

July 14, 2009

Mr. Alan K. Goodboy
Department of Communication Studies
and Theatre Arts
Bloomsburg University
1102 McCormick Center for Human Services
400 East Second Street
Bloomsburg, PA 17815-1301

Dear Mr. Goodboy:

This PDF contains the edited manuscript and a copy of the proof of your paper, "Love styles and desire for closeness in romantic relationships."

Please read the proof carefully. Author's corrections are charged to the author. This refers to any changes in the copy which are not due to printer's error. Such changes are expensive and increase the time necessary for handling.

You will receive 50 preprints without covers. If you wish to order additional preprints or covers, please fill in the amounts of each on the enclosed form. Be sure to indicate the correct mailing address for the preprints.

As there are one blank pages in your signature, we would like to ask your permission to print an article in that space. This additional material would appear in the journal but not in your preprints. With your permission to use the space in this signature, we will credit you with this amount of space to be used in publishing a one-page article in the future. We encourage publication of short articles of one to two pages, as many studies lend themselves to this brief form and, in addition, it tightens up the appearance of the journal.

Please be sure to *courier* back to us or e-mail a copy of the *corrected proof* and any changes to the *preprint order form* within 72 hours of receipt. We cannot accept faxed documents. Courier services will require our street address—1917 South Higgins Avenue, Missoula, MT 59801—and telephone number, (406)-728-1702.

Sincerely,

Carol H. Ammons, Ph.D.
Senior Editor

CHA/tws
Enclosures

ORDER FORM

PSYCHOLOGICAL REPORTS

Box 9229, Missoula, Montana 59807

RATES FOR ADDITIONAL PREPRINTS & COVERS:

Additional preprints	Length of Article				
	1-4 pages	5-8 pages	9-12 pages	13-16 pages	___ pages*
First Additional 50	\$15.00	\$20.00	\$25.00	\$30.00	
Shipping*: to USA	\$ 1.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.00	
to Canada/Mexico	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	
to All Other Countries	\$ 3.00	\$ 6.00	\$12.00	\$12.00	
Further Additional 50s	\$12.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	
Shipping*: to USA	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 2.00	
to Canada/Mexico	\$ 4.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 7.00	\$10.00	
to All Other Countries	\$ 3.00	\$ 6.00	\$11.00	\$12.00	
Covers*					
First 50 (or 25 for a note)	\$15				
Further 50s	\$12				

*E-mail us for fees for: (1) signatures of 17 pages or more, (2) ordering covers, or (3) delivery via courier (shipping@AmmonsScientific.com).

I wish to order the following preprints and covers. I am enclosing either a purchase order or a personal check for extra preprints and covers, if applicable.

Preprints (free) 50 **\$ 00.00**

Additional preprints _____

Number of covers _____

Shipping _____

TOTAL ENCLOSED **\$ _____**

<p>For Office Use Only</p> <p>Author Payment Rec'd: <u>bankcard</u></p> <p>Incr / Decr Signature: \$ _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Credit / Refund / Charge</p> <p>Author Alteration Fee: \$ _____</p> <p>Other: _____</p>
--

For payment options, visit our website
(<http://ammons.ammonsscientific.com/homepage/pdf/Payment-Options.pdf>).

Please send **proof** to:
(street address and phone number required)

Dr. Alan K. Goodboy
Department of Communication Studies
And Theater Arts
Bloomsburg University
1102 McCormick Center for Human Services
400 East Second Street
Bloomsburg, PA 17815-1301

Phone No. _____

Please send **preprints** to:
(street address and phone number required)

Same

Phone No. _____

☐

If box is X'd, please complete, sign, and promptly return the enclosed Copyright Assignment form.

This is your ONLY OFFICIAL ORDER for additional preprints and covers.
Please fill it out carefully and return it with your corrected proof.

LOVE STYLES AND DESIRE FOR CLOSENESS IN ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS¹

ALAN K. GOODBOY

MELANIE BOOTH-BUTTERFIELD

Bloomsburg University

West Virginia University

Summary.—This study investigated differences in love styles (i.e., eros, ludus, storge, pragma, agape, mania) associated with the romantic desire for closeness. Participants were 197 undergraduate students (M age = 19.8 yr., SD = 1.9; 92 men, 104 women) currently in a romantic relationship who completed a survey assessing their love styles and current desire for closeness with their partner (i.e., desired less closeness, the same level of closeness, or more closeness). Results indicated small significant differences in individuals' preferences for closeness with the eros and ludus love styles. Specifically, individuals who desired less closeness scored lower on eros love and higher on ludus love than partners who reported an ideal level of closeness or who desired more closeness.

Relational closeness and the experience of love are related (Aron, Fisher, & Strong, 2006). Closeness refers to having cognitive interdependence with a relational partner by promoting a connection between self and partner inclusion (Aron, Aron, Tudor, & Nelson, 1991; Aron, Mashek, & Aron, 2004) through sharing relational identities, resources, and perspectives (Aron & Aron, 1986). Although most satisfied romantic partners experience a considerable desire for relational closeness, around 12 to 30% of romantic partners actually would prefer less closeness in their relationship (Mashek & Sherman, 2004). Mashek and Sherman (2004) suggested that partners who desire more relational autonomy may perceive threats to personal control and identity in their relationships. Furthermore, Mashek and Sherman recommended that researchers examine relational correlates of the desire for less closeness in romantic relationships. One important correlate of relational quality is love styles (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).

Love Styles

Romantic partners can communicate and experience love in fundamentally different ways. Based on work conducted by Lee (1988), Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) operationalized six styles of loving: eros, storge, ludus, pragma, mania, and agape. *Eros* love refers to a focus on passion and physical attraction. An eros lover is likely to value beauty. *Storge* love is a developmental love based on friendship. This love takes

¹Address correspondence to Alan K. Goodboy, 1128 McCormick Center, 400 E. 2nd Street, Bloomsburg, PA 17815 or e-mail (agoodboy@bloomu.edu).

a longer time to flourish and often emerges from established friendships. *Ludus* love is viewed as game-playing love. A ludic lover will manipulate situations and play strategic games that are advantageous for him. *Pragma* love is considered practical or logical, where compatibility with a partner is the primary focus. An ideal partner who matches certain criteria is sought. *Mania* love refers to an obsessive and possessive type of love. A manic lover tends to engage in intense and ruminating thought about the relationship. *Agape* love is considered altruistic and other-oriented love. The agape lover puts his partner before himself. These love styles have recently been linked to neurotransmitter genes (Emanuele, Brondino, Pesenti, Re, & Geroldi, 2007).

Generally, the eros and agape love styles are advantageous in romantic relationships (Hendrick, Hendrick, & Adler, 1988). Eros lovers tend to experience more relational and sexual satisfaction (Fricker & Moore, 2002), spend more time with their relational partners (Levine, Aune, & Park, 2006), and report falling in love more often (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Agape lovers tend to use many relational intensification strategies (e.g., social support, rewards, tokens of affection, personalized communication, verbal or nonverbal expressions of affection) with their partners (Levine, *et al.*, 2006) and also report falling in love more often (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Considering that the eros and agape love styles are associated with relational quality indicators, the desire for less closeness should not be a yearning for these types of lovers. Therefore, it was expected that (1) relational partners who report desiring less closeness will score lower on eros love (as measured by the Love Attitude Scale) than partners who possess a desirable level of closeness or desire more closeness (as measured by the Inclusion of Other in Self Scale); and (2) those who report desiring less closeness will score lower on agape love than partners who possess a desirable level of closeness or desire more closeness.

In contrast, the ludus love style is not associated with satisfying relationships (Hahn & Blass, 1997). The ludus love style is associated with lower relational and sexual satisfaction (Fricker & Moore, 2002). Ludus lovers tend to engage in more infidelity (Wiederman, 1999), are more narcissistic (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002), tend to have more defeatist attitudes about romance (Williams & Schill, 1994), and possess more liberal views concerning sex, and engage in sexual interactions more frequently (Hensley, 1996; Lacey, Reifman, Scott, Harris, & Fitzpatrick, 2004). Furthermore, ludus partners perceive they are in love either very rarely or very often, depending on whether they view romantic encounters as casual affairs or love affairs (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Considering that the ludus lover views romance as a game and relationships are not viewed as particularly important, it could be expected that (3) relational partners who report de-

siring less closeness will score higher in ludus love than partners possessing a desirable level of closeness or who desire more closeness.

Like ludus love, the mania love style is also considered undesirable in relationships (Davies, 2001). Mania lovers tend to experience more loneliness (Rotenberg & Korol, 1995), have lower self-esteem (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986), use more secret tests in relationships (Levine, *et al.*, 2006), and experience more depression (Arnold & Thompson, 1996). Considering that mania lovers tend to be intensely obsessed with their romantic partners, are generally unhappy, and have a strong desire for companionship and interdependence, (4) those who report desiring less closeness likely will score lower in mania love than partners who possess a desirable level of closeness or who desire more closeness.

As far as the remaining love styles, storge and pragma, are concerned, it is not clear whether (5) relational partners who report desiring less closeness would differ from partners who possess a desirable level of closeness or who desire more closeness.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 197 undergraduate students (92 men, 104 women, 1 sex unreported; M age = 19.8 yr., $SD = 1.9$) enrolled in an introductory communication studies course at a large university in the Northeastern U.S. All participants were currently involved in a committed romantic relationship, ranging from 2 to 71 months ($M = 18.9$, $SD = 14.8$). A committed relationship was defined as monogamous and exclusive and participants had to be involved in such a relationship for a minimum of two months. Consequently, casual dating relationships were excluded from this study. Participants received minimal extra credit for their participation.

Procedures

Participants completed an anonymous survey in class that assessed their love styles along with their perceptions of the closeness in their romantic relationships. This survey consisted of the Love Attitudes Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986) and the Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992).

Measures

Love Attitudes Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).—This measure is a 42-item, Likert-type scale that asks participants to report on the love styles in their relationships. The scale measures six types of love styles: eros, ludus, storge, pragma, mania, and agape. Responses were solicited using a 5-point scale ranging from 1: Strongly disagree to 5: Strongly agree. Sample items include: "My partner fits my ideal standards of physical beauty"

(eros), "I enjoy playing the 'game of love' with my partner and a number of other partners" (ludus), "Our friendship merged gradually into love over time" (storge), "One consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my career" (pragma), "When my partner does not pay attention to me, I feel sick all over" (mania), and "I would rather suffer myself than let my partner suffer" (agape). Previous reliability coefficients for this scale have been: .71 for the Eros subscale, .69 Ludus, .75 Storge, .78 Pragma, .74 Mania, and .82 Agape (Kunkel & Burleson, 2003). In this study, obtained Cronbach coefficients alpha were: Eros ($\alpha = .74$), Ludus ($\alpha = .83$), Storge ($\alpha = .77$), Pragma ($\alpha = .81$), Mania ($\alpha = .75$), and Agape ($\alpha = .84$).

Inclusion of Other in the Self (Aron, *et al.*, 1992).— This measure assesses relational closeness between self and one's partner. It includes seven Venn diagrams depicting two circles representing the self and the other. The circles overlap in different proportions ranging from being very independent to very interdependent. Responses are solicited by circling the diagram that best represents the person's perception of self and other interdependence on a 7-point continuum. To assess the desire for less closeness, two versions of this scale were included. One version asked participants to "Please circle the picture below that best describes your relationship with your romantic partner." The second version asked participants to "Please circle the picture below that best describes your *ideal* relationship with your romantic partner." Scores from version one are then subtracted from version two to measure Desire for Less Closeness ($M = -0.5$, $SD = 1.5$). Scores were then transformed to represent one of three levels of Relational Closeness. Participants whose scores are negative (indicating their current level of closeness was less than desired) were categorized as More closeness desired. Participants whose scores were zero (current and desired level of closeness identical) were categorized as desired closeness Achieved. Participants whose scores were positive (current level of closeness was too close) were categorized as Less closeness desired.

RESULTS

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) examined overall differences in scores of the love styles between partners who reported desiring Less closeness, reported desired closeness Achieved, and reported desiring More closeness (see Table 1). The MANOVA yielded a statistically significant model between the groups (Wilks $\lambda = .84$; $F_{12,378} = 2.8$, $p < .01$). Univariate effects were significant for Eros love ($F_{2,194} = 11.7$, $p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .11$) and ludus love ($F_{2,194} = 7.1$, $p < .01$; partial $\eta^2 = .07$). An examination of the mean scores using Scheffe *post hoc* tests indicated small significant differences for these styles. Hypotheses 1 and 3 were supported.

TABLE 1
DIFFERENCES OF LOVE STYLE SCORES WITH DESIRED LEVEL OF RELATIONAL CLOSENESS

Love Style	Total		Desire for Closeness						<i>F</i>	η^2
	<i>(n</i> = 197)		Less		Achieved		More			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>(n</i> = 30)		<i>(n</i> = 77)		<i>(n</i> = 90)			
			<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Eros	28.1	4.2	24.9	4.9 _{ab}	29.1	3.9 _a	28.3	3.8 _b	12.1†	.11
Agape	26.2	5.1	24.5	5.6	27.0	5.2	26.0	4.8	2.6	.03
Ludus	16.3	6.2	20.0	6.5 _{ab}	15.1	6.2 _a	16.1	5.6 _b	6.3*	.07
Mania	20.9	5.3	19.0	4.7	21.0	6.0	21.5	4.7	2.3	.03
Storge	22.1	5.4	21.4	6.0	23.1	5.5	21.5	5.0	2.1	.02
Pragma	19.2	6.0	18.2	6.2	19.4	6.3	19.3	5.6	0.5	.01

Note.—Means sharing subscripts across each row are significantly different from each other.

* $p < .01$. † $p < .001$.

Romantic partners who were categorized as desiring Less closeness scored significantly lower on the Eros love subscale than those categorized as desiring closeness Achieved or desiring More closeness. Additionally, romantic partners categorized as desiring Less closeness scored significantly higher on the Ludus love subscale than partners categorized as desiring closeness Achieved or desiring More closeness. In respect to Hypotheses 2 and 4, and the general research Question 5, no significant univariate effects were observed for the following love style subscales: Mania ($F_{2,194} = 2.4$, $p = .09$), Agape ($F_{2,94} = 2.6$, $p = .08$), Storge ($F_{2,194} = 2.1$, $p = .13$), or Pragma ($F_{2,194} = 0.5$, $p = .61$).

DISCUSSION

This study examined love styles and how they might be associated with the desire for closeness in romantic relationships. Results suggest that the desire for closeness may be due in part to eros and ludus love attitudes. The associations differ in direction with people who experience eros love style generally wanting to be closer, and those experiencing ludus desiring less closeness. These findings reinforce the notion that eros lovers may be suitable romantic partners whereas ludus lovers may jeopardize relational quality because of their orientation. Eros lovers may also actively move a relationship to a more intimate level in order to have their needs met, while ludus lovers are content playing relational games and maintaining distance. Considering the amount of variance explained in the current study, the desire for less closeness is, not surprisingly, influenced by additional individual differences, relational characteristics, and situational variables. Future research should examine these possibilities as predictors of closeness preferences.

A limitation of this study was that the sample consisted of college students; a sample of married couples or a noncollege sample could have

yielded different results. Alternatively, college students may be an appropriate target group in which to study love and romance, especially considering that their level of relational closeness may be just developing. Another limitation is the cross-sectional design. As Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) explained, "it would be desirable to monitor possible changes in love attitudes as a love relationship progresses from first encounter to binding commitment" (p. 401). These two limitations warrant caution in the interpretation of the data. Nonetheless, these findings suggest certain relational dynamics. That is, ludic lovers may attempt to distance themselves in romantic relationships, and eros lovers may not possess such a desire.

REFERENCES

- ARNOLD, M. E., & THOMPSON, B. (1996) Love style perceptions in relation to personality function. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 11, 425-438.
- ARON, A., & ARON, E. N. (1986) *Love as the expansion of self: understanding attraction and satisfaction*. New York: Hemisphere.
- ARON, A., ARON, E. N., & SMOLLAN, D. (1992) Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 596-612.
- ARON, A., ARON, E. N., TUDOR, M., & NELSON, G. (1991) Close relationships as including other in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 241-253.
- ARON, A., FISHER, H. E., & STRONG, G. (2006) Romantic love. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships*. New York: Cambridge Univer. Press. Pp. 595-614.
- ARON, A. P., MASHEK, D. J., & ARON, E. N. (2004) Closeness as including other in the self. In D. J. Mashek & A. Aron (Eds.), *Handbook of closeness and intimacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Pp. 27-41.
- CAMPBELL, W. K., FOSTER, C. A., & FINKEL, E. J. (2002) Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 340-354.
- DAVIES, M. F. (2001) Socially desirable responding and impression management in the endorsement of love styles. *Journal of Psychology*, 135, 562-571.
- EMANUELE, E., BRONDINO, N., PESENTI, S., RE, S., & GEROLDI, D. (2007) Genetic loading on human loving styles. *Neuroendocrinology Letters*, 28, 815-821.
- FRICKER, J., & MOORE, S. (2002) Relationship satisfaction: the role of love styles and attachment styles. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 7, 182-204.
- HAHN, J., & BLASS, T. (1997) Dating partner preferences: a function of similarity of love styles. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12, 595-610.
- HENDRICK, C., & HENDRICK, S. (1986) A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 392-402.
- HENDRICK, S. S., HENDRICK, C., & ADLER, N. L. (1988) Romantic relationships: love, satisfaction, and staying together. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 980-988.
- HENSLEY, W. E. (1996) The effect of a ludus love style on sexual experience. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 24, 205-212.

- KUNKEL, A., & BURLESON, B. (2003) Relational implications of communication skill evaluations and love styles. *Southern Communication Journal*, 68, 181-197.
- LACEY, R. S., REIFMAN, A., SCOTT, J. P., HARRIS, S. M., & FITZPATRICK, J. (2004) Sexual-moral attitudes, love styles, and mate selection. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 41, 121-128.
- LEE, J. A. (1988) Love-styles. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univer. Press. Pp. 38-67.
- LEVINE, T. R., AUNE, K. S., & PARK, H. S. (2006) Love styles and communication in relationships: partner preferences, initiation, and intensification. *Communication Quarterly*, 54, 465-486.
- 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*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Pp. 343-356.
- ROTENBERG, K. J., & KOROL, S. (1995) The role of loneliness and gender in individuals' love styles. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 10, 537-546.
- WIEDERMAN, M. W. (1999) Extradyadic involvement during dating. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 16, 265-274.
- WILLIAMS, D., & SCHILL, T. (1994) Adult attachment, love styles, and self-defeating personality characteristics. *Psychological Reports*, 75, 31-34.

Accepted May 27, 2009.

Love Styles and Desire For Closeness in Romantic Relationships¹

Alan K. Goodboy
Bloomsburg University

Melanie Booth-Butterfield
West Virginia University

¹Address correspondence to Alan K. Goodboy, 1128 McCormick Center, 400 E. 2nd Street, Bloomsburg, PA 17815, or e-mail (agoodboy@bloomu.edu).

Summary.—This study investigated differences in love styles (i.e., eros, ludus, storge, pragma, agape, mania) associated with the romantic desire for closeness. Participants were 197 undergraduate students (M age = 19.8 yr., SD = 1.9; 92 men, 104 women) currently in a romantic relationship who completed a survey assessing their love styles and current desire for closeness with their partner (i.e., desired less closeness, the same level of closeness, or more closeness). Results indicated small significant differences in individuals' preferences for closeness with the eros and ludus love styles. Specifically, individuals who desired less closeness scored lower on eros love and higher on ludus love than partners who reported an ideal level of closeness or who desired more closeness.

Relational closeness and the experience of love are related (Aron, Fisher, & Strong, 2006). Closeness refers to having cognitive interdependence with a relational partner by promoting a connection between self and partner inclusion (Aron, Aron, Tudor, & Nelson, 1991; Aron, Mashek, & Aron, 2004) through sharing relational identities, resources, and perspectives (Aron & Aron, 1986). Although most satisfied romantic partners experience a considerable desire for relational closeness, around 12–30% of romantic partners actually would prefer less closeness in their relationship (Mashek & Sherman, 2004). Mashek and Sherman (2004) suggested that partners who desire more relational autonomy may perceive threats to personal control and identity in their relationships. Furthermore, Mashek and Sherman recommended that researchers examine relational correlates of the desire for less closeness in romantic relationships. One important correlate of relational quality is love styles (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).

Love Styles

Romantic partners can communicate and experience love in fundamentally different ways. Based on work conducted by Lee (1988), Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) operationalized six styles of loving: eros, storge, ludus, pragma, mania, and agape. *Eros* love refers to a focus on passion and physical attraction. An eros lover is likely to value beauty. *Storge* love is a developmental love based on friendship. This love takes a longer time to flourish and often emerges from established friendships. *Ludus* love is viewed as game-playing love. A ludic lover will manipulate situations and play strategic games that are advantageous for him. *Pragma* love is considered practical or logical, where compatibility with a partner is the primary focus. An ideal partner who matches certain criteria is sought. *Mania* love refers to an obsessive and

possessive type of love. A manic lover tends to engage in intense and ruminating thought about the relationship. *Agape* love is considered altruistic and other-oriented love. The agape lover puts his partner before himself. These love styles have recently been linked to neurotransmitter genes (Emanuele, Brondino, Pesenti, Re, & Geroldi, 2007).

Generally, the eros and agape love styles are advantageous in romantic relationships (Hendrick, Hendrick, & Adler, 1988). Eros lovers tend to experience more relational and sexual satisfaction (Fricker & Moore, 2002), spend more time with their relational partners (Levine, Aune, & Park, 2006), and report falling in love more often (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Agape lovers tend to use many relational intensification strategies (e.g., social support, rewards, tokens of affection, personalized communication, verbal or nonverbal expressions of affection) with their partners (Levine, *et al.*, 2006) and also report falling in love more often (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Considering that the eros and agape love styles are associated with relational quality indicators, the desire for less closeness should not be a yearning for these types of lovers. Therefore, it was expected that (1) relational partners who report desiring less closeness will score lower on eros love (as measured by the Love Attitude Scale) than partners who possess a desirable level of closeness or desire more closeness (as measured by the Inclusion of Other in Self Scale); and (2) those who report desiring less closeness will score lower on agape love than partners who possess a desirable level of closeness or desire more closeness.

In contrast, the ludus love style is not associated with satisfying relationships (Hahn & Blass, 1997). The ludus love style is associated with lower relational and sexual satisfaction (Fricker & Moore, 2002). Ludus lovers tend to engage in more infidelity (Wiederman, 1999), are more narcissistic (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002), tend to have more defeatist attitudes about romance (Williams & Schill, 1994), and possess more liberal views concerning sex, and engage

in sexual interactions more frequently (Hensley, 1996; Lacey, Reifman, Scott, Harris, & Fitzpatrick, 2004). Furthermore, ludus partners perceive they are in love either very rarely or very often, depending on whether they view romantic encounters as casual affairs or love affairs (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Considering that the ludus lover views romance as a game and relationships are not viewed as particularly important, it could be expected that (3) relational partners who report desiring less closeness will score higher in ludus love than partners possessing a desirable level of closeness or who desire more closeness.

Like ludus love, the mania love style is also considered undesirable in relationships (Davies, 2001). Mania lovers tend to experience more loneliness (Rotenberg & Korol, 1995), have lower self-esteem (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986), use more secret tests in relationships (Levine, *et al.*, 2006), and experience more depression (Arnold & Thompson, 1996). Considering that mania lovers tend to be intensely obsessed with their romantic partners, are generally unhappy, and have a strong desire for companionship and interdependence, (4) those who report desiring less closeness likely will score lower in mania love than partners who possess a desirable level of closeness or who desire more closeness.

As far as the remaining love styles storge and pragma are concerned, it is not clear whether (5) relational partners who report desiring less closeness would differ from partners who possess a desirable level of closeness or who desire more closeness.

Method

Participants

Participants were 197 undergraduate students (92 men, 104 women, 1 sex unreported; *M* age = 19.8 yr., *SD* = 1.9) enrolled in an introductory communication studies course at a large

university in the Northeastern U.S. All participants were currently involved in a committed romantic relationship, ranging from 2 to 71 months ($M = 18.9$, $SD = 14.8$). A committed relationship was defined as monogamous and exclusive and participants had to be involved in such a relationship for a minimum of two months. Consequently, casual dating relationships were excluded from this study. Participants received minimal extra credit for their participation.

Procedures

Participants completed an anonymous survey in class that assessed their love styles along with their perceptions of the closeness in their romantic relationship. This survey consisted of the Love Attitudes Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986) and Inclusion of Other in Self scale (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992).

Measures

Love Attitudes Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).—This measure is a 42-item, Likert-type scale that asks participants to report on the love styles in their relationships. The scale measures six types of love styles: eros, ludus, storge, pragma, mania, and agape. Responses were solicited using a 5-point scale ranging from 1: Strongly disagree to 5: Strongly agree. Sample items include: “My partner fits my ideal standards of physical beauty” (eros), “I enjoy playing the ‘game of love’ with my partner and a number of other partners” (ludus), “Our friendship merged gradually into love over time” (storge), “One consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my career” (pragma), “When my partner does not pay attention to me, I feel sick all over” (mania), and “I would rather suffer myself than let my partner suffer” (agape). Previous reliability coefficients for this scale have been: .71 for the Eros subscale, .69 Ludus, .75 Storge, .78 Pragma, .74 Mania, and .82 Agape (Kunkel & Burleson, 2003). In this

study, obtained Cronbach coefficients alpha were: Eros ($\alpha = .74$), Ludus ($\alpha = .83$), Storge ($\alpha = .77$), Pragma ($\alpha = .81$), Mania ($\alpha = .75$), and Agape ($\alpha = .84$).

Inclusion of Other in Self (Aron, *et al.*, 1992).— This measure assesses relational closeness between self and one's partner. It includes seven Venn diagrams depicting two circles representing the self and the other. The circles overlap in different proportions ranging from being very independent to very interdependent. Responses are solicited by circling the diagram that best represents the person's perception of self and other interdependence on a 7-point continuum. To assess the desire for less closeness, two versions of this scale were included. One version asked participants to "Please circle the picture below that best describes your relationship with your romantic partner." The second version asked participants to "Please circle the picture below best describes your *ideal* relationship with your romantic partner." Scores from version one are then subtracted from version two to measure Desire for Less Closeness ($M = -0.5$, $SD = 1.5$). Scores were then transformed to represent one of three levels of Relational Closeness. Participants whose scores are negative (indicating their current level of closeness was less than desired) were categorized as More closeness desired. Participants whose scores were zero (current and desired level of closeness identical) were categorized as desired closeness Achieved. Participants whose scores were positive (current level of closeness was too close) were categorized as Less closeness desired.

Results

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) examined overall differences in scores of the love styles between partners who reported desiring Less closeness, reported desired closeness Achieved, and reported desiring More closeness (see Table 1). The MANOVA yielded

a statistically significant model between the groups (Wilks' $\lambda = .84$; $F_{12, 378} = 2.8$, $p < .01$). Univariate effects were significant for Eros love ($F_{2, 194} = 11.7$, $p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .11$) and ludus love ($F_{2, 194} = 7.1$, $p < .01$; partial $\eta^2 = .07$). An examination of the mean scores using Scheffe *post hoc* tests indicated small significant differences for these styles. Hypotheses one and three were supported.

Romantic partners who were categorized as desiring Less closeness scored significantly lower on the Eros love subscale than those categorized as desired closeness Achieved or desiring More closeness. Additionally, romantic partners categorized as desiring Less closeness scored significantly higher on the Ludus love subscale than partners categorized as desired closeness Achieved or desiring More closeness. In respect to hypotheses two and four, and the general research question 5, no significant univariate effects were observed for the following love style subscales: Mania ($F_{2, 194} = 2.4$, $p = .09$), Agape ($F_{2, 194} = 2.6$, $p = .08$), Storge ($F_{2, 194} = 2.1$, $p = .13$), or Pragma ($F_{2, 194} = 0.5$, $p = .61$).

Discussion

This study examined love styles and how they might be associated with the desire for closeness in romantic relationships. Results suggest that the desire for closeness may be due in part to eros and ludus love attitudes. The associations differ in direction with people who experience eros love style generally wanting to be closer, and those experiencing ludus desiring less closeness. These findings reinforce the notion that eros lovers may be suitable romantic partners whereas ludus lovers may jeopardize relational quality because of their orientation. Eros lovers may also actively move a relationship to a more intimate level in order to have their needs met, while ludus lovers are content playing relational games and maintaining distance.

Considering the amount of variance explained in the current study, the desire for less closeness is, not surprisingly, influenced by additional individual differences, relational characteristics, and situational variables. Future research should examine these possibilities as predictors of closeness preferences.

A limitation of this study was that the sample consisted of college students; a sample of married couples or a non-college sample could have yielded different results. Alternatively, college students may be an appropriate target group in which to study love and romance, especially considering that their level of relational closeness may be just developing. Another limitation is the cross-sectional design. As Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) explained, “it would be desirable to monitor possible changes in love attitudes as a love relationship progresses from first encounter to binding commitment” (p. 401). These two limitations warrant caution in the interpretation of the data. Nonetheless, these findings suggest certain relational dynamics. That is, ludic lovers may attempt to distance themselves in romantic relationships and eros lovers may not possess such a desire.

References

- Arnold, M. E., & Thompson, B. (1996) Love style perceptions in relation to personality function. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 11, 425-438.
- Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1986) *Love as the expansion of self: understanding attraction and satisfaction*. New York: Hemisphere.
- Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992) Inclusion of other in the self scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 596-612.
- Aron, A., Aron, E. N., Tudor, M., & Nelson, G. (1991) Close relationships as including other in self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 241-253.
- Aron, A., Fisher, H. E., & Strong, G. (2006) Romantic love. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships*. New York: Cambridge Univer. Press. Pp. 595-614.
- Aron, A. P., Mashek, D. J., & Aron, E. N. (2004) Closeness as including other in the self. In D. J. Mashek & A. Aron (Eds.), *Handbook of closeness and intimacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Pp. 27-41.
- Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002) Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 340-354.
- Davies, M. F. (2001) Socially desirable responding and impression management in the endorsement of love styles. *Journal of Psychology*, 135, 562-571.
- Emanuele, E., Brondino, N., Pesenti, S., Re, S., & Geroldi, D. (2007) Genetic loading on human loving styles. *Neuroendocrinology Letters*, 28, 815-821.

- Fricker, J., & Moore, S. (2002) Relationship satisfaction: the role of love styles and attachment styles. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 7, 182-204.
- Hahn, J., & Blass, T. (1997) Dating partner preferences: a function of similarity of love styles. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12, 595-610.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1986) A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 392-402.
- Hendrick, S. S., Hendrick, C., & Adler, N. L. (1988) Romantic relationships: love, satisfaction, and staying together. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 980-988.
- Hensley, W. E. (1996) The effect of a ludus love style on sexual experience. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 24, 205-212.
- Kunkel, A., & Burleson, B. (2003) Relational implications of communication skill evaluations and love styles. *Southern Communication Journal*, 68, 181-197.
- Lacey, R. S., Reifman, A., Scott, J. P., Harris, S. M., & Fitzpatrick, J. (2004) Sexual-moral attitudes, love styles, and mate selection. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 41, 121-128.
- Lee, J. A. (1988) Love-styles. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univer. Press. Pp. 38-67.
- Levine, T. R., Aune, K. S., & Park, H. S. (2006) Love styles and communication in relationships: partner preferences, initiation, and intensification. *Communication Quarterly*, 54, 465-486.
- 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*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Pp. 343-356.
- Rotenberg, K. J., & Korol, S. (1995) The role of loneliness and gender in individuals' love

styles. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 10, 537-546.

Wiederman, M. W. (1999) Extradysadic involvement during dating. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 16, 265-274.

Williams, D., & Schill, T. (1994) Adult attachment, love styles, and self-defeating personality characteristics. *Psychological Reports*, 75, 31-34.

Accepted May 27, 2009.

Table 1

Usual formats; see below for additional data

Differences of Love Style Scores with Desired Level of Relational Closeness

		Desire for Closeness									
Love Style	Total		Less		Achieved		More		<i>F</i>	η^2	
	(n=197)		(n=30)		(n=77)		(n=90)				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Eros			24.9 (4.9) _{ab}		29.1(3.9) _a		28.3(3.8) _b		12.1†	.11	
Agape			24.5(5.6)		27.0(5.2)		26.0(4.8)		2.6	.03	
Ludus			20.0(6.5) _{ab}		15.1(6.2) _a		16.1(5.6) _b		6.3*	.07	
Mania			19.0(4.7)		21.0(6.0)		21.5(4.7)		2.3	.03	
Storge			21.4(6.0)		23.1(5.5)		21.5(5.0)		2.1	.02	
Pragma			18.2(6.2)		19.4(6.3)		19.3(5.6)		0.5	.01	

Note. —Means sharing subscripts across each row are significantly different from each other. * $p < .01$.
[†] $p < .001$.

Total sample means and standard deviations for above table are Eros ($M = 28.1$, $SD = 4.2$), Ludus ($M = 16.3$, $SD = 6.2$), Storge ($M = 22.1$, $SD = 5.4$), Pragma ($M = 19.2$, $SD = 6.0$), Mania ($M = 20.9$, $SD = 5.3$), and Agape ($M = 26.2$, $SD = 5.1$).