carry out this research. The main independent variables were religion and religiosity while the main dependent variables were the three components of Sternberg’s triangular theory of love (i.e. intimacy, passion and decision/commitment) and relationship satisfaction.

Participants

In this study, convenience and snowball sampling were used to invite participants. 482 samples (179 men, 303 women) were collected in total. However, three criteria were set to select participants to do analysis: (1) young adults (aged 18 to 35), (2) unmarried individuals and (3) either Christians or PWOR. After considering these criteria, 435 individuals (164 men, 271 women) were included in the analysis. The ages of 91% of them ranged from 18 to 25 and 63.9% of them were studying in university. 51.5% of them were Christians who have attended church for about 7.9 mean years. 39.5% of them reported to have dating currently with the duration of nearly 31 mean months. 29.2% of them have ever had dating before with the duration of 13 mean months or so. 27.4% of the participants have never engaged in dating.

Procedure

Two main methods were used to collect data. Half of the questionnaires were distributed during breaks or after lessons with approvals of the lecturers or tutors in one
university in Hong Kong. Other questionnaires were solicited by asking friends to distribute them in their churches or fellowships in universities. All participants were informed of the objectives of this research, confidentiality of their participation and asked for their consent before filling in the questionnaires.

**Materials**

*Intimacy, Passion and Commitment Scale (IPCS).* 20 out of 23 items in this scale were employed to measure Sternberg’s three components of love (Lemieux & Hale, 1999, 2000) (see Appendix 1). This scale originally consists of 7 intimacy items, 8 passion items and 8 commitment items. One passion item was deleted when the scale was constructing by Lemieux and Hale in 1999. To measure the attitude towards these three components, other two commitment items were deleted and the anchors were changed from agree-disagree to important-unimportant in the current study. However, each item was still rated on 7-point Likert scale from 1=strongly unimportant to 7=strongly important. Besides, one original term “my partner” was also modified into “my ideal partner” to remind the participants of asking their attitudes. The English version was translated into Chinese and the backward translated into English to ensure maintaining similar meanings.

*Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS).* This scale was used to measure relationship satisfaction (Hendrick, 1988) (see appendix 2). It consists of 7 items which all are on a 5-point Likert scale. The anchors are different in each item. For example, in the first
item, it ranges from “poorly” to “extremely well” and, in the second item, it ranges from “unsatisfied” to “extremely satisfied”. A screening question – “do you have dating now?” was added and the translation process was also made in this scale.

*Religiousness Scale.* This scale was used to measure the religiosity (Strayhorn, Weidman & Larson, 1990) (see appendix 3). It contains 5 public religiosity items and 7 private religiosity items which are on a 5-point Likert scale. Same as RAS, each item has different anchors. For instance, it ranges from “not at all” to “very much” in the first item and from “never” to “daily” in the second item. Another screening question – “are you a Christian?” was also added and the translation process was also made in this scale.

Demographic factors have also been concerned, including age, gender, education level, income, marital status, religion, parental relationship, past romantic experience and dating duration. The full Chinese version questionnaire was attached (see appendix 4).

*Statistical Analyses*

To test the first hypothesis, Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) was used to investigate the differences of intimacy, passion and commitment between Christians and PWOR by controlling the gender effect. For the second hypothesis, total religiosity was transformed from scale to categorical variable. Total religiosity was divided into “low religiosity” and “high religiosity” by median split method. No
religious people were grouped into “no religiosity”. MANCOVA was also run to find
the differences of intimacy, passion and commitment among no religiosity, low
religiosity and high religiosity by controlling gender effect. To test the third hypothesis,
independent-sample $t$-test was used to find the relational satisfaction difference between
Christians and PWOR. Finally, simple linear regression analyses and a hierarchical
stepwise regression analysis were applied to address the relationship between religiosity
and relational satisfaction in the fourth hypothesis.
Chapter 3: Results

Reliability and Internal Validity

In Table 2, it shows significant correlations (Pearson’s \( r \) ranged from .01 to .93, \( p < .01 \)) among the Intimacy, Passion and Commitment Scale (IPCS) and its subscales, Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS), and Religiousness Scale and its subscales. It was found that IPCS and its subscales had a weak to moderate association with RAS (from .09 to .41, \( p < .01 \)) while non-significant correlations were found with Religiousness Scale and its subscales except commitment subscale. Only commitment, the subscale of IPCS, was observed to significantly correlate with all other scales and subscales (from .23 to .74, \( p < .01 \)). Religiousness scale and its subscales were discovered to have a weak to moderate correlation with RAS and the commitment subscale (from .23 to .46, \( p < .01 \)). The reliability of the overall Intimacy, Passion and Commitment Scale was .84 (\[ M = 106.87, SD = 14.36 \]). The intimacy subscale was .68 (\[ M = 39.58, SD = 5.97 \]) while passion and commitment were .75 (\[ M = 35.03, SD = 6.90 \]) and .82 (\[ M = 32.03, SD = 5.67 \]) respectively. The coefficient alpha of RAS was found to be .84 (\[ M = 26.82, SD = 4.16 \]). Besides, the reliability of the overall Religiousness Scale was .90 (\[ M = 41.78, SD = 7.85 \]) while public religiosity and private religiosity were .84 (\[ M = 16.46, SD = 4.04 \]) and .86 (\[ M = 25.35, SD = 4.43 \]) respectively (also see in Table 2).
Table 2

Pearson’s Correlation, Cronbach’s Alpha, Means and Standard Deviations of Intimacy, Passion and Commitment Scale, RAS and Religiousness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. IPCS</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Intimacy</td>
<td>.82** (.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.58</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Passion</td>
<td>.76** .47** (.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.03</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Commitment</td>
<td>.74** .49** .24** (.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RAS</td>
<td>.35** .32** .09 .41** (.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.82</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RS</td>
<td>.05 .02 -10 .28** .46** (.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Public RS</td>
<td>.03 .01 -.11 .23** .44** .93** (.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Private RS</td>
<td>.07 .03 -.08 .29** .43** .93** .71** (.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* IPCS: Intimacy, Passion and Commitment Scale (7-point scale); RAS: Relationship Assessment Scale (5-point scale); RS: Religiousness Scale (5-point scale). Values in the parentheses indicate Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

**Hypothesis 1:** Christians would have Higher Level of Intimacy and Decision/Commitment and Lower Level of Passion than PWOR

Intimacy, passion and commitment were examined using MANCOVA with an independent variable (religion) and a covariate (gender). The results revealed significant relationships among the three dependent variables, the independent variable (Wilk’s $\lambda = 0.87, F [3, 405] = 19.12, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.12$) and the covariate (Wilk’s $\lambda = 0.95, F [3, 405] = 6.76, p < .001. \eta^2 = 0.05$). Univariate analyses revealed that both passion ($F [1, 407] = 5.19, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.01$) and commitment ($F [1, 407] = 37.97, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.09$) were affected by religion (i.e. PWOR and Christians). However, gender difference was found in intimacy ($F [1, 407] = 5.13, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.01$), where women ($M = 5.55, SD = 0.75$) had more intimacy than men ($M = 5.72, SD = 1.00$), and passion ($F [1, 407] = 4.69, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.01$), in which men ($M = 5.16, SD = 1.05$) had higher passion than
women ($M = 4.91, SD = 0.93$). To understand the degree of gender effect, MANOVA was run and found a weak influence on the dependent variables. The $F$-value of passion ($F [1, 408] = 5.32, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.01$) and commitment ($F [1, 408] = 38.07, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.09$) were similar to the results in MANCOVA. To further indentify the dimension of the differences in passion and commitment, mean scores were addressed in Table 3 and it shows that Christians had lower level of passion and higher level of commitment than PWOR (see Figure 1). Hence, the first hypothesis was partially supported. As passion is a multidimensional concept, further analyses of each item in the subscale was done. Table 4 shows that only two statements, “my ideal partner is sexually exciting” ($t [430] = 3.42, p < .01$) and “sex is an important part of our relationship” ($t [431] = 5.72, p < .001$), in this subscale was found to have significant differences between PWOR and Christians.

**Table 3**

*Means, Standard Deviations, F-test, p-value and Effect Size for Intimacy, Passion and Commitment in Religion with Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>PWOR</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>37.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 410; df = 1, 407; PWOR: People without religion; $F$: $F$-value; $p$: significant level; $\eta^2$: effect size.*

* p < .05 (2-tailed); ** p < .001 (2-tailed).
Table 4
Means, Standard Deviations, t-value, p-value for Seven Items in Passion Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>PWOR</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel a powerful attraction for my ideal partner.</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I am often aroused by my ideal partner’s presence.</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) My ideal partner and I are very passionate toward one another.</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) My ideal partner and I are very affectionate toward one another.</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) My ideal partner is sexually exciting.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.42*</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) My ideal partner and I have a very passionate relationship.</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Sex is an important part of our relationship.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>5.72**</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. t: t-value; df: degree of freedom; PWOR: People without religion.
* p < .01 (2-tailed); ** p < .001 (2-tailed).

Figure 1. Means of intimacy, passion and commitment between people without religion (PWOR) and Christians.
Hypothesis 2: Christians with Higher Religiosity would have More Intimacy, Less Passion and Deeper Commitment in Romantic Relationship than those with Lower Religiosity

The scale variable (total religiosity) has been transformed into a three level categorical variable (called degree of religiosity). MANCOVA was also used to examine intimacy, passion and commitment with the degree of religiosity and the covariate (gender). The results also show significant relationships among the three components of love, degree of religiosity (Wilk’s $\lambda = 0.87$, $F[6, 808] = 9.82$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.68$) and gender (Wilk’s $\lambda = 0.95$, $F[3, 404] = 6.58$, $p < .001$. $\eta^2 = 0.05$). Univariate analyses revealed that only commitment ($F[2, 406] = 21.99$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.10$) contained significant influence of the degree of religiosity (i.e. no religiosity, low religiosity and high religiosity). However, the same gender effect was also found in intimacy ($F[1, 406] = 4.77$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = 0.01$) and passion ($F[1, 406] = 4.55$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = 0.01$). To investigate the gender effect, MANOVA was used. The $F$-value of commitment ($F[2, 407] = 22.03$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.10$) with no covariate was calculated to show a weak gender impact. To further analyze the differences, Bonferroni post hoc tests were carried out. It shows that both low ($p < .01$) and high religious people ($p < .001$) had higher commitment than PWOR. Besides, it can also be seen that high religious people also had more commitment than low religious people ($p < .01$). In sum, the second hypothesis was partly supported (see details in Table 5 and Figure 2).
Table 5
Means, Standard Deviations, F-test, p-value and Effect Size for Intimacy, Passion and Commitment in Degree of Religiosity with Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Religiosity</th>
<th>No Religiosity</th>
<th>Low Religiosity</th>
<th>High Religiosity</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 410; df = 2, 406; F: F-value; p: significant level; η²: effect size.
** p < .001 (2-tailed).

Figure 2. Means of intimacy, passion and commitment among people with no religiosity, low religious people and high religious people.

Hypothesis 3: There would be No Difference of Relationship Satisfaction between Christians and PWOR

To find the answer of this hypothesis, independent-sample t-test was applied to determine the difference of relationship satisfaction between PWOR and Christians. The results show that there was no significant difference of relationship satisfaction between
Christians and PWOR ($t \ [163] = 1.07, \ p > .05$). Thus, the fourth hypothesis was supported.

**Hypothesis 4: Christians with Higher Religiosity would have High Relational Satisfaction than those with Lower Religiosity**

Simple linear regression was run to understand the individual predictive power of private religiosity, public religiosity and total religiosity towards relationship satisfaction. The results were found that private religiosity ($\beta = .43, \ p < .001$), public religiosity ($\beta = .44, \ p < .001$) and total religiosity ($\beta = .46, \ p < .001$) all significantly predicted the satisfaction. To identify the contribution of each type of religiosity, a stepwise hierarchical regression analysis was adopted. In step 1 of this model, it was found that private religiosity alone has accounted for 18% of the variance ($F \ [1, 80] = 17.65, \ p < .001$) in relationship satisfaction (see Table 6). It shows that private religiosity ($\beta = .43, \ p < .001$) was able to positive significantly predict relationship satisfaction. In step 2, public religiosity was considered in the equation. The result shows that though an additional 3% of unique variance in relational satisfaction was found but it was statistically non-significant ($\Delta F \ [1, 79] = 2.75, \ p = \text{n.s.}$). In step 3, total religiosity was taken into account. However, it was excluded from the model as little contribution was found. Therefore, it can be concluded that the most powerful predictor of relationship satisfaction among the three predictors (private, public, and total religiosity) was private religiosity, which shows a positive association to the satisfaction.
The fourth hypothesis was also supported.

Table 6

A Hierarchical Regression Analysis with Degree of Religiosity and Relationship Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>SE $B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Private Religiosity</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Private Religiosity</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Religiosity</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 81; $R^2$: R square; $\Delta R^2$: R square change; $B$: unstandardized coefficient; SE $B$: standard error of the coefficient; $\beta$: standardized beta coefficient.

* $p < .001.$
Chapter 4: Discussion and Conclusions

The aim of this research was to explore the impact of religion and religiosity on intimacy, passion, commitment and relationship satisfaction. Most results were statistically significant. From the results, it can be seen that religion had impact on the components of love, especially on reducing passion and facilitating commitment, and religiosity was positively associated with commitment. Besides, it was found that religiosity was one of the predictors of relationship satisfaction. People with higher religiosity, especially private religiosity, were revealed to have higher satisfaction in romantic relationship.

Intimacy should, theoretically, be higher among Christians, especially the more religious one, than people with no religion, but no statistically significant result was found in this research. According to Sternberg (1986, 1988, 1998), intimacy being a multidimensional concept does not only appear in romantic relationship but in many loving relationships such as parent-child relationships and friendship. He found intimacy is a common core component of these loving relationships. Besides, Chinese culture may influence the level of intimacy. Hong Kong being a Chinese cultural city has many traditional values, norms and rituals. Confucianism emphasizing humaneness (ren) has affected Chinese for thousands years (Stepaniants, 2002). Humaneness asked people to care, love and support whoever are their family members or strangers (Stepaniants, 2002). This idea is an implicit core value of most Chinese. It may explain
why both Christians and PWOR have a similar level of intimacy.

To consider the levels of intimacy, passion and commitment, it shows that PWOR had high intimacy and high passion which can fit to “romantic love” in Sternberg’s eight kinds of love while Christians had high intimacy and high commitment which meet the criterion of “companionate love” (Sternberg, 1986, 1988, 1998). However, it is only able to claim these two kinds of love fitted to Christians and PWOR as no measurement was used to examine the kinds of love. Thus, to understand the relationship among religion, religiosity and the kinds of love, further study is recommended to carry out.

Regarding religiosity, it was revealed to have a significant impact on commitment but not passion. From the results, it can be seen that the main difference in passion related to sexual thoughts and behaviors which are restricted among Christians as the doctrine of Christianity emphasizes suppression of sexual thoughts and behaviors until marriage (e.g. 2 Corinthians 12:21 & Hebrews 13:4 in BBE, 1964). Thus, there was no passion difference between high and low religiosity. For commitment, the findings were similar to the results of other related studies focusing on marital commitment (Larson & Goltz, 1989; Mahoney, et al., 1999). Larson and Goltz (1989) mentioned that relational commitment was associated to religious commitment which also affected the degree of religiosity. Thus, religiosity had a positive relationship with commitment in romantic relationship.

With respect to relationship satisfaction, the results show that no religious
difference of relationship satisfaction was found. It may be because of the compensation effect of the three components of love. However, other factors can also affect the quality of relationship satisfaction. Eğeci and Gençöz (2006) suggested that a secure attachment style, the ability of problem solving and communication skills were all associated with the relational quality. Siavelis and Lamke (1992) found that instrumentalness and expressiveness could maintain the quality of a loving relationship. They suggested that instrumental abilities could increase interactions while expressive abilities could give and respond the cues to the partner. Francis and Robbins (1999) uncovered that some traits of personality, like toughminded and neuroticism, were associated to the discomforts in a romantic relationship while extraversion was able to increase the relational satisfaction. Bazzini, Stack, Martincin and Davis (2007) did a research to investigate the relationship between laughter recollection and relationship satisfaction. They found that retrieving positive events increased the quality of a romantic relationship. Besides, some neutral or negative events, like embarrassing incidents, could also improve the relationship satisfaction.

Religiosity was revealed to associate with the relational satisfaction. People with high religiosity, particularly private religiosity, were discovered to have more relationship satisfaction in the current study. These results were consistent with previous studies. According to Fincham, et al., (2008), they found that prayer served as a facilitator of the satisfaction in romantic relationship. Prayer for one’s partner was also
proved to promote later relational satisfaction. Another study found that church attendance and religious service had a significant association with the satisfaction in romantic relationship (Jenkins, 1991; Orathinkal & Vansteenwegen, 2006). In Dudley and Kosinski’s research (1990), intrinsic orientation, private and public ritualistic practices and religious activities were positively related to satisfaction. Thus, it is believed that religiosity had a significant impact on the quality of romantic relationship.

Limitations and Future Studies

Some limitations were addressed in this study. Firstly, the gender ratio of the samples was not similar to the population (M: F = 1: 1.3) (Census & Statistics Department, 2009). About 60% of the participants were female which might influence the accuracy of the results. Secondly, 64% of the participants were studying in university which might not represent the whole group of young adults (aged 18 to 35). Thirdly, the Intimacy, Passion and Commitment Scale was used as no other appropriate love attitudes measurement could be found. However, this scale is originally designed to measure the behavioral aspect of the three love components. Thus, the accuracy of love values might be interfered by the statements describing behaviors, especially for those participants who had dating currently. Finally, being a cross-sectional design, the results could only reveal the associations among variables. Thus, longitudinal study is suggested to implement in order to identify and understand more the causal relationships among these variables.
Conclusions

Generally speaking, the objectives of this study were achieved. The influence of religion and religiosity were found in romantic relationship. Attitude towards the three components of love, especially passion and commitment, was proved to be affected by religion and religiosity. Besides, it also supported that religiosity could facilitate relational satisfaction in couples.
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你好！本人是香港城市大學應用社會科學系心理學三年級的學生。現正進行一項有關戀愛價值觀、擇偶條件和戀愛關係滿意度的調查研究。這份問卷並沒有標準答案，閣下只要按照真實情況填寫便可。閣下的資料將會被銷毀和絕對保密，並只供學術研究用途，請放心填寫。

第一部份：以下是一些有關戀愛價值觀的描述，請根據您理想的戀愛關係，圈出適合的數字代表其重要性。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目描述</th>
<th>非 常 不 重 要</th>
<th>非 常 重 要</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 我和我理想的伴侶（下稱：他/她）會與對方分享私人的資料。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 我任何事都可以告知他/她。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 我和他/她可以互相透露心底的想法。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 有些事情我只能告訴他/她而不能告訴其他人。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 他/她能了解我的感受。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 我和他/她心理上很接近。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 我感覺大部份時候和他/她很親近。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 我感到他/她的吸引力很強。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 他/她的出現會令我精神為之一振。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 我和他/她能熱情地相待。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 我和他/她是深厚情的。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 他/她能令我產生性衝動。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 我和他/她的關係是很熱情的。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 性愛是我們的關係中的一部份。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 維持單身的生活方式。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 我會保守我們的關係。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 我們的關係是永恆的。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 承諾是我們關係中的主要部份。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 這段關係可以永遠持續。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 他/她是我唯一要走在一起的人。</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
第二部份：根據您的拍拖現況，圈出您對這段關係的滿意程度。（只供正在拍拖人士填寫）

1. 你現在有拍拖嗎？
   A 有       B 沒有（請跳至第三部份）

2. 你的伴侶能夠滿足你的需要嗎？
   A 不能夠       B 頗不能夠       C 一般       D 頗能夠       E 能夠

3. 總括而言，你滿意你的戀愛關係嗎？
   A 不滿意       B 頗不滿意       C 一般       D 頗滿意       E 滿意

4. 與其他人相比，你的戀愛關係有多好？
   A 非常不好       B 不好       C 一般       D 良好       E 非常良好

5. 你是否時常希望這段戀愛關係從未開始？
   A 從不       B 有時       C 一般       D 常常       E 經常

6. 你的戀愛關係和你的預期有多少相同/不同？
   A 完全不同       B 有點不同       C 一般       D 有點相同       E 完全相同

7. 你有多愛你的伴侶？
   A 不愛       B 不是很愛       C 一般       D 愛       E 很愛

8. 在你的戀愛關係存在着多少問題呢？
   A 非常少       B 很少       C 一般       D 很多       E 非常多

第三部份：以下是有關信仰程度的項目，請按照您的情況圈出最適合的答案。（只供基督徒填寫）

1. 你是否基督徒？
   A 是       B 否（請跳至第四部份）

2. 你認為你的信仰程度是怎樣呢？
   A 很淺       B 不是很深       C 一般       D 頗深       E 很深

3. 你是否時常獨自看聖經呢？
   A 從不       B 很少       C 間中       D 經常       E 每日

4. 除了用餐外，平均來說，你是否時常獨自禱告呢？
   A 從不       B 很少       C 間中       D 每日       E 每日幾次

5. 當你被引誘去做一些不好的事時，你是否時常尋求神的幫助好讓自己去做正確的事？
   A 從不       B 很少       C 有時       D 常常       E 經常
6. 在日常生活中，当你作决定时，你是否时常问自己神希望你做什么或者寻求神的协助去作决定？
   A 很少  B 很少  C 有时  D 常常  E 经常

7. 平均来说，你去年是否时常出席崇拜/主日学 (团契不包括在内)？
   A 很少  B 一年几次  C 每月一次至两次
   D 每星期或差不多每星期  E 每星期多次至一次

8. 你每年平均会把多少收入奉献给教会或宗教团体？
   A 很少  B 很少  C 少  D 中等  E 多

9. 你是否时常在教会或其他宗教团体事奉，如主日学导师、带领教会有活动或其他责任？
   A 很少  B 一年几次  C 每月一次至两次
   D 每星期或差不多每星期  E 每星期多次至一次

10. 你如何形容你和神之间的关系呢？
    A 没有关系或没有神的概念  B 有距离的关系
    C 有距离和亲密之间的关系  D 贴近关系  E 非常亲近关系

11. 当你做了一些好事，你是否时常感到/体验到这是神准许的？
    A 很少  B 很少  C 有时  D 常常  E 经常

12. 当你做了一些不好事，你是否时常感到/体验到这是神不准许的？
    A 很少  B 很少  C 有时  D 常常  E 经常

13. 你认为在多少程度上一些宗教的教义在指引你生命的方向？
    A 很少  B 一定程度上  C 中等程度上  D 一定程度上  E 很大程度上

第四部分：基本资料（请在适当的格内加上“√”）

1. 性别
   □ (1) 男   □ (2) 女

2. 年龄组别
   □ (1) 18 岁以下   □ (2) 18 – 25 岁   □ (3) 26 – 30 岁   □ (4) 31 – 35 岁
   □ (5) 36 – 40 岁   □ (6) 41 – 45 岁   □ (7) 46 – 50 岁   □ (8) 51 岁或以上

3. 教育程度
   □ (1) 小学   □ (2) 中一至中五  □ (3) 预科   □ (4) 就读大学
   □ (5) 就读大专   □ (6) 学士   □ (7) 副学士   □ (8) 学士以上

4. 婚姻状况
   □ (1) 未婚   □ (2) 已婚   □ (3) 同居   □ (4) 離婚
   □ (5) 分居   □ (6) 喪偶
5. 個人每月平均收入

□ (1) $5000 以下 □ (2) $5001 ～ $10000 □ (3) $10001 ～ $15000
□ (4) $15001 ～ $20000 □ (5) $20001 ～ $25000 □ (6) $25001 ～ $30000
□ (7) $30001 以上

6. 宗教信仰

□ (1) 無信仰 □ (2) 佛教 □ (3) 基督教(至今已返教會_____年)
□ (4) 天主教 □ (5) 其他(請註明：__________)

7. 您覺得您父母的婚姻關係是......

□ (1) 十分恩愛 □ (2) 良好 □ (3) 一般
□ (4) 不良 □ (5) 十分惡劣 □ (6) 不適用

8. 您的拍拖次數是......(單戀、暗戀不計算在內)

□ (1) 從不 □ (2) 1 次 □ (3) 2 次 □ (4) 3 次
□ (5) 4-5 次 □ (6) 6-8 次 □ (7) 9 次或以上

9. 戀愛狀況及持續時間

□ 正在拍拖，直至現在已持續了_________個月。
□ 曾經拍拖但現在沒有拍拖，最近一次拍拖持續了_________個月。
□ 不適用。

----------------------------------- 問卷完畢，非常感謝您的幫忙！-----------------------------------