THESIS

PERCEIVED PARTNER SIMILARITY OF DESIRED INTIMACY IN HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS

Submitted by

Kasey L. Schultz

Department of Psychology

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Science

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 2011

Master's Committee:

Advisor: Kathryn M. Rickard

Justin J. Lehmiller
Sharon K. Anderson

ABSTRACT

PERCEIVED PARTNER SIMILARITY OF DESIRED INTIMACY IN HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS

Past literature has discussed gender differences in romantic partners' desires for intimacy and has suggested that these gender differences have negative effects on heterosexual relationships. The current study sought to explore the validity of these claims. Participants completed surveys assessing their own desires for intimacy, their perceptions of their partners' desires for intimacy, and relationship outcome variables (satisfaction/commitment). Results indicated that perceived similarity of overall desired intimacy to one's partner is associated with relationship satisfaction and commitment. The effects of perceived similarity varied across types of intimacy and gender, such that perceived similarity in desires for social and emotional intimacy were most associated with relationship outcome variables for women and perceived similarity in desires for sexual intimacy was most associated with relationship outcome variables for men.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

LITERATURE REVIEW

"If intimacy is one of the most often discussed aspects of relationship functioning, then there are good reasons. It is the distinguishing mark of a person's most important and valued relationships. It is predictive of the highest levels of satisfaction, love, and trust as well as perhaps the primary reward of closeness" (Prager, 2000, p. 229).

Intimacy has continually been pointed to in the literature as an important construct and component in couple relationships. It has been found to have psychological and physiological benefits. Prager (1995) reviewed some of the factors associated with intimacy, noting that people in intimate relationships seem to be less affected by stress, that people who do not engage in intimate relationships have a greater likelihood of illness, and that people in poorly functioning relationships suffer negative outcomes such as low self-efficacy, depression, and physical complaints. Thus, Prager explained that intimacy is a worthwhile concept to research and an essential construct to understand because it is "good for people" (1995, p.1).

The contributions of intimacy to well-being are found throughout the literature. Intimacy has been found to decrease secretion of daily cortisol (Ditzen, Hoppman, &Klumb, 2008), to mediate the effects of daily stressors on marital quality (Harper, Schallje, & Sandberg, 2000), and to reduce maternal stress in the first three years of a child's life (Mulsow, Caldera, Pursley, Reifman, & Huston, 2002). Prager and

Buhrmester (1998) found that, based on couples' daily reporting, intimate interactions fulfilled important psychological needs in individuals, such as needs for love and affection, companionship, belonging, and nurturance. Multiple authors have pointed out that a lack of intimacy in relationships is often a reason given for seeking psychotherapy and divorce (Horowitz, 1979; Waring, 1988). Furthermore, intimacy, as measured through intimacy questionnaires, has been repeatedly connected to marital satisfaction for both men and women in heterosexual and same-sex relationships (Eldridge & Gilbert, 1990; Kurdek, 1998; Greef & Malherbe, 2001; Patrick, Sells, Giordano, &Tollerud, 2007). There is strong support suggesting that intimacy is beneficial at both individual and relational levels. Further research regarding factors affecting the experience of intimacy in relationships will contribute to both a greater understanding of the process of intimacy as well as ways in which intimacy and its positive effects can be facilitated in couple relationships.

The purpose of this research is to explore partner similarity in intimacy. In order to do this, it is important to first address how intimacy has been defined in the literature and how it will be conceptualized for the present research. Existing research on the impact of partner similarity on relationships and, specifically, similarity in intimacy, will then be discussed. Much of the literature that discusses similarity and dissimilarity in intimacy focuses on gender differences in intimacy. For this reason, the issue of gender differences in intimacy will be addressed, followed by a discussion of the implications that this literature has for the importance of partner similarity for intimacy of all couple relationships.

What is Intimacy?

Researchers have struggled to arrive at one widely accepted definition of intimacy. Some researchers have attempted to integrate some of the existing definitions of the construct. Moss and Schwebel (1993), for example, reviewed 61 definitions of intimacy found in the literature. They concluded that seven themes appeared in over fifty percent of the definitions. These themes were: exchange or mutual interaction, in-depth affective awareness-expressiveness, in-depth cognitive awareness-expressiveness, in-depth physical awareness-expressiveness, shared commitment and feeling of cohesion, communication or self-disclosure, and a generalized sense of closeness to another. The authors thus proposed the following definition of intimacy: "Intimacy in enduring romantic relationships is determined by the level of commitment and positive affective, cognitive, and physical closeness one experiences with a partner in a reciprocal relationship" (Moss & Schwebel, 33).

Laurenceau and Kleinman (2006) noted that some of the struggle researchers have had in defining intimacy surrounds the difficulty in determining the locus of intimacy. Intimacy has been variously defined as a quality of the individual, a quality of interactions, and a quality of relationships. These levels have also been described by Vangelisti and Beck (2007). At the individual level, researchers have described variations in individuals' capacities to develop and maintain close relationships. Conceptualization of intimacy at the individual level has been described through constructs such as attachment and fear of intimacy (Vangelisti& Beck, 2007). Attachment researchers noted that the individual difference of attachment style influences one's intimate experiences and that securely attached individuals are more comfortable with and report higher levels

of intimacy (Collins & Feeney, 2004). Mashek and Sherman (2004) have discussed the concept of desiring less closeness and noted that individuals who are unsatisfied with the level of closeness in their relationship often have a greater fear of intimacy than those who are satisfied. These individual difference variables are some of the factors discussed by researchers who conceptualize intimacy at the individual level.

At the interactional level, intimate interactions are described as behaviors that tend to result in the creation of intimate relationships (Vangelisti& Beck, 2007). Reis and Shaver (1988) created a model of intimate interaction which includes components such as self-disclosure and expression, emotional responses, experiences of validation, and motivations, needs, goals, and fears. They described intimacy at the interactional level as "an interpersonal process within which two interaction partners experience and express feelings, communicate verbally and nonverbally, satisfy social motives, augment or reduce social fears, talk and learn about themselves and their unique characteristics, and become 'close'" (Reis & Shaver, 1988, p. 387). Prager and Roberts (2004) distinguished intimate interactions from other interactions in that intimate interactions involve self-revealing behavior, positive involvement with the other, and shared understandings.

At the relational level, intimate relationships are thought to be relationships characterized by a history of intimate interactions and in which a couple expects to share these interactions over time (Vangelisti& Beck, 2007). Sternberg (1986) defined intimacy at the relational level as "feelings of closeness, connectedness, and bondedness in loving relationships, [including] those feelings that give rise to the experience of warmth in a loving relationship" (p.119). Waring's (1984) definition of intimacy at the relational level included eight facets, namely conflict resolution, affection, cohesion,

sexuality, identity, compatibility, expressiveness, and autonomy. Some definitions include aspects of intimacy at both the interactional and relational levels. Schaefer and Olson (1981) distinguished between intimate experiences and intimate relationships, describing an intimate experience as a feeling of closeness with another person in one of multiple areas. They further described intimate relationships as relationships in which one has intimate experiences in several areas, along with an expectation that these experiences will continue over time. The multiple areas of intimacy defined by Schaefer and Olson (1981) are emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational intimacy. Prager (1995) made a similar distinction between intimate interactions and intimate relationships, noting that intimate interactions are "exchanges in which one or both partners share something private or personal with the other" that result in positive feelings about ones partner and oneself (p. 28). Intimate relationships, on the other hand, are relationships characterized by affection, trust, and cohesiveness that exist over time and are characterized by a history of intimate interacting along with an expectation that intimate interactions will continue in the future (Prager, 1995).

While the field of research on close relationships has yet to accept one definition of intimacy, it is evident that the process of intimacy is affected by characteristics of the individual, the interaction, and the relationship. It is thought to be a goal or product of a relationship that is in constant development and variable over time (Laurenceau & Kleinman, 2006). The current study approaches the construct of intimacy from Schaefer and Olson's (1981) perspective, which is frequently utilized in relationship research and examines the five types of intimacy: emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and relational intimacy. It approaches intimacy from both the individual and relational level, in terms

of the effects of an individual's desire or expectation for intimacy on the level of relational intimacy experienced.

Similarity in Relationships

A multitude of research has demonstrated that close relationship partners tend to be similar to each other on various physical, demographic, and psychological characteristics (see Gonzaga, Campos, & Bradbury, 2007). Furthermore, couples have a tendency to converge and become more similar to each other over time. This has been shown to occur in domains such as emotional responses (Anderson, Keltner, & John, 2003) and personality (Gonzaga et al., 2007).

Much research has explored the connection between partner similarity and relationship outcome variables. Multiple aspects of similarity have been studied, including constructs such as personality, attitudes, values, and demographic characteristics such as religion, ethnicity, and age (Luo, 2009). Gonzaga et al. (2007), for example, found that among heterosexual dating and married couples, partner similarity in both emotional experience and personality was positively correlated with relationship quality, which included the relationship domains of commitment, satisfaction, and affection. Some areas of similarity have been found to be more important for relationship satisfaction than others. Luo and Klohnen (2005) indicated that similarity in personality-relevant domains were predictive of relationship satisfaction while attitude-related domains were not.

The connection between similarity and relationship outcome variables has also been demonstrated in samples from countries other than the United States. Gaunt (2006) found that similarity of values and gendered personality traits predicted both marital

satisfaction and lower levels of negative affect among a sample of Jewish Israeli, heterosexual, married couples. The relationship between similarity and relationship outcome has been found among various domains for early dating couples (Luo, 2009) and married couples (Luo & Klohnen, 2005; Gonzaga et al., 2007).

Furthermore, some researchers have shown that one's *perceptions* of partner similarity, as opposed to actual similarity, are related to relationship quality. Rusbult, Kumashiro, Kubacka, and Finkel (2009) reported that one's perceptions of his or her partner as similar to his or her ideal self is predictive of affirmation by one's partner and, in turn, couple well-being. Murray, Holmes, Bellavia, Griffin, and Dolderman (2002) demonstrated that one's perception of partner similarity leads to feelings of being understood, which leads to greater relationship satisfaction.

Thus, similarity between partners in intimate relationships has been shown to be associated with relationship outcome variables such as couple well-being, relationship quality, relationship satisfaction, and decreased levels of negative affect. While the presence and strength of this correlation depends on the domain of similarity that is being assessed, much evidence points to the importance of similarity as an important factor to explore in relationships.

Similarity in Intimacy

The importance of partner similarity in intimacy and its contribution to relationship quality has not been explored extensively in the literature. There are, however, some suggestions that similarity in reported level of intimacy may be predictive of relationship quality. Vangelisti and Beck (2007) discussed the idea that a central factor with regard to intimacy is whether or not intimacy is jointly experienced by

relationship partners. They emphasize the need to examine discrepancies in the degree to which intimacy is experienced by each partner, suggesting that partners who experience similar levels of intimacy may experience the relationship differently than those who have dissimilar levels of intimacy. This suggests that similarity in the level of intimacy in the relationship may be important. Support for this idea was found in Heller and Wood's (1998) study. The authors reported a correlation between similarity in partner ratings of intimacy and the couple's overall intimacy level, such that those partners who differ in their feelings of intimacy reported a lower overall intimacy level. These findings were contradicted by Kenny and Acitelli's (1994) findings that partner similarity in intimacy level, as measured by comparing each partner's self-reported intimacy, did not significantly predict marital well-being.

It is important to distinguish experienced intimacy level from expected or desired level of intimacy. Schaefer and Olson (1981) made this distinction in their measure of intimacy. The previous research that found some connections between similarity in level of intimacy and relationship quality measured experienced intimacy in the relationship (Heller & Wood, 1998; Kenny &Acitelli, 1994). Some researchers have pointed to the negative impact of differing intimacy needs on relationship quality. Prager (2000) suggests that partners might find that they have incompatible intimacy needs. She also indicated that these incompatibilities in preferences for intimate interaction often result in frustration and distress for the couple. Wynne and Wynne (1986) indicate that couples often experience intimacy differently, noting that partners sometimes disagree about when they have had intimate moments. Additionally, Schaefer and Olson (1981) point out that it is important to compare partner's scores of both expected and experienced

intimacy to each other in order to assess couple's agreements and disagreements. Although multiple researchers have suggested that comparisons of partners' desired intimacy is important, it has not yet been explored. The main focus of the current study will be to explore the association between similarity of desired intimacy and relationship outcomes.

Intimacy, Gender, and Implications for Dissimilarity

In the vast amount of literature on intimacy, the construct is often discussed in relation to gender. This area of the literature is one in which researchers frequently discuss potential implications of similarity/dissimilarity in partners' desired intimacy. Before discussing the suggested implications, it is important to understand in what ways men and women are believed to differ with regard to intimacy.

Gender and Intimacy. While there is some evidence of gender differences in intimacy, researchers have yet to reach a clear conclusion on this topic. Some researchers claim that there are large differences in how women and men experience, perceive, and express intimacy. Other researchers, however, point out that gender differences are actually much less pronounced than many claim.

In an overview of the impact of gender on intimacy, Thompson & Walker (1989) described some of these gender differences. They indicated that women tend to express more emotion, be more affectionate, and be more responsible for creating intimacy in marriages while men tend to experience closeness through sex, shared activities, practical help, and economic support. Orosan and Schilling (1992) asked men and women to describe intimate relationships. They found that although men and women perceived intimacy to be comprised of similar components, such as trust, openness, and honesty,

their descriptions of intimacy in relationships differed. While women first described the importance of emotional sharing, closeness, and trust in intimate relationships, followed by the role of shared activities, men described them in the opposite order. Other researchers have found similar results, pointing out that although men and women place equal value on intimacy and spend an equal amount of time with equal numbers of friends, men emphasize shared activities and women emphasize emotional sharing in intimate friendships (Caldwell &Peplau, 1982).

While the previous studies focused on intimate relationships in general, other studies have cited this difference in couple relationships. Greeff and Mahlerbe (2001) found in a study on marital intimacy that men and women did not differ in desired intimacy but did differ in their experiences of intimacy. Men reported experiencing less sexual and relational intimacy than women, and women reported experiencing less social intimacy than men. Similar results were reported in Talmadge and Dabbs' (1990) study on intimacy and conversation, in which more positive affect was reported by men who had higher sexual intimacy and women who had higher emotional intimacy, suggesting that emotional intimacy is more important to women while sexual intimacy is more important to men. Some researchers have noted that women desire more intimacy than men in the form of love, affection, and emotional sharing in relationships (Hook, Gerstein, Detterich, & Gridley, 2003).

While some research emphasizes the differences between men and women in their experiences of intimacy, other literature has commented that men and women are actually more similar in their experience of this construct than researchers have typically acknowledged. Mackey, Diemer, and O'Brien (2000) explored intimacy in both

heterosexual and same-gender couples. They proposed that because men and women are socialized differently, men may experience intimacy through shared activities while women experience intimacy through shared affect. The authors concluded that gender had a moderate effect but was not as powerful a factor in shaping intimacy as has often been assumed.

In their qualitative study of men's perceptions of intimacy, Patrick and Beckenbach (2009) noted that the differences between men and women on the construct of intimacy are not well understood. A further complication of the issue, they point out, is the gender bias that is present in the concept of intimacy. Intimacy tends to be described by words such as communication, affection, and closeness, which are all concepts closely tied to women's, and not men's, gender-role socialization. The men in Patrick and Beckenbach's study described intimacy as involving multiple levels of sharing, acceptance of oneself by the other, and a level of vulnerability. They acknowledged that gender influenced intimacy in heterosexual relationships, describing their desires to be the protector of their female partners and noting that relationships with women are the only area in which heterosexual men are able to be vulnerable. While this research supported the idea that gender has a strong association with individuals' experiences of intimacy, it also demonstrated that men may experience intimacy to a similar degree and in similar ways as women. In other words, the differences may not be as extreme as is often believed.

In a summary of the research on the conceptualization, assessment, and role of gender in intimacy, Gaia (2002) discussed the fact that gender differences have been highlighted in the literature, especially in the research showing that women score higher

on intimacy measures than men. Gaia pointed out, however, that meta-analyses show little differences in the experience of intimacy based on gender. She failed to find evidence to conclude that men and women perceive intimacy differently and concluded that if there are slight differences, they may be a result of social expectations that change the expression of intimacy for women and men. In a review of the research on gender differences in intimacy, Reis (1998) concluded that the genders "define intimacy and closeness in largely the same way and aspire to essentially the same relationship qualities" (Reis, 1998, p. 226). Additionally, he called for researchers to move "beyond arguments about whether men and women really differ to questions about causes, consequences, and moderators" (Reis, 1998, p. 226) of the inhibition and facilitation of intimacy.

Given that much of the literature has emphasized gender differences, there remains some confusion around the issue of gender and intimacy. Many researchers have concluded that although some gender differences may exist in the expression of intimacy, they do not seem to affect men's and women's experiences with regard to the level and type of intimacy. Furthermore, multiple researchers have pointed out that gender differences in intimacy may not be as strong as other researchers and popular culture have led us to believe. Most importantly, however, there has been a call for researchers to move beyond the search for gender differences in intimacy to seemingly more important issues of causes, consequences, and moderators of intimacy.

Implications for Similarity. The importance of the gender research for this topic lies in the implications of partner differences in desired and expected intimacy. While the degree of gender differences with regard to intimacy remains a somewhat unresolved

issue in the literature, a question remains with regard to the implications of these gender differences. If these differences in desired intimacy do exist, large or small, what is their impact? Much of the literature that emphasizes these gender differences implies that they cause problems for achieving intimacy in couple relationships.

Ridley (1993) discussed the idea that while women desire love, affection, and the expression of warm feelings, men find intimacy through sexual behavior and physical closeness. While the author mentioned that all heterosexual couples will not experience gender differences in the same way, she discussed multiple areas in which men and women may differ with regard to intimacy. She also wrote that "clinical experience" of hers suggests than many individuals become distressed with their partner over such differences. Hook et al. (2003) noted that gender differences in intimacy lead to marital difficulties and that counselors working on intimacy issues with couples "must be able to bridge the gender gap that exists in close relationships" (Hook et al, 2003, p. 471). This gender gap was also emphasized by Parker (1999), who explained that in order to create a deeper intimacy, couples need to bridge the differences that put them on "distant planets" (p. 2). Crowe (1997) further discussed the implications for intimacy in couple therapy, saying that "men and women seem to have predictable differences in their wishes for intimacy, and sometimes it is difficult for a couple to achieve a comfortable compromise in this area" (p. 235). In exploring the issues that often bring couples into therapy, Rampagne (2003) discussed gendered preferences for interactions in relationships and pointed out that gender issues are often a part of the constraints that heterosexual couples do not realize is keeping them from achieving intimacy. Yet another researcher claims that "gender is frequently seen as preventing the creation of intimacy in partnerships

because of either differences in conceptions of intimacy or a mismatch in partners' motivation for engaging in the strategies necessary to create it" (Brown, 2001, p. 137).

Durana (1997) conducted a psychoeducational program designed to enhance intimacy in married couples. Differences were found in intimacy needs and reported intimacy levels prior to the intervention. After the program, however, men and women were more similar to each other in their ratings of aspects of intimacy such as sharing, acceptance, caring, and decrease in conflict. Durana concluded that the program created agreement between genders about the factors that are essential to intimacy. He noted that "as the gender differences began to blur with more uniformity of responses, intimacy and marital satisfaction levels increased" (1997, p. 212). He further explains that the psychoeducation decreased the gender gap in intimacy that often causes distress in relationships.

Problems with Previous Research. Much of the research discussed to this point claims that there are large gender differences in the desire for and experience of intimacy. Furthermore, there are many claims that these gender differences cause problems for couples in their intimate relationships. There is, however, much confusion over whether or not these gender differences actually exist or are as large as researchers have portrayed them to be. If these differences do exist, there is not much empirical evidence to support or refute the claim that gender differences in intimacy cause distress in relationships. Durana's (1997) research provides some empirical evidence to suggest that it may be occurring. These results, however, only show that both a decrease in the 'gender gap' and an increase in relationship satisfaction are a result of Durana's intervention. It is not

clear whether the decrease in gender differences is directly correlated with relationship satisfaction.

Additionally, the claim that these differences cause problems in relationships rests upon the assumption that all intimate relationships exist between partners of different sexes. The reality is that much of this research has been conducted with heterosexual, and often only married, couples (Mackey et al., 2000). To assume that gendered differences in intimacy act as a barrier to improving intimacy ignores the intimacy that exists for same-sex couples. It may be that the gender of one's partner does not have implications for differences in intimacy. Regardless of one's gender or one's partner's gender, differing desires for intimacy may serve as a barrier to improving intimacy and relationship satisfaction.

There seems to be an underlying assumption in the literature that having different intimacy needs than one's partner automatically causes problems in the relationship. There is, however, no empirical evidence to support or refute this assumption. One scholar suggests that the assumption is not true, stating that clinical data he has collected over multiple years supports the idea that couples who differ in intimacy needs often are still satisfied with their intimate interactions (Bagarozzi, 2001). The author does not, however, provide any evidence to support this claim. Thus, there is no evidence to show whether or not partner discrepancy in intimacy needs causes problems for the relationship.

The problems with the previous research include the lack of inclusion of all types of couple relationships and the lack of empirical evidence to support the claims made in the literature. The underlying assumption of the literature in this area that needs to be

examined is how a discrepancy between partners' desired intimacy affects their relationship. The only evidence cited to both support and refute the idea that such a discrepancy causes problems in the relationship is "clinical evidence" from the authors' experiences (Ridley, 1993; Bagarozzi, 2001). The purpose of this study is to answer Reis' (1998) call to move beyond discussing gender differences in intimacy and to address the underlying assumption in the literature that partner differences in desired intimacy cause problems for relationships. The study explored partners' differing intimacy needs in all relationships, including same-sex and heterosexual couples.

Hypotheses

The previously mentioned literature on similarity and the implications for gender differences in intimate relationships suggests that differing intimacy needs in couple relationships may be associated with negative outcomes for the relationship. Some of the empirical research points to the fact that similarity to one's partner across many variables, including level of intimacy, is beneficial for the relationship. Much of the intimacy research suggests that there are at least small gender differences in desired intimacy which result in increased conflict and distress for heterosexual couples.

Beyond the previously discussed suggestions by researchers, there is reason to believe that lack of similarity in intimacy may be associated with negative outcomes for the relationship. Acitelli, Kenny, and Weiner (2001) reported that partner similarity in ideals was negatively correlated with frequency of conflict and tension in the relationship. These ideals included things such as talking about important issues, doing things together, being sexually satisfied, and showing affection, which may be closely related to some of the types of intimacy outlined by Schaefer and Olson (1981). Other

evidence suggests that conflict over intimacy negatively affects relationship satisfaction. Kurdek (1994) found that conflict in general is negatively related to relationship satisfaction. Intimacy, which was an area of high conflict for gay, lesbian, and heterosexual couples, was more salient in predicting relationship satisfaction than most other areas of conflict (Kurdek, 1994). This suggests that similarity in intimacy may be an important variable to explore. If dissimilarity in intimacy is associated with more conflict over intimacy, this lack of similarity may affect relationship satisfaction. Another piece of evidence to suggest that similarity in intimacy needs leads to benefits for the relationship comes from Fletcher, Simpson, Thomas, and Giles' (1999) study on intimate relationship ideals. The results indicated that the more an individual's relationship resembles his or her ideal, the greater his or her relationship satisfaction. It is would seem that the more similar an individual's intimacy ideals are to his or her partner's intimacy needs, the more likely those ideals are to be met, which would result in greater relationship satisfaction.

As previously indicated, intimacy in this study was conceptualized as outlined by Schaefer and Olson (1981). The five types of intimacy defined by these researchers (Schaefer & Olson, 1981, p. 50) are as follows:

1. *Emotional intimacy*—the experience of closeness of feelings.
2. *Social intimacy*—the experience of having common friends and similarities in social networks.
3. *Intellectual intimacy*—the experience of sharing ideas.
4. *Sexual intimacy*—the experience of sharing general affection and/or sexual activity.

5. *Recreational intimacy*—shared experiences of interests in hobbies and mutual participation in sporting events.

Based on the evidence supporting the association between similarity and positive variables in intimate relationships, this author hypothesized that, overall, perceived partner similarity in desired level of intimacy, along with perceived similarity of each separate type of desired intimacy, would be positively correlated with relationship-enhancing outcome variables.

Hypothesis 1: Overall perceived partner similarity in desired intimacy will positively correlate with relationship satisfaction and commitment.

Hypothesis 2: Perceived partner similarity in each of the 5 types of desired intimacy (emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and relational) will positively correlate with relationship satisfaction and commitment.

Prior to the study, it was unclear which specific types of intimacy would be most important in contributing to overall measures of relationship satisfaction. Thus, the analyses also explored which specific types of intimacy will contribute most to relationship satisfaction.

It is also important to explore any gender differences or similarities in desired intimacy in this study. Based on gender differences in intimacy discussed by previous research, the types of intimacy that are most predictive of relationship outcome variables may differ for women and men. Research discussed previously in this paper indicated that sexual intimacy may be more important to men while emotional intimacy may be more important to women. Based on this research, the author hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 3: Higher perceived partner similarity in desired sexual intimacy will be more positively associated with relationship satisfaction for men than for women.

Hypothesis 4: Higher perceived partner similarity in desired emotional intimacy will be more positively associated with relationship satisfaction for women than for men.

Furthermore, because data was only collected from one partner, noting the direction of any perceived difference in desired intimacy was important. For instance, individuals who perceive their partners to desire less of a particular type of intimacy than they do may respond differently to measures of relationship quality than individuals who perceive their partners to desire more of a particular type of intimacy than they do. The direction of this potential difference is unknown. One goal of the current research was to explore the relationship of perceived differences in desired intimacy and the relationship variables.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

Participants were recruited to complete the online survey in two different ways. One group was recruited from undergraduate introductory psychology courses at a large, Western university. These participants received course credit for their participation. The rest of the participants were recruited over the Internet, via advertisements on various websites and discussion boards. All participants were eligible for a drawing for a gift card as compensation for their participation. Fifteen participants reported that either they or their partner had completed the survey previously, four indicated that they were under the age of 18, and five had repeat IP addresses, indicating that they may have completed the survey more than once. These participants were removed from the data set, along with 131 individuals who stopped completing the survey halfway through. This left 251 participants to be included in the data set.

The gender of participants was 76.1% female, 22.3% male, and 0.4% transgender –female to male. Eight percent of the participants were currently involved in a same-sex relationship and 90.8% were currently involved in a heterosexual relationship. The race of participants was as follows: 80.5% White non-Hispanic, 5.6% Black non-Hispanic, 6.4% Asian/Pacific Islander, 8.4% Hispanic, 3.2% American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 2.4% Other. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 57 (M= 23.27, SD= 8.19).

Relationship length ranged from 0 months to 480 months (M= 32.26, SD=54.02). The relationship status of participants was 12.4% casually dating, 52.6% seriously dating not cohabiting, 14.3% seriously dating and cohabiting, 17.5% married/committed and cohabiting, and 0.8% married/committed not cohabiting. Most of the participants (90.4%) reported that they were sexually active with their partners, while the remaining reported that they were not (9.6%).

Of the 251 participants, 60.7% were undergraduate psychology students and 39.3% were recruited over the Internet. Compared to the Internet sample, the undergraduate sample tended to be younger and have shorter relationships. They were also more likely to be male, married/committed, cohabiting, and currently involved in a heterosexual relationship than the Internet sample. Despite these demographic differences, the two samples did not significantly differ on most of the independent or dependent variables measured by the survey items. Relationship commitment, however, was significantly lower for the undergraduate sample (M = 44.58, SD = 11.44) than for the Internet sample (M = 50.97, SD = 7.78; $t(238) = -5.16$, p = .000).

Materials

Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships. Desired intimacy was measured with the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR) Inventory (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). This scale was developed to measure the multidimensional nature of intimacy, as conceptualized by its authors. The PAIR assesses the five types of intimacy (emotional, social, sexual, recreational, and intellectual) that were defined previously and includes a sixth scale to assess *conventional intimacy*, which measures socially desirable responding.

The measure contains 6 questions for each type of intimacy, each on a 5-point Likert Scale. Traditionally, the questionnaire is given twice. The first time the individual is asked to respond to the item "as it is now" to give a measure of *realized* intimacy, and the second time the individual is asked to respond to each item "how he/she would like it to be" to give a measure of *expected* intimacy (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). For the purposes of this study, the PAIR was also given twice. For the first set of questions the participants were asked to respond how he/she would like it to be, to give a measure of the individual's desired intimacy. The second time, however, the participants were asked to respond how he/she thinks his/her partner would like it to be, to give a measure of perception of partner's desired intimacy. In order to keep the survey as brief as possible, realized intimacy was not measured.

The PAIR was originally developed for use in heterosexual relationships, but it has since been utilized to assess intimacy in same-sex relationships (Eldridge & Gilbert, 1990). Alpha reliabilities for the current study are as follows: .91 (self overall), .78 (self emotional), .62 (self social), .67 (self sexual), .73 (self intellectual), .55 (self recreational), .92 (partner overall), .75 (partner emotional), .66 (partner social), .74 (partner sexual), .76 (partner intellectual), and .69 (partner recreational). Although reliability for a few of the scales fell slightly below the typical cutoff of .7 and the reliability for the self desired recreational intimacy scale fell below conventional standards in the present research, the scales have been deemed reliable in the past. Alpha reliabilities reported by Schaefer and Olson (1981) in the original validation of the scales are .75 (emotional intimacy), .71 (social intimacy), .77 (sexual intimacy), .70 (intellectual intimacy), and .70 (recreational intimacy). This measure can be found in Appendix A.

Relationship Satisfaction. Relationship satisfaction was measured with the Satisfaction Level questions of the Investment Model Scale (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998). The questions are intended to assess the amount of positive versus negative affect an individual experiences in a relationship and are noted to be affected by the degree to which one's partner fulfills his or her needs (Rusbult et al., 1998). The measure consists of five items assessing satisfaction at a global level. The items are answered on an 8-point Likert Scale. Alpha reliability of the scale has reported to range between .92 and .95 (Rusbult et al., 1998). Alpha reliability for the current study was .918. This scale can be found in Appendix B.

Commitment. One's commitment to his/her relationship was measured with the Commitment subscale from the Investment Model Scale (Rusbult et al., 1998). This measure consists of seven items answered on an 8-point Likert Scale. The items are meant to assess one's intent to persist in a relationship. Alpha reliability of the scale has been reported to range between .91 and .95 (Rusbult et al., 1998).Alpha reliability for the current study was .894. This scale can be found in Appendix C.

Demographics Questionnaire. Demographic information and specific information about participants' relationships was also gathered. This information included age, sex, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, geographical information, and partner's age, sex, and race/ethnicity. It also included information specific to the relationship, such as relationship length, sexual activity, and relationship status. This scale can be found in Appendix D.

Procedure

As previously indicated, the survey for this study was completed online. Some participants were recruited via the Internet and some participants were recruited via an undergraduate psychology student research participant pool. The survey was administered via the Internet, regardless of where the participants were recruited. Previous research has discussed some of the benefits and obstacles to Internet data collection. Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, and John (2004) explored concerns that are frequently expressed about data obtained through Internet samples. The researchers found that although participants are not entirely representative of the population, they are often more diverse and just as well adjusted as traditional samples. Furthermore, the authors noted that Internet data is not impacted by the presentation format, correlates with other non-internet measures, and that although repeat responders do occur, steps can be taken to prevent this. Gosling et al. (2004) concluded that data gathered from Internet samples is at least as good, if not better than, data gathered from traditional sampling methods. Thus, conducting this research over the Internet was appropriate for the purposes of this study. Steps were taken, however to ensure that individuals did not respond to the survey more than once. A method utilized in this study was to record IP addresses for each completed survey. Survey data with repeat IP addresses were not included in the analyses. The purpose of utilizing multiple samples of participants was to ensure efficient data collection while also increasing the diversity of the participants.

For the participants who were recruited online, the survey was advertised on websites and online discussion forums. Participants who were recruited from a research pool of undergraduate psychology students found the study on a psychology department

website that lists research currently being conducted. During recruitment, participants were asked for their participation in a study on romantic relationships. They were instructed that in order to complete the survey, they needed to be at least 18 years-old and currently involved in either a heterosexual or same-sex romantic relationship.

The participants who chose to participate in the study then selected the link that brought them to the survey site. Once on the survey website, they were directed to read the cover letter explaining the purpose of and risks and benefits associated with the participation. The page reminded them that participation was voluntary and that they were able to exit the study at anytime. The page also instructed them that by clicking the link to continue on to the next page they were giving their consent to participate in the study. The next page contained the first set of PAIR items, for which they were asked to respond regarding how they would most like their relationship to be. They were then directed to another page that contained the second set of PAIR items, for which they were asked to respond regarding how they think their partner would most like their relationship to be. On the following pages the participants completed the relationship satisfaction and commitment measures. The last page of the survey contained the demographic questionnaire.

Upon completion of all survey questions, the participants were directed to a page that offered a short debriefing regarding the purpose of the study. They were instructed to enter their e-mail address if they wanted to be entered into a lottery to receive one of two $40 gift cards. They were also given information regarding the topic of intimacy, resources to help facilitate discussions of intimacy between partners, and resources for dealing with relationship difficulties.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Data Management and Analyses

Data management and analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics 19. As previously indicated, participants who were under age 18, who had completed the survey before, whose partners had completed the survey before, with repeat IP addresses, and who did not complete more than the first half of the survey were removed from the data set. A missing values analysis indicated that approximately 1.12% of the data were missing. Because this percentage was small, missing data were excluded from analyses using list-wise deletion.

While there is debate about the best method of calculating similarity, researchers seem to agree that the most accurate calculation seems depends on the construct being studied (Gaunt, 2006; Luo, 2009; Luo & Klohnen, 2005). Kenny, Kashy, and Cook (2006) discussed multiple methods for examining similarity and dissimilarity in couples. They noted that a discrepancy score is acceptable when the main focus of similarity is the level of the variable, as it is in this case. For this reason, absolute discrepancy scores (ADS) were utilized to calculate similarity for the current research. With this type of score, similarity is represented by lower scores and difference is represented by higher scores. Because of this, a negative correlation coefficient between an ADS and a second variable would indicate that greater similarity is associated with higher values of the

second variable. Each scale was first summed for self (participant's desired intimacy) and partner (participant's perception of their partner's desired intimacy). An ADS was then computed for each type of intimacy (overall, emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational intimacy) by subtracting each partner scale from its respective self scale.

Primary Analyses

Descriptive Data and Variable Correlations. To assess the first two hypotheses, a number of correlations were computed. Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for each ADS variable, relationship satisfaction, and relationship commitment.

Hypothesis 1: Overall Intimacy. As can be observed in Table 1, a significant negative correlation was found between ADS of overall intimacy and relationship satisfaction, suggesting that individuals with less difference in overall intimacy from their partners are more satisfied with their relationships. A significant negative correlation was also found between ADS of overall intimacy and relationship commitment, suggesting that individuals who perceive less difference in overall intimacy from their partners are more committed to their relationships. These correlations support the hypothesis that greater similarity will be associated with greater relationship satisfaction and commitment.

Hypothesis 2: Types of Intimacy. The results for each type of intimacy can be found in Table 1. Descriptions of the analyses conducted for to assess the second hypothesis are as follows.

Correlation Analyses. As the results in the table indicate, absolute discrepancy of emotional intimacy, social intimacy, sexual intimacy, intellectual intimacy, and

recreational intimacy were found to negatively correlate with relationship satisfaction. This supports the hypothesis and suggests that individuals who perceive themselves as more similar to their partners in their desires for emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational intimacy tend to be more satisfied with their relationships.

Absolute discrepancy of emotional intimacy, social intimacy, intellectual intimacy, and recreational intimacy were found to negatively correlate with relationship commitment. This supports the hypothesis and suggests that individuals with greater perceived similarity to their partner in their desires for these types of intimacy tend to be more committed to their relationships. Absolute discrepancy of sexual intimacy, however, did not significantly correlate with relationship commitment, suggesting that degree of similarity or difference between one's desires and their perceptions of their partners' desires is not associated with commitment to the relationship. This finding did not support the hypothesis.

Regression Analyses. Because the five types of intimacy are constructs that correlate highly with one another, it is important to examine the relative contribution of each type of intimacy independent of the contributions of the others. To explore the unique contribution of each type of intimacy to relationship satisfaction and commitment, multiple linear regression analyses were conducted. Results from these analyses can be seen in Tables 2 and 3.

A multiple linear regression was conducted with relationship satisfaction as the dependent variable and ADS for each of the five types of intimacy as the independent variables. The results indicate that, overall, discrepancy in the five types of intimacy significantly predicted 16.7% of the variance in relationship satisfaction (R^2= 0.167,

$F(5,223) = 8.95$, $p<.001$). Specifically, discrepancy in both emotional($\beta = -0.209$, $t = -2.81$, $p<.01$)and social($\beta = -0.145$, $t = -2.28$, $p<.05$) intimacy significantly predicted relationship satisfaction, beyond the impact of the other types of intimacy. This suggests that, of the five types of intimacy, greater perceived similarity in emotional and social intimacy is most associated with greater relationship satisfaction.

A second multiple linear regression was conducted with relationship commitment as the dependent variable and ADS for each of the five types of intimacy as the independent variables. The results of the second analysis indicate that, overall, perceived discrepancy in the five types of intimacy significantly predicted 10.5% of the variance in relationship commitment $R^2 = 0.105$, $F(5,222) = 5.19$, $p<.001$). Specifically, discrepancy in emotional intimacy($\beta = -0.271$, $t = -3.49$, $p<.01$) significantly predicted relationship commitment, beyond the impact of the other types of intimacy. This suggests that, of the five types of intimacy, greater perceived similarity in emotional intimacy is most associated with greater relationship commitment.

Hypotheses 3 and 4: Gender Comparisons. Because the participants were predominantly female, the findings regarding the impact of gender must be interpreted with caution. Due to the lack of large numbers of male participants, specific gender comparisons using interaction terms were not examined. The data lacked statistical power to conduct these analyses. Instead, analyses were conducted that examined general differences and similarities between the male and female participants as well as by performing the previously mentioned multiple linear regressions with the file split by gender. Because these analyses contained less predictor variables than a multiple regression containing interaction terms, statistical power was adequate. For example, a

power analysis using an online post-hoc power calculator indicated that the male portion of the split file multiple regression of relationship satisfaction on similarity of each of the five types of intimacy had a power of .89 (Soper, 2010). If, however, the adjusted $R^2$is utilized, the analysis only had statistical power of .68 (Soper, 2010). Thus, the analyses seem to have had enough power to make comparisons between genders, but the results should still be interpreted with caution.

Comparisons of Means. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to assess gender differences on the independent and dependent variables, including relationship commitment, relationship satisfaction, desires for various types of intimacy, perceptions of partners' desires for various types of intimacy, and ADS of various types of intimacy. Significant results are presented below.

Women were significantly higher than men in relationship commitment ($t(86.4)=3.79$, $p<.001$), desires for overall intimacy ($t(81.8=3.01$, $p<.01$), desires for sexual intimacy ($t(83.6)=2.17$, $p<.05$), desires for intellectual intimacy ($t(83.1)=3.38$, $p<.01$), desires for recreational intimacy ($t(88.3)=3.41$, $p<.01$), perceptions of their partner's desires for emotional intimacy ($t(238)=2.47$, $p<.05$), and perceptions of their partner's desires for sexual intimacy ($t(236)=2.84$, $p<.01$). Means for each group can be found in Table 4. There were no significant differences for ADS of intimacy scales.

Split File Comparisons. Relationship satisfaction was regressed on the ADS of the five types of intimacy with the file split by gender. The results can be found in Table 5. The overall model predicted 27.2% of the variance in relationship satisfaction for men ($R^2= 0.272$, $F(5,44) = 3.29$, $p<.05$) and 16.8% of the variance in relationship satisfaction for women ($R^2= 0.168$, $F(5,169) = 6.81$, $p<.001$). Because the sample size for men was

relatively small, the adjusted R^2may be more representative of the effect in the population. The adjusted R^2 in this case indicates that the overall model may actually predict closer to 18.9% of the variance in relationship satisfaction for men. Specifically, perceived similarity in desires for sexual intimacy was the only independent variable that uniquely contributed to the prediction of relationship satisfaction for men (β = -0.338, t = -2.47, p<.05). For women, perceived similarity in desires for emotional intimacy was the only independent variable that uniquely contributed to the prediction of relationship satisfaction (β = -0.241, t = -2.68, p<.01). This suggests that for men, greater perceived similarity in desires for sexual intimacy may be most predictive of relationship satisfaction, as compared to similarity in the other forms of intimacy. For women, however, it seems that greater perceived similarity in desires for emotional intimacy is more predictive of relationship satisfaction than similarity in the other forms of intimacy. These findings support Hypotheses 3 and 4.

Relationship commitment was also regressed on the ADS of the five types of intimacy with the file split by gender. The results can be found in Table 6. The overall model was only marginally significant for men, predicting 18.7% of the variance in relationship commitment (R^2= 0.187, F(5,45) = 2.06, p=.087). For women, the overall model significantly predicted 12.9% of the variance in relationship commitment (R^2= 0.129, F(5,167) = 4.93, p<.001). With regard to the specific types of intimacy, perceived similarity in desired emotional intimacy uniquely contributed to the prediction of relationship commitment for women (β = -0.365, t = -3.92, p<.001). This suggests that for women greater perceived similarity in desires for emotional intimacy is associated with greater relationship commitment, above and beyond the impact of similarity of

desires for other types of intimacy. It also suggests that perceived similarity in desires for intimacy may predict relationship commitment for men, but at this point, these analyses must be interpreted with caution.

Same-sex and Heterosexual Comparisons

Data were also collected to analyze potential differences between individuals in same-sex relationships and heterosexual relationships. Of the 251 participants, only 20 participants endorsed current involvement in a same-sex relationship. Because of this, the data lacked statistical power to conduct meaningful analyses. Despite this difficulty, it is important to assess for general similarities and differences with this sample. Demographically, the participants in same-sex relationships tended to be older and be involved in longer relationships than individuals in heterosexual relationships. It seems that they also tended to have greater perceived similarity in desires for overall intimacy between themselves and their partners. It is important to note that this observed difference may be attributable to the demographic differences previously discussed. It is not possible to determine whether these represent true group differences between participants in same-sex and heterosexual relationships or whether they are simply representative of the demographic differences. Participants in same-sex relationships seem to have scored similarly to participants in heterosexual relationships on other measures of perceived similarity in desired intimacy as well as in self and partner desires for intimacy.

Direction of Discrepancy

Testing for the importance of direction of discrepancy in desires for intimacy was done in multiple ways. The first was to conduct all of the major analyses (Hypotheses 1

and 2) using a difference score instead of an ADS (absolute discrepancy score). A difference score maintains the sign of the difference, thus including the direction in the analysis. None of these analyses were found to be significant.

The second method of testing for the effect of direction was to create a variable denoting the direction of the ADS. The direction variable indicated whether the participant desired more or less intimacy than their partner. A direction variable was coded for ADS of overall intimacy as well as for ADS of each of the five types of intimacy. An interaction variable was then computed to describe the interaction between the direction for each type of intimacy and its respective ADS. Six hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted for each of the two dependent variables (relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment). Each regression contained the direction variable and ADS of a specific type of intimacy (overall, emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational) in the first step and the respective interaction in the second step.

The analyses for overall, emotional, sexual, intellectual, and recreational intimacy did not show significant main effects for direction or interactions between direction and ADS of intimacy variables. The regression of relationship satisfaction on ADS of social intimacy, direction of difference in social intimacy, and the interaction between these two variables, however, showed significance but violated the assumption of multicollinearity. Thus, none of the analyses used to test the direction revealed a significant main effect or interaction.

The third method of testing for the effect of direction of difference in desires for intimacy used the dichotomous direction variables previously described. These variables

indicated whether the participant perceived that they desired more or less intimacy than their partner across overall intimacy and each of the five types of intimacy. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare differences between participants who desired more intimacy and those who desired less intimacy. Six t-tests were conducted, each with relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment as dependent variables and direction for each type of intimacy (overall, emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, or recreational) as the grouping variable. None of these analyses showed significant main effects, indicating that the direction of difference in perceptions of desires for intimacy did not have a significant impact on relationship satisfaction or commitment.

Further analyses were conducted to assess for a potential connection between gender and the direction of difference of perceived desires for intimacy. This was first done by assessing for consistent differences in the direction of discrepancy by gender. Independent samples t-tests for each of the five types of intimacy as well as overall intimacy were conducted. The results were not significant, indicating that there were no consistent gender differences in the direction of differing desires for intimacy.

The second method of testing for the combined effect of gender and direction on the relationship between relationship outcome variables and perceived similarity of desired intimacy used the dichotomous direction variables and an interaction term between gender and direction. Six hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted for each of the relationship outcome variables. Each regression contained gender and direction of difference for the specific type of intimacy in the first step and the respective interaction term in the second step. The findings were not significant.

The third method of testing for the impact of gender and direction on the relationship between satisfaction/commitment and perceived similarity of desired intimacy looked at a three way interaction. Three-way interaction terms were calculated for each type of intimacy, calculating the interaction between gender, the ADS for that type of intimacy, and the direction of difference for that type of intimacy. Hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted using gender, direction, and ADS in the first step, the three respective two-way interaction terms in the second step, and the three-way interaction term in the third step. None of the three-way interaction terms reached significance. None of the direction analyses showed significant results, indicated that the direction of difference in perceived similarity of desired intimacy did not have an effect on relationship satisfaction or commitment.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Recent literature has suggested that differing intimacy needs in couple relationships may be associated with negative outcomes for the relationship. Some research, furthermore, has indicated that similarity to one's partner across many variables, including level of intimacy and relationship ideals, is beneficial for the relationship. The current study sought to investigate the empirically unsupported and disputed claims that differing desires for intimacy in couple relationships cause distress for the couple. The hypothesis that perceived similarity to one's partner in overall desired intimacy would be related to relationship satisfaction and commitment was supported. Results of the correlation analyses demonstrate that similarity between one's own overall desired intimacy and one's partner's overall desired intimacy is significantly related to both relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment. This finding suggests that individuals who perceive their partners as having similar desires for intimacy as themselves are most satisfied and more committed to their relationship. Perceived similarity thus seems to be positively associated with relationship variables that most desire to be high, such as satisfaction and commitment.

This study also hypothesized that perceived similarity in desires for each type of intimacy would be related to relationship satisfaction and commitment. For the most part, the results supported this hypothesis. The results indicated that perceived partner

similarity in desires for all types of intimacy (emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational) is related to relationship satisfaction. Perceived partner similarity in desires for emotional, social, intellectual, and recreational, but not sexual, intimacy is associated with relationship commitment. It is interesting to note that the only non-significant correlation with the relationship outcome variables is perceived similarity in desires for sexual intimacy. While similarity in sexual intimacy desires is associated with relationship satisfaction, it is not related to commitment. Although people who have more similarity in sexual intimacy desires are more satisfied in their relationships, they are not necessarily more committed than those who do not have more perceived similarity in sexual intimacy desires.

Furthermore, the current study examined the relative strength of each of the types of intimacy in terms of its unique contribution to the prediction of relationship satisfaction and commitment. Results indicated that social and emotional intimacy are most uniquely associated with relationship satisfaction, while emotional intimacy was the only variable uniquely related to commitment. Thus, while similarity across all five types of intimacy seems to be related to greater satisfaction, similarity in desires for social and emotional intimacy seems to be the most important in terms of their association with relationship satisfaction. Similarity in desires for emotional intimacy seems to be the most important for relationship commitment.

The findings that perceived partner similarity in desires for intimacy is related to greater relationship satisfaction and commitment challenges the "clinical evidence" that Bagarozzi (2001) provided claiming that couples are not negatively affected by these differences. It also supports the idea alluded to by Durana (1997) and suggested by some

other research findings regarding ideals and the relationship between intimacy and conflict (Acitelli et al., 2001; Fletcher et al., 1999; Kurdek, 1994). In terms of Durana's (1997) intervention, it suggests that the merging of partners' desires and views of intimacy that occurred during the course of the psychoeducational intervention program may have resulted in greater relationship satisfaction. This finding supports the previously untested underlying assumption of the intimacy literature that partner differences, or in this case perceived partner differences, in desired intimacy have negative implications for the relationship. They are, in fact, associated with less relationship satisfaction and commitment.

Some possible explanations for why partner dissimilarity is associated with less positive relationship variables are found in evidence from previous research. Kurdek's (2004) data showed that intimacy is a high area of conflict in romantic relationships that is more salient in predicting relationship satisfaction than other areas of conflict. Acitelli et al. (2001) found partner similarity in ideals, which may be similar to relationship ideals to be negatively correlated with conflict in the relationship. It is possible that greater perceived similarity in desires for intimacy result in less conflict in the relationship, which in turn results in more relationship satisfaction and commitment. On the other hand, a couple that has greater dissimilarity in desires for intimacy may have more conflict about their desires for or realized level of intimacy, thus impacting relationship satisfaction and commitment. Another possible explanation comes from Simspon et al.'s (1999) research on relationship ideals. It is possible that greater similarity between partners' desires for intimacy results in more likelihood that the relationship resembles

the ideal relationship. Closer resemblance between the relationship and one's ideals is associated with relationship satisfaction (Simpson et al., 1999).

Furthermore, it is possible that greater perceived similarity in partners' desires for intimacy is associated with greater actual similarity in intimacy desires. When one's partner has similar desires for intimacy, one's desires may be more likely to be achieved, resulting in greater realized intimacy. As previously discussed, greater intimacy is associated with greater relationship satisfaction (Eldridge & Gilbert, 1990; Kurdek, 1998; Greeff & Mahlerbe, 2001; Patrick et al., 2007). Thus perceived partner similarity in desires for intimacy may be associated with greater relationship satisfaction and commitment because of factors such as less frequency of conflict, less frequency of intimacy related conflict, closer resemblance of the relationship to one's ideals, and greater levels of realized intimacy.

In comparing genders on each of the main variables involved in the study, it was observed that women were more likely to endorse higher desires for overall, sexual, intellectual, and recreational intimacy than men were. They were also likely to endorse higher perceived partner desires for emotional and sexual intimacy than men were. Previous literature has suggested that women would tend to desire more emotional and social intimacy than men while men would tend to desire more sexual and recreational intimacy than women (e.g. Orosan & Schilling, 1992; Thompson & Walker, 1989). These trends were not supported by the current research. Instead, the research seemed to support the idea that women tend to desire greater levels of intimacy than men. Heller and Wood (1998) found that women tend to report greater levels of intimacy than men do. It may be that women desire and report greater levels of intimacy than men. One

explanation for this is that intimacy may be more salient for women than it is for men. Intimacy is a construct and word typically associated with women in popular culture. Women may thus be more likely to notice and experience more intimacy in relationships because of this (Heller & Wood, 1998).

Furthermore, although the specific items of the PAIR did not mention intimacy, the cover letter explained that the study would be exploring relationship closeness, and if male participants believed relationship closeness to be more associated with women than men, they may have been influenced to respond in a way that was congruent with that. Regardless, the fact that there are some significant differences in desires for intimacy between women and men, combined with the finding that differences in desires for intimacy are associated with lower relationship satisfaction and commitment suggests that heterosexual couples may be likely to experience negative impacts as a result of each partner's differing intimacy desires.

The results of the current study do indicate some differences between women and men that are congruent with the literature on gender differences in the experience of intimacy. The results indicated that while perceived partner similarity in desires for social and emotional intimacy are significantly uniquely related to relationship satisfaction for women, only perceived partner similarity in desires for sexual intimacy is significantly associated with satisfaction for men. This finding is in line with previous research suggesting that sexual intimacy is more important for men while emotional intimacy is more important for women in predicting positive affect (Talmadge & Dabbs, 1990). While women and men may experience differing levels of desires for various types of intimacy, it seems that the factors most related to relationship satisfaction are

sexual intimacy for men and emotional and social intimacy for women. This may also have important implications for heterosexual relationships, such that differences across each type of intimacy may be differently associated with satisfaction and commitment for men and women. It also supports the idea that while men and women may experience intimacy in similar ways, for the most part, there are important differences in their experiences.

While the current study did not have enough statistical power to conduct meaningful analyses exploring any potential differences between the experience of perceived similarity of intimacy in same-sex and heterosexual relationships, some general observations included that the participants in same-sex relationships seemed to report greater similarity to their partner in their desires for overall intimacy. Degree of similarity on other types of intimacy, as well as self and partner desires for intimacy did not differ. It is important to note that demographic differences between groups, such as age and relationship length, may explain this difference in similarity. Because there was not enough power to conduct meaningful analyses, it is difficult to draw conclusions from these findings. It is important to study the concept of perceived partner similarity in desired intimacy within same-sex relationships. In doing, so the implications for gender should be explored as well. It may be that gay/lesbian individuals report greater similarity to their partner in desires for similarity than heterosexual individuals because they may not have gender differences in their desires for intimacy. If this is the case, same-sex couples may experience greater relationship satisfaction as a result. It would be interesting to explore the perceived partner similarity in desired intimacy in terms of its association with relationship satisfaction and commitment. It seems plausible that same-

sex couples may be less negatively affected by differing desires for intimacy because they may not experience the same stereotypical gender differences as heterosexual couples. It also seems logical, however, that same-sex couples may be more adversely affected by differing desires for intimacy than heterosexual couples because they do not have the construct of gender to explain their differences. They also may have a greater expectation of similarity, thus making it incredibly impactful when they do have different desires than their partners. Further research needs to be conducted to explore these concepts.

Lastly, the results of the current study explored the influence of direction of similarity/difference in desires for intimacy. The direction of the difference does not appear to be related to relationship satisfaction and commitment. For example, a participant who desires more emotional intimacy than their partner does not differ in relationship satisfaction from an individual who desires less emotional intimacy then their partner. The same is true for overall intimacy and the four other types of intimacy. This is an interesting finding. While there were no direct predictions with regard to direction, it is somewhat surprising that direction of difference has no connection to relationship satisfaction. It seems that the degree of difference between partners' perceived desires for intimacy, and not the direction of this difference, is associated with satisfaction and commitment. Assuming the degree of difference between own desired intimacy and perceived partner desired intimacy is the same across partners, one should not suffer more than the other based on this difference. The only case in which they may be more impacted is in a heterosexual relationship if the difference is across the domains of sexual or emotional intimacy. It appears that simply perceiving oneself as different

from one's partner, as opposed to desiring more or less intimacy than one's partner, is related to satisfaction and commitment.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to the current study. The data are correlational in nature. Although this is a difficult limitation to avoid with this study, it is important to note. It can be easy to assume a direction in the relationship between perceived partner similarity in desired intimacy and relationship satisfaction and commitment. Because partner desires for intimacy presumably exist before the relationship and independent from the relationship, it is natural to discuss this topic as if perceived partner similarity causes greater relationship satisfaction. Based on the results of this study, however, it is impossible to conclude that and incorrect to state that it is the case. It is also possible that the other direction is true, such that greater relationship satisfaction results in greater likelihood of perceiving oneself as being similar to or having similar desires as one's partner. As one feels better about their relationship, this may cause them to change their desires for intimacy or the way they view their partner's desires for intimacy, resulting in greater similarity.

As previously indicated, the reliabilities of a few of the subscales, especially the subscale measuring the participants own desires for recreational intimacy, were below conventional standards for reliability. The scales have all been shown to have adequate reliability in previous research, and it is unclear why they had reduced reliability in the present study. It is important to note that this is the case and it is possible that if the scale had greater reliability, significant effects could have been found with regard to similarity

of recreational intimacy. If future research continues to demonstrate low reliability of this subscale, effort should be made to create a better measure of recreational intimacy.

The current study had much more data from heterosexual women than from lesbian women, gay men, and heterosexual men. While there was enough statistical power to conduct a few analyses exploring potential gender differences, the sample may not have been representative of the population of men. Greater power would have led to the ability to conduct further analyses, as well. The data did not have enough participants involved in same-sex relationships to look at the way these constructs operate in same-sex couples. As previously discussed, perceived partner similarity in desired intimacy may be experienced in same-sex couples in a similar way that it is experienced in heterosexual couples. It is also possible that it may affect them to a greater or lesser degree.

The sample also mostly identified themselves as White/Caucasian. While there were a few ethnic minority participants, it is not clear that these results can be generalized to ethnic minority populations. Furthermore, participants were either college students or agreed to voluntarily participate in Internet research. Data on socioeconomic status and education level was not collected in the current study. The origin of the participants, however, may indicate that the education level and potentially the socioeconomic status of the participants were relatively high. It is not clear whether these results can be generalized to individuals of other education or socioeconomic levels.

A further limitation of the current research is that it explored perceptions of similarity between partner's desires. While this may be the most important construct in determining relationship satisfaction and commitment based on similarities in intimacy,

that cannot be concluded at this point. It can be easy to assume that one's perceptions of their partner's desires for intimacy correlate with their partner's actual desires for intimacy. This should not, however, be assumed, as the correlation is unknown. It may be that perceived differences and actual differences are quite similar and have similar relationships to relationship satisfaction and commitment, but it also may be that one or the other is more associated with satisfaction and commitment.

Implications for Counseling Practice

The results of the current study have important implications for counseling practice. In terms of counseling practice, perceived similarity in desired intimacy should be included as an important issue related to couple relationships and problems faced by couples in their relationships. Couple's counselors should be aware of the role that perceptions of difference may play. It may be important within couple's counseling to facilitate communication about each partner's desire for intimacy and the ways in which the partners compromise to meet each others' needs. Couple's counselors could utilize the PAIR (Schaefer & Olson, 1981) as an assessment of each partner's desire, to facilitate insight regarding one's own desires for intimacy, and to guide discussion and communication about intimacy within the relationship. At this point it is not known whether greater communication about desires for intimacy may lessen the association between differences of desired intimacy and satisfaction and commitment. If this is the case, however, communication about the topic in couple's therapy could be beneficial for the couple.

Furthermore, psychoeducational workshops, such as the one conducted by Durana (1997), may benefit from this knowledge of the connection between similarity of desired

intimacy and satisfaction and commitment. It may be important to incorporate measures of intimacy needs/desires and clarify perceptions versus actual desires. While the specific roles of perceptions of partner similarity in desires and actual partner similarity in desires is not currently known, helping partners to clarify their perceptions of the others' desires may be beneficial.

The findings with regard to gender also have some implications for couple's counseling. Couple's counselors should be aware of the general trends of gender similarities and differences in the experience of similarity of intimacy in romantic relationships. It may be helpful to discuss with a couple the tendency for sexual intimacy similarity to be more important for men and for emotional and social intimacy to be more important for women. At the same time, however, it is essential to acknowledge that these differences do not necessarily exist for all men and women and to emphasize the similarities as well. Facilitating discussion about this may help couples to better understand factors that may be related to their satisfaction in their relationship. Additionally, it is essential for couple's therapists to be aware that same-sex couples may also have differing desires for intimacy. It may be a counselor's tendency to think of differences in desired intimacy as defined by gender and thus only applicable to heterosexual couples, but different desires for intimacy may have a significant relationship to same-sex couple satisfaction and commitment as well.

Implications for Future Research

The results of the current study have implications for future research. Many of these implications have already been discussed. In terms of various populations and the representativeness of the sample from the current study, future research should be

conducted assessing the perceived partner similarity in heterosexual men, gay men, and lesbian women. It will be important to examine any similarities or differences between these groups of individuals. It may also be important to explore the role that gender plays in the relationship between similarity of desired intimacy and satisfaction/commitment in heterosexual couples as compared to same-sex couples. Opening up our explorations of intimacy to all couples will deepen our understanding of the construct as it applies to couple relationships.

Another demographic variable that may be useful to explore in future research is length of relationship. It is possible that perceived similarity in desired intimacy is associated with relationship variables differently for relationships of different lengths. In the current study, the average length of relationship was approximately three years. While the association between perceived similarity of desired intimacy and other relationship variables may not differ for longer and shorter relationships, it also seems plausible that it may. For example, couples that have less perceived similarity in desired intimacy may end their relationship sooner, resulting in individuals in longer relationships tending to have greater perceived similarity. It is also possible that individuals who have been in relationships longer may be tend to be influenced by their partners' desires for intimacy and thus may have more similar perceived desires for intimacy. The opposite is also possible, however. It seems plausible that early in a relationship, individuals may be more idealistic and tend to view their partners' as more similar to themselves. With time, however, individuals may be more likely to report perceived differences in theirs and their partners' desires. At this point, it is unclear if relationship length has an impact on the association between relationship outcome

variables and perceived similarity in desired intimacy. Further research should be conducted to explore the potential correlational or causal connection between relationship length and perceived similarity in desires for intimacy.

Future research, furthermore, should seek to clarify the relationship between perceived partner desires and actual partner desires for intimacy. As previously discussed, these constructs may be the same or may be different. If they are different, they may be equally related to relationship satisfaction or one may be more associated with satisfaction/commitment than the other. If this is the case, it has implications for couple's counseling and the need to clarify their perceptions versus their partner's actual desires, as mentioned previously.

Additionally, it is unclear why similarity in emotional, social, and sexual intimacy seemed to be most uniquely related to relationship satisfaction and commitment (depending on gender) while the other types of intimacy were not. It may be important for future research to explore the role of recreational and intellectual intimacy to determine their relative importance in terms of their association with other variables.

Lastly, future research may wish to explore other variables that may be involved in the relationship between perceived partner similarity in desired intimacy and relationship satisfaction/commitment. There may be other relationship outcome variables that are important, such as relationship dissolution. Additionally, the role of any mediating or moderating factors in the relationship between perceived partner similarity in desired intimacy and satisfaction/commitment should be examined. Greater perceived similarity, for example may be associated with actual similarity or with greater realized intimacy. It is possible that this could account for the association it has with relationship

satisfaction and commitment. It is also possible that while greater similarity tends to be associated with greater satisfaction/commitment, there may be other factors that help couples navigate differences in their desires. Factors could include communication, conflict, and honesty, among others. Conducting research on factors that help couples navigate their differences in desired intimacy to ensure that both partners' needs are met may shed light on the ways in which couple's counselors or workshops can assist couples in improving their relationships.

REFERENCES

Acitelli, L. K., Kenny, D. A., & Weiner, D. (2001).The importance of similarity and understanding of partners' marital ideals to relationship satisfaction. *Personal Relationships, 8,* 167-185.

Anderson, C., Keltner, D., & John, O. P. (2003). Emotional convergence between people over time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84,* 1054-1058.

Bagarozzi, D. A. (2001).*Enhancing Intimacy in Marriage: A Clinician's Guide.* New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Brown, J. (2001). Intimacy, gender and self psychology: Considerations for relationship counseling. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy, 22,* 137-146.

Caldwell, M. &Peplau, L. A. (1982).Sex differences in same-sex friendship. *Sex Roles, 8,* 721-732.

Collins, N. L. & Feeney, B. C. (2004).An attachment theory perspective on closeness and intimacy. In D. J. Mashek & A. Aron (Eds.) *Handbook of Closeness and Intimacy* (pp.163-187). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Crowe, M. (1997). Intimacy in relation to couple therapy. *Sexual and Marital Therapy, 12,* 225-236.

Ditzen, B., Hoppman, C., &Klumb, P. (2008). Positive couple interactions and daily cortisol: On the stress-protecting role of intimacy. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 70,* 883-889.

Durana, C. (1997). Enhancing marital intimacy through psychoeducation: The PAIRS program. *The Family Journal, 5,* 204-215.

Eldridge, N. S. & Gilbert, L. A. (1990).Correlates of relationship satisfaction in lesbian couples. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 14,* 43-62.

Fletcher, G. J. O., Simpson, J. A., Thomas, G. & Giles, L. (1999). Ideals in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 72-89.

Gaia, A. C. (2002). Understanding emotional intimacy: A review of conceptualization, assessment and the role of gender. *International Social Science Review, 77,* 151-170.

Gaunt, R. (2006). Couple similarity and marital satisfaction: Are similar spouses happier? *Journal of Personality, 74,* 1401-1420.

Gonzaga, G. C., Campos, B., & Bradbury, T. (2007).Similarity, convergence, and relationship satisfaction in dating and married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93,* 34-48.

Gosling, S. D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. P. (2004). Should we trust web-based studies? A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist, 59,* 93-104.

Greeff, A.P. & Malherbe, H. L. (2001). Intimacy and marital satisfaction in spouses. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 27,* 247-257.

Harper, J. M., Schaalje, B. G., & Sandberg, J. G. (2000). Daily hassles, intimacy, and marital quality in later life marriages. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 28,* 1-18.

Heller, P. E. & Wood, B. (1998). The process of intimacy: Similarity, understanding and gender. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 24,* 273-288.

Hook, M. K., Gerstein, L. H., Detterich, L., & Gridley, B. (2003). How close are we? Measuring intimacy and examining gender differences. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 81,* 462-472.

Horowitz, L. M. (1979). On the cognitive structure of interpersonal problems treated in psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47,* 5-15.

Kenny, D. A. & Acitelli, L. K. (1994). Measuring similarity in couples. *Journal of Family Psychology, 8,* 417-431.

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic Data Analysis*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Kurdek, L. A. (1994). Areas of conflict for gay, lesbian, and heterosexual couples: What couples argue about influences relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56,* 923-934.

Kurdek, L. A. (1998). Relationship outcomes and their predictors: Longitudinal evidence from heterosexual married, gay cohabiting, and lesbian cohabiting couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 60,* 553-568.

Laurenceau, J. P. & Kleinman, B. M. (2006).Intimacy in personal relationships. In A. Vangelisti& D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 637-653). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Luo, S. (2009). Partner selection and relationship satisfaction in early dating couples: The role of couple similarity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47,* 133-138.

Luo, S. & Klohnen, E. C. (2005). Assortative mating and marital quality in newlyweds: A couple-centered approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 304-326.

Mackey, R. A., Diemer, M. A., & O'Brien, B. A. (2000). Psychological intimacy in the lasting relationships of heterosexual and same-gender couples. *Sex Roles, 43,* 201-227.

Mashek, D. J. & Sherman, M. D. (2004). Desiring less closeness with intimate others. In D. J. Mashek& A. Aron (Eds.) *Handbook of Closeness and Intimacy* (pp.343-356). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Moss, B. F. & Schwebel, A. I. (1993). Defining intimacy in romantic relationships. *Family Relations, 42,* 31-37.

Mulsow, M., Caldera, Y. M., Pursley, M., Reifman, A., & Huston, A. C. (2002). Multilevel factors influencing maternal stress during the first three years. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64,* 944-956.

Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., Bellavia, G., Griffin, D. W., & Dolderman, D. (2002).Kindred spirits? The benefits of egocentrism in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 563-581.

Orosan, P. G. & Schilling, K. M. (1992).Gender differences in college students' definitions and perceptions of intimacy. *Women & Therapy, 12,* 201-212.

Parker, L. (1999). Bridging gender issues in couples work: Bringing "Mars and Venus" back to Earth. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy, 10,* 1-15.

Patrick, S. &Beckenbach, J. (2009). Male perceptions of intimacy: A qualitative study. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 17*, 47-56.

Patrick, S., Sells, J. N., Giordano, F. G., & Tollerud, T. R. (2007). Intimacy, differentiation, and personality variables as predictors of marital satisfaction. *The Family Journal*, *15*, 359 – 367.

Prager, K. J. (1995). *The psychology of intimacy*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Prager, K. J. (2000). Intimacy in personal relationships. In C. Hendrick & S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A sourcebook* (pp. 229-242). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Prager, K. J. & Buhrmester, D. (1998). Intimacy and need fulfillment in couple relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*, 435-469.

Prager, K. J. & Roberts, L. J. (2004). Deep intimate connection: Self and intimacy in couple relationships. In D. J. Mashek& A. Aron (Eds.) *Handbook of Closeness and Intimacy* (pp.43-60). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rampagne, C. (2003). Gendered constraints to intimacy in heterosexual couples. In L. B. Silverstein & T. J. Goodrich (Eds.), *Feminist Family Therapy: Empowerment in Social Context* (pp. 199-210). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Reis, H. T. (1998). Gender differences in intimacy and related behaviors: Context and process. In D. J. Canary & K. Dindia (Eds.) *Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication: Critical Essay sand Empirical Investigations of Sex and Gender in Interaction* (pp. 203-232).Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Reis, H. T. & Shaver, P. (1988). Intimacy as an interpersonal process. In S. W. Duck (Ed.) *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research, and interventions* (pp. 367-389). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Ridley, J. (1993). Gender and couples: Do men and women seek different kinds of intimacy?.*Sexual and Marital Therapy*, *8,* 243-253.

Rusbult, C. E., Kumashiro, M., Kubacka, K. E., & Finkel, E. J. (2009). "The part of me that you bring out": Ideal similarity and the Michealangelo phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96,* 61-82.

Rusbult, C. E., Marsh, J. M, & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships, 5,* 357-391.

Schaefer, M. T. & Olson, D. H. (1981). Assessing intimacy: The PAIR Inventory. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 71,* 47-60.

Soper, D.S. (2010) "The Free Statistics Calculators Website", *Online Software*, http://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc/

Sternberg, R. J. (1986) A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review, 93,* 119-135.

Talmadge, L. D. &Dabbs, J. M. (1990). Intimacy, conversational patterns, and concomitant cognitive/emotional processes in couples. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9,* 473-488.

Thompson, L. & Walker, A. J. (1989). Gender in families: Women and men in marriage, work, and parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy, 51*, 845-871.

Vangelisti, A. L. & Beck, G. (2007). Intimacy and fear of intimacy. In L. L'Abate (Ed.), *Low-cost approaches to promote physical and mental health: Theory, research, and practice* (pp.395-414). New York: Spring Science & Business Media.

Waring, E. (1984). The measurement of marital intimacy. *The Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 10,* 185-192.

APPENDIX A

Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships

Imagine your relationship with your partner **as you would like** it to be. Please answer the following questions as if your relationship were exactly **HOW YOU WOULD LIKE** it to be.

(The second time the measure is given:)
Think about how your partner would like his or her relationship with you to be. Please answer the following questions **AS IF YOU WERE YOUR PARTNER**, answering with regard to **HOW YOUR PARNTER WOULD LIKE** his or her relationship with you to be.

1 2 3 4 5
Disagree Somewhat disagree Neutral Somewhat agree Agree

1. My partner listens to me when I need someone to talk to.	1	2	3	4	5
2. We enjoy spending time together with other couples.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I am satisfied with our sex life.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My partner helps me clarify my thoughts.	1	2	3	4	5
5. We enjoy the same recreational activities.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My partner has all the qualities I've ever wanted in a mate.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I can state my feelings without him/her getting defensive.	1	2	3	4	5
8. We usually "keep to ourselves."	1	2	3	4	5
9. I feel our sexual activity is just routine.	1	2	3	4	5
10. When it comes to having a serious discussion it seems that we have little in common.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I share in very few of my partner's interests.	1	2	3	4	5
12. There are times when I do not feel a great deal of love and affection for my	1	2	3	4	5

partner.					
13. I often feel distant from my partner.	1	2	3	4	5
14. We have very few friends in common.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I am able to tell my partner when I want sexual intercourse.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I feel "put down" in serious conversation with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5
17. We like playing together.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Every new thing that I have learned about my partner has pleased me.	1	2	3	4	5
19. My partner can really understand my hurts and joys.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Having time together with friends is an important part of our shared activities.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I "hold back" my sexual interest because my partner makes me feel uncomfortable.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I feel it is useless to discuss some things with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5
23. We enjoy the out-of-doors together.	1	2	3	4	5
24. My partner and I understand each other completely.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I feel neglected at times by my partner.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Many of my partner's closest friends are also my closest friends.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Sexual expression is an essential part of our relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
28. My partner frequently tries to change my ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
29. We seldom find time to do fun things together.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I don't think anyone could possibly be happier than my partner and I when we are with one another.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I sometimes feel lonely with we're together.	1	2	3	4	5
32. My partner disapproves of some of my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
33. My partner seems disinterested in sex.	1	2	3	4	5
34. We have an endless number of things to talk about.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I think that we share some of the same interests.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I have some needs that are not being met by my relationship.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

Relationship Satisfaction

1. I feel satisfied with our relationship.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do not agree at all				Agree somewhat				Agree completely

2. My relationship is much better than others' relationships.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do not agree at all				Agree somewhat				Agree completely

3. My relationship is close to ideal.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do not agree at all				Agree somewhat				Agree completely

4. Our relationship makes me very happy.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do not agree at all				Agree somewhat				Agree completely

5. Our relationship does a good job of fulfilling my needs for intimacy, companionship, etc.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Do not agree at all Agree somewhat Agree completely

APPENDIX C

Commitment Level

1. I want our relationship to last for a very long time.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Do not agree at all Agree somewhat Agree completely

2. I am committed to maintaining my relationship with my partner.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Do not agree at all Agree somewhat Agree completely

3. I would not feel very upset if our relationship were to end in the near future

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Do not agree at all Agree somewhat Agree completely

4. It is likely that I will date someone other than my partner within the next year.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Do not agree at all Agree somewhat Agree completely

5. I feel very attached to our relationship—very strongly linked to my partner.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Do not agree at all Agree somewhat Agree completely

6. I want our relationship to last forever.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do not agree at all			Agree somewhat					Agree completely

7. I am oriented toward the long-term future of my relationship (for example, I imagine being with my partner several years from now).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do not agree at all			Agree somewhat					Agree completely

APPENDIX D

Demographics Questionnaire

Have you completed this survey before? Yes No

Has your partner completed this survey before? Yes No

Where do you live? (Country, State/Region)

Please indicate your age:

Please indicate your partner's age:

Please indicate your gender: Male Transgender, Male to Female
Female Transgender, Female to Male

Please indicate your partner's gender: Male Transgender, Male to Female
Female Transgender, Female to Male

Please indicate your race/ethnic background:
Black, non-Hispanic Asian or Pacific Islander White, non-Hispanic Hispanic
American Indian or Alaskan Native Other _____

Please indicate your partner's race/ethnic background:
Black, non-Hispanic Asian or Pacific Islander White, non-Hispanic Hispanic
American Indian or Alaskan Native Other _____

What is your sexual orientation? Heterosexual Homosexual Bisexual Other

Please indicate your relationship status:
Friends Casually dating Seriously dating, not co-habiting Seriously dating, Co-habiting
Married/Committed, Co-habiting Married/Committed, not co-habiting

How long have you been dating your partner? _____ years

Are you currently sexually active with your partner? Yes No

Table 1.
Variable Means, Standard Deviations and Intercorrelations

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. ADS Overall Intimacy	6.97	7.28	1	_	_	_	_	_	
2. ADS Emotional Intimacy	1.76	2.29	.601**	1	_	_	_	_	
3. ADS Social Intimacy	2.58	2.35	.428**	.108	1	_	_	_	
4. ADS Sexual Intimacy	1.80	2.32	.471**	.292**	.126	1	_	_	
5. ADS Intellectual Intimacy	2.03	2.42	.678**	.529**	.241**	.256**	1	_	
6. ADS Recreational Intimacy	1.77	2.09	.536**	.237**	.187**	.214**	.283**	1	
7. Relationship Satisfaction	20.98	4.43	-.352**	-.322**	-.211**	-.175**	-.315**	-.193**	1
8. Relationship Commitment	47.06	10.76	-.228**	-.267**	-.139*	-.111	-.173**	-.153*	.648**

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

Table 2.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Emotional, Social, Sexual, Intellectual, and Recreational Intimacy on Relationship Satisfaction

Variable	*B*	SE *B*	*β*	R^2
Constant	23.29	0.48		
ADS of Emotional Intimacy	-0.41	0.14	-0.209**	
ADS of Social Intimacy	-0.27	0.12	-0.145*	
ADS of Sexual Intimacy	-0.13	0.12	-0.066	
ADS of Intellectual Intimacy	-0.24	0.14	-0.134	
ADS of Recreational Intimacy	-0.12	0.14	-0.059	.167***

*p< .05.**p< .01.***p< .001.

Table 3.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Emotional, Social, Sexual, Intellectual, and Recreational Intimacy on Relationship Commitment

Variable	*B*	SE *B*	*β*	R^2
Constant	51.24	1.21		
ADS of Emotional Intimacy	-1.29	0.37	-0.271**	
ADS of Social Intimacy	-0.53	0.30	-0.117	
ADS of Sexual Intimacy	-0.13	0.32	-0.027	
ADS of Intellectual Intimacy	0.15	0.35	0.033	
ADS of Recreational Intimacy	-0.36	0.35	-0.069	.105***

*p< .05.**p< .01.***p< .001.

Table 4.
Means and Standard Deviations of Variable Comparisons by Gender

	Female (N=191)		Male (N=56)	
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Relationship Commitment	48.57	10.25	42.38	10.84
Desired Overall Intimacy	133.98	13.05	127.74	13.42
Desired Sexual Intimacy	27.58	3.14	26.46	3.44
Desired Intellectual Intimacy	26.95	3.64	24.93	4.03
Desired Recreational Intimacy	27.26	2.79	25.79	2.85
Perceived Partner Desired Emotional Intimacy	28.09	3.03	26.85	3.94
Perceived Partner Desired Sexual Intimacy	27.70	3.30	26.13	4.35

Table 5.
Multiple Regression Analysis of Relationship Satisfaction on Emotional, Social, Sexual, Intellectual, and Recreational Intimacy, Split by Gender

Gender	Variable	*B*	SE *B*	*β*	R^2
Male					
(N=49)	Constant	23.85	1.20		
	ADS of Emotional Intimacy	-0.349	0.267	-0.183	
	ADS of Social Intimacy	-0.358	0.253	-0.187	
	ADS of Sexual Intimacy	-0.687	0.278	-0.338*	
	ADS of Intellectual Intimacy	-0.202	0.287	-0.103	
	ADS of Recreational Intimacy	-0.096	0.361	-0.035	0.272*
Female					
(N=174)	Constant	23.27	0.523		
	ADS of Emotional Intimacy	-0.464	0.173	-0.241**	
	ADS of Social Intimacy	-0.251	0.134	-0.138	
	ADS of Sexual Intimacy	0.022	0.139	0.012	
	ADS of Intellectual Intimacy	-0.217	0.158	-0.125	
	ADS of Recreational Intimacy	-0.137	0.148	-0.070	0.168***

*p< .05.**p< .01.***p< .001.

Table 6.

Multiple Regression Analysis of Relationship Commitment on Emotional, Social, Sexual, Intellectual, and Recreational Intimacy, Split by Gender

Gender	Variable	*B*	SE *B*	*β*	R^2
Male					
(N=50)	Constant	49.8	3.06		
	ADS of Emotional Intimacy	-0.766	0.684	-0.164	
	ADS of Social Intimacy	-0.559	0.654	-0.118	
	ADS of Sexual Intimacy	-0.997	0.718	-0.199	
	ADS of Intellectual Intimacy	-0.904	0.741	-0.186	
	ADS of Recreational Intimacy	-0.195	0.932	-0.029	0.187
Female					
(N=172)	Constant	52.0	1.27		
	ADS of Emotional Intimacy	-1.65	0.420	-0.365***	
	ADS of Social Intimacy	-0.554	0.324	-0.129	
	ADS of Sexual Intimacy	0.261	0.339	0.059	
	ADS of Intellectual Intimacy	0.583	0.384	0.143	
	ADS of Recreational Intimacy	-0.471	0.360	-0.102	0.129***

*p< .05.**p< .01.***p< .001.