LOVE ATTITUDES SCALE: SHORT FORM

Reference:

Hendrick, C., Hendrick, S., & Dicke, A. (1998). The Love Attitudes Scale: Short form. *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships*, 15, 147-159.

Description of Measure:

This is a shortened version of the original and revised Love Attitudes Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986, 1990). The original has 42 items, making up 6 different subscales (each with 7 items) that represent 6 different love styles

EROS (passionate love)

LUDUS (game-playing love)

STORGE (friendship love)

PRAGMA (practical love)

MANIA (possessive, dependent love)

AGAPE (altruistic love)

The shortened version maintains the same structure of subscales, but shrinks each subscale to 3 items. Thus, the shortened version is an 18-item measure of love attitudes. Respondents answer each item using a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree), 2 (moderately agree), 3 (neutral), 4 (moderately disagree), 5 (strongly disagree).

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 392-402.

This research was part of a larger research program on love and sex attitudes. Earlier work on love was reported in Hendrick, Hendrick, Foote, and Slapion-Foote (1984). The work on love extends Lee's (1973/1976) theory of six basic love styles: Eros (passionate love), Ludus (game-playing love), Storge (friendship love), Pragma (logical, "shopping list" love), Mania (possessive, dependent love), and Agape (all-giving, selfless love). Theory development has proceeded concurrently with the development of measurement scales. Study I (N = 807) used a 42-item rating questionnaire, with 7 items measuring each of the love styles. Six love style scales emerged clearly from factor analysis. Internal reliability was shown for each scale, and the scales had low intercorrelations with each other. Significant relationships were found between love attitudes and several background variables, including gender, ethnicity, previous love experiences, current love status, and self-esteem. Confirmatory Study II (N = 567) replicated factor structure, factor loadings, and reliability analyses of the first study. In addition, the significant relationships between love attitudes and gender, previous love experiences, current love status, and self-esteem were also consistent with the results of Study I. The love scale shows considerable promise as an instrument for future research on love.

Sprecher, S. & Fehr, B. (2005). Compassionate love for close others and humanity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22, 629-651.

A compassionate love scale was developed that can be used, in alternative forms, to assess compassionate or altruistic love for different targets (e.g., close others and all of humankind). Using three samples (total N = 529), the Compassionate Love scale was developed and piloted. Three studies (total N = 700) were then conducted to provide validation of the scale



and to examine correlates of compassionate love. In support of our predictions, compassionate love was found to be associated positively with prosocial behavior, as directed both to close others and to all of humanity. Those who were more religious or spiritual experienced more compassionate love than those who were less religious or spiritual. Evidence was found that compassionate love is distinct from empathy. In the final study, we introduced a relationship-specific version of the Compassionate Love scale, and found that compassionate love for a specific close other was associated with the provision of social support for that person.

Hendrick, S. & Hendrick, C. (2002). Linking romantic love with sex: Development of the perceptions of love and sex scale.

Pilot work and three studies detail the development of the `Perceptions of Love and Sex Scale, a measure of how people view the link between love and sex in their romantic relationships. College students generated descriptive responses to a query about the connections between love and sex in their romantic relationships. Twenty-seven themes were distilled into item format. In Study 1, these items and other relationship measures were administered to 348 participants. Five subscales were extracted from the 27 items, using principal components analyses. In Study 11, a revised scale and other relationship measures were completed by 274 participants, with results replicated in Study III (N=299). Samples from Studies 11 and Ill were combined for a variety of analyses, including confirmatory factor analyses, correlations, hierarchical regression analyses, and sex comparisons. The final version of the scale yielded 17 items on four subscales (Love is Most Important, Sex Demonstrates Love, Love Comes Before Sex, and Sex is Declining) with acceptable psycho- metric properties and expected correlations with measures of other relationship constructs. This research demonstrates the utility of studying romantic love and sexual expression as linked constructs, rather than as separate, isolated domains of scholarly inquiry.

Scale:

	1	2	3	4	5			
2. I feel that my lover and I were meant for each other.								
	1	2	3	4	5			
3. My partner fits my ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomness.								
	1	2	3	4	5			
4.) I believe that what my partner doesn't know about me won't hurt him/her.								
	1	2	3	4	5			
5.) I have sometimes had to keep my partner from finding out about other lovers.								
	1	2	3	4	5			

1. My partner and I have the right physical "chemistry" between us.

6.) My partner would get upset if he/she knew of some of the things I've done with other people.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
7.) Our love is the best kind because it grew out of a long friendship.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
8.) Our friendship merged gradually into love over time.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
9.) Our love relationship is the most satisfying because it developed from a good friendship.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
10.) A main consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my family.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
11.) An important factor in choosing my partner was whether or not he/she would be a good parent.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
12.) One consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my career.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
13.) When my partner doesn't pay attention to me, I feel sick all over.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
14.) I cannot relax if I suspect that my partner is with someone else.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
15.) If my partner ignores me for a while, I sometimes do stupid things to try to get his/her attention back.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
16.) I would rather suffer myself than let my partner suffer.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
17.) I cannot be happy unless I place my partner's happiness before my own.										
	1	2	3	4	5					
18.) I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let my partner achieve his/hers.										
	1	2	3	4	5					

Self Report Measures for Love and Compassion Research: $Different\ Types\ of\ Love$

Scoring:

Each subscale is measured separately (each participant gets a different score on each subscale). The items are divided into subscales in the following way:

Eros: 1-3 Ludus: 4-6 Storge: 7-9 Pragma: 10-12 Mania: 13-15 Agape: 16-18

Scoring is kept continuous.

