

Development of the Russian version of Sternberg's Love scale*

Gershon Breslavs* & Julia Tyumeneva**

* International College of Applied Psychology, Riga, Latvia

** Moscow State Pedagogical University, Russia

Abstract

The second version of Sternberg's Love scale (Sternberg, 1997) was adapted to Russian by the author and 16 collaborators (including three English philologists from the Faculty of Modern Languages of Latvian University) in 2002-2005, according to the *Oxford Outcomes*' procedure comparing the original version with back reconciled translation by experts. The scale was also verified by the two-month test-retest procedure on 22 undergraduate students of English philology from Latvian university. The correlation between the original and back translation questionnaires versions was 0.76 for the full scale ($p \leq .001$). The scale showed positive correlations with satisfaction subscale of the Berne Subjective Well-being inventory (intimacy subscale – 0.540, passion – 0.395, commitment – 0.405) and with the 25-item Self-Report Jealousy Scale (accordingly – 0.521, 0.650, 0.584). In the Russian samples (including students enrolled in different universities of Russia) the internal consistency of the Russian version reveals the reliability of all three subscales, which ranges from 0.92 to 0.95. Factor analysis shows data structure which corresponds to Sternberg's Love scale, although items expected to load on a particular factor do not always show their highest loading on this factor.

It is possible to apply famous words of Ebbinghaus: ***“Psychology has a long past but only a short history”*** (Ebbinghaus, 1905) to the field of psychology of Love. Thinking about and non-scientific descriptions we can find from Ancient Greek texts till huge amount of psychoanalytic and esoteric speculations but a scientific study begins at the end of 1960-ies only (Rubin, 1970; 1988) despite some separate early empirical studies (Ellis, 1949; Swensen, 1961; Swensen, & Gilner, 1964).

Zick Rubin's scale stimulated other researchers transfer to empirical studies. At 1971 Elaine Hatfield (Walster) formulated her concept of Passionate Love that later resulted in the Passionate Love Scale elaboration (Hatfield, & Sprecher, 1986; Walster (Hatfield), 1971). In the second edition of her and Ellen Berscheid book empirical study of the love became more expanded (Berscheid, & Walster, 1978). Karen & Kennet Dion elaborated different measures for the love study and studied the different aspects of the love place in personality and in personal relations (Dion, K.L., & Dion, K.K. 1973; Dion, K.K., & Dion, K.L. 1975).

**The paper presented at the 14th European conference on Personality, Tartu, July 16-20, 2008.*

In the same time, development of empirical studies cannot be separated from a theoretical progress in the field. At 1970-ies some typologies of love were introduced. Before mentioned Hatfield & Walster proposed the differentiation of two basic types of love – the Passionate Love and Companionate Love based on the prevalence or lack of sexual desire (Hatfield, (Walster) & Walster, G. 1978). Sociologist John Allen Lee proposed more complicated typology of six love styles based on old Plato's ideas on love and differences on motivation in love relationships (Lee, 1973; Lee, 1977). Two different measures of love styles were elaborated: the 50-item true-false SAMPLE questionnaire (Lasswell, T., & Lasswell, M., 1976; Lasswell, & Lobsenz, 1980) and the 42-item Love Attitude Scale with 5-point estimation scale (Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. 1986).

At 1980-ies some theoretical models of love emerged: attachment love theory (Shaver, & Hazan, 1988; Shaver, Hazan, Bradshaw, 1988); Triangulating Love model by Sternberg based on three main components of this phenomena – Intimacy, Passion, and Commitment that represent accordingly – emotional, motivational, and cognitive-decisive aspects of love (Sternberg, 1986; Sternberg, 1988). Fool-blooded love by Sternberg means more or less equal representation of these three components but a prevalence of one or two means more particular types of love. As show following studies such three-dimensional or three-factor structure can be considered as prototypical for the love (Aron, & Westbay, 1996). Similar generalizations were made on the basis of phenomenological analysis too (Fehr, 1988).

Later, Sternberg started analyze a dynamic of love relationships through the love stories that overlap partly with Lee' love style model (Sternberg, 1994). The Lee's typology emerged on the Love Story Card Sort data (Lee, 1988) and presupposes three primary styles (Eros, Storge, Ludus) and three secondary styles (Agape, Pragma, Mania) only but Sternberg presupposes existence of more than 20 different types of love stories. The difference is in the understanding of the love too. Sternberg perceives the love in this context as an interpretation of own feelings, beliefs, and desires, but Lee – as a motivation first of all: a type of wanting or desire. Sternberg emphasizes more cognitive aspect of love that is understandable taking into account his contribution to the field of intelligence and wisdom.

Both interpretations more or less has similar background – self-report data from structural or semi-structural interview that stimulated participants to create the connexions between own love experience and a representation of this experience. Possible discrepancies between real cases and love stories and bias in these descriptions Sternberg considers as love stories “re-writing” (Sternberg, 1994). These discrepancies could be created by the process of re-appraisal of relationship but can be a primary form of its perception or understanding.

It means too that to minimize such subjective bias we should choose more general measures to collect data about love. It is not a requirement for researchers to choose observation-data or test-data only but self-report data using questionnaires are more available for a statistical analysis and a generalization than self-report data collected by interviews or narratives. In love studies we confront with a classical dilemma between the richness but bad-formalized and generalized case study and the poor on details but well-generalized data of questionnaires. It is essential that researchers in the field start with collecting of narratives and continued with more strong psychometric scales elaboration.

In this context the love as an interpretation is not as stable as a motivation or a complex of motivation, attitudes, and activities as was described in many studies (Бреслав, 2004). Despite strong data on a universality of Romantic love in different cultures (Jankowiak, & Fisher, 1992) there are many cultural differences on understanding of love. For example, is known about negative connotations of the love in Chinese culture (Fisher, & Tangney, 1995) and specific understanding of the love as a dependence – amai concept - in Japan culture (Doi,

1963). According to Kenneth & Karen Dion, priority of individualistic values including self-realization in American culture hinders the development of Romantic love (Dion, K.L., & Dion, K.K., 1988). In the same time, Maslow considered the love as self-actualization as something contrary to the love as a dependence (Maslow, 1954) - the opinion very widespread in the West. In turn Russian cultural traditions prefer describe the love as a form of attachment that cannot be analysed outside dependence (Даль, 1881, т.2).

Culturally different connotations and beliefs on love require more careful analysis of love concepts with the same methods in different cultures. It was one of the main reasons to adapt the Sternberg Love scale in Latvia and Russia. This work started at 1999 in Riga when first Russian and Latvian versions of the 36-item scale were elaborated and continued later with the 45-item version (from 2005 in cooperation with Russian colleagues in Moscow) of the scale (Sternberg, 1997). The procedure of the scale adaptation was recommended by “Oxford Outcomes”. First stage – preparation of two or more forward (primary) translation from a test original language to native language by experienced interpreters. Second stage – preparation of the Reconciliation version that combine the best from two or more primary versions (see table # 1).

Table # 1. Reconciliation Report.

ORIGINAL ENGLISH Love scale ITEM	First Forward Latvian or Russian Translation	Second Forward Latvian or Russian Translation	Reconciled Translation	Explanation for choice of wording/other comments
Title: Love Questionnaire				

Third stage includes Reconciled Forward version back translation to original language and the comparison of the Back translation version with an original version (see table # 2). After the correction of words or phrases of Reconciled version that lead to non-coherent Back translation it will be presented to fill by a pilot sample. The forth stage of the adaptation means not only the filling of a questionnaire by a small group of participants (approximately 1/10 of the number of planned sample) but a detailed asking about a questionnaire in general (*Are the instructions clear and easy to understand? Are the questions or statements generally clear, easy to understand, easy to answer?*) and about every detail of it (see table # 3) that labeled Cognitive Debriefing or Pilot Testing Report.

Table # 2. The Back Translation comparison with an original version.

ORIGINAL ENGLISH Love scale ITEM	Reconciled Translation	Back Translation	Comments on acceptance or no acceptance
Title: Love Questionnaire			

Table # 3. Cognitive Debriefing or Pilot Testing Report.

Corrected Reconciled Translation of a scale	Do you understand this instruction/item/ response ?	If there are any difficulties, how would you reword this instruction/ item/response ?	What does this item mean to you?	Are the response options consistent with this item?	Interviewer comments on the respondent's suggestions & recommendations whether any change is required
Title: Love Questionnaire					

References

- Aron, A., Westbay, L. (1996). Dimensions of the Prototype of Love. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 70 (3), 535-551.
- Berscheid, E., and Hatfield (Walster), E. (1978). *Interpersonal attraction*. (2nd ed.) Reading, MA. : Addison Wesley.
- Dion, K.L., & Dion, K.K. (1973). Correlates of romantic love. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 41, 51-56.
- Dion, K.K., & Dion, K.L. (1975). Self-esteem and romantic love. *Journal of Personality*, 43, 39-57.
- Dion, K.L., & Dion, K.K. (1988). Romantic Love : Individual and Cultural Perspectives. In: R.Sternberg & M.Barnes (Eds.) *The Psychology of Love*. New Haven: Yale University Press, p.264-289.
- Doi, L.T. (1963). Some thoughts on helplessness and the desire to be loved. *Psychiatry*, 26, 266-272.
- Ellis, A. (1949). A study of human love relationships. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 75, 61-71.
- Fehr, B. (1988). Prototype analysis of the concepts of love and commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 557-579.
- Fisher, K.W., Tangney, J.P. (1995). Self-Conscious Emotions and the Affect Revolution: Framework and Overview. In J.P.Tangney & K.Fisher (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp.3-22). New York: Guilford Press.
- Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1986). Measuring passionate love in intimate relations. *Journal of Adolescence*, 9, 383-410.
- Hatfield, (Walster) E., Walster, G.W . (1978). *A new look at love*. Lantham, MA: University Press of America.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of Love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, v.50, 392- 402.
- Jankowiak, W. R., & Fisher, E. F. (1992). A cross-cultural perspective on romantic love. *Ethnology*, 31, 149-155.
- Lasswell, Tom E, & Lasswell, Marcia, E. (1976). I love you but I'm not in love with you. *Journal of Marriage and Family Counselling*, 38, 211-224.
- Lasswell, Marcia, & Lobsenz, Norman M. (1980). *Styles of loving: Why we love the way you do*. New York: Doubleday.
- Lee, J. (1973). *Colours of love*. Toronto: New Press.
- Lee, J. (1977). A typology of styles of loving. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3, 173-182.

- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16, 265-273.
- Shaver, P. R. and C. Hazan (1988). A biased overview of the study of love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5:473-501.
- Shaver, Ph., Hazan, C., Bradshaw, D. (1988). Love as Attachment: The Integration of Three Behavioral Systems. In: R.Sternberg & M.Barnes (Eds.) *The Psychology of Love* (pp.68-99). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A Triangular Theory of Love. *Psychological Review*, 93 (2), 119-135.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1988). Triangulating Love. In: R.Sternberg & M.Barnes (Eds.) *The Psychology of Love* (pp.119-138). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1994). Love is a story. *The General Psychologist*, 30 (1), 1-11.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1997). Construct validation of a triangular love scale. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27(3), 313-335.
- Swensen, Clifford, H. . (1961). Love: A self-report analysis with college students. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 17, 167-171.
- Swensen, C. & Gilner, F. (1964). Factor analysis of self-report statement on love relationships. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 20, 186-188.
- Walster, (Hatfield) E. (1971). Passionate love. In B.I.Murstein (Ed.), *Theories of attraction and love* (pp.85-99). New York: Springer.