

The Relationship Rating Form (RRF)
A Measure of the Characteristics of Romantic Relationships and Friendships

Keith E. Davis, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-4263
FAX: (803) 777-9558
email: Daviske@sc.edu

@copyrighted (1996)

RRF

Instrument Summary for the Relationship Rating Form (RRF)

Author: Keith E. Davis, Ph. D.
 Department of Psychology
 University of South Carolina
 Columbia, SC 29208

Name: The Relationship Rating Form (RRF): A Measure of the Characteristics of Romantic Relationships and Friendships.

Variables Measured: Seven global characteristics and 20 facets of friendships and romantic relationships are assessed. The global characteristics are labeled Viability (which consists of the Acceptance/Tolerance, Respect, and Trust subscales), Intimacy (which consists of the confiding and understanding subscales), Care (which consists of the Give the Utmost, Championing, and Assistance subscales), Passion (which consists of the Fascination, Exclusiveness, and Sexual Intimacy subscales), Satisfaction (which consists of the Success, Enjoyment, Reciprocity, and Esteem subscales), Commitment (which is a 4-item scale of his own), and Conflict/Ambivalence (which consists of the separate Conflict and Ambivalence subscales). The 20 facets or subscales are listed with their items in Table 1. The Maintenance, Coercion subscales, and the single item for Equality have not consistently clustered with any of the seven global scales and so they stand alone.

Key Words: Commitment, Conflict/ambivalence, Intimacy, Passion, and Satisfaction. [If I may go beyond 5, I would include the other two global scale labels--Care and Viability.]

Number of items: 68.

Response Format & Instructions: "Below you will find questions about your relationship with your friend, partner, lover or spouse. To answer the questions, write the number between 1 and 9 that best reflects your feelings about your relationship with this person. Use the following key to the meaning of the numbers: "1 = Not at all; 2 = very little; 3 = Slightly (or rarely); 4 = somewhat (not often); 5 = a fair amount; 6 = very much; 7 = a great deal; 8 = strongly (almost always), and 9 = Completely or extremely"; While a 9-point scale is preferred, a 7-point scale will give approximately the same results. To use a 7-point format delete responses 4 and 6 from the 9-point format.

Sample Items: Do you confide in this person? (Intimacy Global Scale; Confiding subscale). Does it give you pleasure just to watch or look at this person? (Passion Global; Fascination subscale). Do you enjoy doing things with this person that you would otherwise would not enjoy? (Satisfaction Global; Enjoyment subscale).

Scoring: Responses to each item within a subscale (or global scale) are summed, with reversed scored items being subtracted from 10 (for 9-point format) or 8 (for the 7-point format). In reporting scores, the summary scores have been divided by the number of items in the scale so that scale values can be directly related to the 9-point scale.

Populations Measured: Most of the work has been done with College Students who were either in romantic relationships or in friendships (See Davis & Todd, 1982 & 1985; Davis & Latty-Mann, 1987; Davis, Kirkpatrick, Levy, & O'Hearn, 1994) but a survey interview version of the RRF has been used with adults aged 40-45 and 60-80 years of age in the community (See Davis, Todd, & Denny, 1988). The RRF has also been translated into German by Hans W. Bierhoff & Petra Plitzko (1995) where it was administered to 56 couples, some married and some cohabiting in the community.

Reliability and Validity: Both the internal consistency and test-retest stability have been established and are included in detail in Table 1 with the full items. Internal consistencies for the global scales average about .8 with a range from .73 to .97. The subscales, having fewer items, have lower internal consistencies. Test-retest stabilities average .76 with a range from .68 to .82.

Several aspects of validity have been explored. The face or content validity of the scales has been explored by having several samples of students rate the degree to which items fit conceptual definitions intended. Known groups of persons have rated the degree to which their friends, lovers, spouse, or partners had the characteristics referred to in the RRF (Davis & Todd, 1982 & 1985). Several expectations of differences between friends and lovers in such things as degree of intimacy, degree of fascination, feelings of exclusiveness, and desire for sexual intimacy were supported. Additional studies have dealt with betrayal of friendships and their consequences for the relationship. The use of the relationship characteristics as a measure of perceived social support has been explored by Brown (1983). Several studies (Davis, Kirkpatrick, Levy, & O'Hearn, 1994; Davis, Todd, & Denny, 1988) show that the global scales are predictive of longitudinal satisfaction and relationship stability.

Availability: The full test is available from the author, at the Department of Psychology, University South Carolina, SC. 29208. 57 items including all of those for all of the global scales except commitment were published Table 1, pp. 416-7 in Davis, K. E. & Latty-Mann (1987). Love styles and Relationship Quality: A contribution to validation. Journal of Social & Personal Relationships, 4, 409-428. The Commitment items were inadvertently omitted because of a scoring error that was not caught before publication.

References:

Bretscher, F. & Bergner, R. (1991). Relational qualities as factors in mate selection decisions. In M. K. Roberts & R. M. Bergner (Eds.) Advances in descriptive psychology, (Vol. 6, pp. 107-123). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. [Uses the conceptual system underlying the RRF to develop an 18 item measure of relational qualities.]

Brown, Edward G. (1983). Social support, social competence, and stress: A longitudinal analysis. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. [Makes use of the revised RRF and a community sample to construct indices of perceived social support from RRF scales.]

*Davis, K. E. (1985). Near and dear: Friendship and love compared. Psychology Today, 19(2), 22-30. [Original data presented at the subscale level.]

Davis, K. E., Kirkpatrick, L. A., Levy, M. B., & O'Hearn, R. E. (1994). Stalking the elusive lovestyle: Attachment styles, lovestyles, and the prediction of relationship outcomes (pp. 179-210). In R. Erber & R. Gilmour (Eds.) Theoretical frameworks for personal relationships. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

*Davis, K. E., & Latty-Mann, H. (1987). Lovestyles and relationship quality: A contribution to validation. Journal of Social and Personal Relations, 4(4), 409-428.

Davis, K. E., & Roberts, M. K. (1985). Relationships in the real world: The descriptive psychology approach. In K. G. Gergen, and K. E. Davis (Eds.), The social construction of the person (pp. 144-163). New York: Springer-Verlag.

*Davis, K. E., & Todd, M. J. (1982). Friendship and love relationships. In K. E. Davis, and T. O. Mitchell (Eds.), Advances in descriptive psychology (Vol. 2, p. 79-112). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. [Contains theoretical basis and original validation studies.]

*Davis, K. E., & Todd, M. J. (1985). Assessing friendships: Prototypes, paradigm cases, and relationship description. In S. Duck, and D. Perlman (Eds.), Understanding personal relationships: Sage series in personal relationships (Vol. 1; pp. 17-37). Beverly Hills: Sage. [More information on theory and validation studies with specific reference to types of friendships.]

*Davis, K. E., Todd, M. J., & Denny, J. B. (1988) Personal networks, friendship, and love relationships over the life cycle. Social & Behavioral Sciences Documents, 18(1). Ms. No. 2846. [Report of the survey study in which the RRF was revised and applied to relationships among participants ranging in age from 20 to 80.]

Fraley, R. C. & Davis, K. E. (1996/in press). Attachment formation and transfer in young adults' close friendships and romantic relationships. Personal Relationships, 4.

Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1989). Research on love: Does it measure up? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 784-794. [Reports a factor analysis of the 57 items from the RRF along with Hendricks' Love Attitudes Scales, Attachment style ratings, and other measures of characteristics of romantic love.]

Levy, M. B., & Davis, K. E. (1988). Lovestyles and attachment styles compared: Their relations to each other and to various relationship characteristics. Journal for Social and Personal Relationships, 5, 439-471.

Smith, Jean Simon (1981). The development of love relationships and progress toward marriage: The Colorado courtship study. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. [Original study in which the first (an early?) multidimensional concept of love was investigated. Data came from a 1967 study in Colorado initiated by K. E. Davis.]

Translations: The German version of the RRF has been translated by Prof. Dr. H. W. Bierhoff & Petra Plitzko, at the Department of Psychology, Ruhr-University of Bochum, Postfach 102148, D-4630 Bochum, Germany, who have an unpublished manuscript entitled "Respekt, Offenheit, Unsicherheit: Wie lassen sich die aktuellen Gefuehle und Erfahrungen in engen Beziehungen beschreiben?" ["Respect, openness, insecurity: A description of the current feelings in close relationships"]. The authors report that the internal consistencies and test-retest stabilities parallel closely US findings, and that the study provides support for the validity of the RRF as a measure of central characteristics of close relationships which are predictive of longitudinal relationship satisfaction and stability.

Table 1. Relationship Rating Form (RRF): Items, Scales, and Reliabilities for the 1986 version.

Viability (alpha = .80; .90; .85; tt = .74)

Acceptance/Tolerance (.61; .50; tt = .69)

1. Do you accept this person as s/he is?
2. Are you willing to ignore this person's small sins because of the way you feel about her/him?
3. Is it easy for you to forgive this person?
4. Does this person disappoint you? (R)

Respect (.63; .69; tt = .71)

5. Do you respect this person?
6. Does this person make bad judgments on important matters? (R)
7. Does this person bring out the best in you?
8. Is this person a good sounding board for your ideas and plans?

Trust (.59; .60; tt = .62)

9. Do you trust this person?
10. Can you count on this person in times of need?
11. Does this person ever forget your welfare? (R)
12. Does this person use things against you that s/he shouldn't? (R)

Intimacy (.76; .73; .79; tt = .78)

Confiding (.75; .55; tt = .71)

13. Do you and this person openly discuss personal matters?
14. Do you confide in this person?
15. Do you feel that there are things about you that this person just would not understand?(R)
16. Do you feel some things about yourself are none of this person's business?(R)

Understanding (.57; .64; tt = .75)

17. Do you know what kind of person s/he is?
18. Is this person's behavior surprising or puzzling to you?(R)
19. Do you know this person's faults and shortcomings?
20. Do you know about this person's past?

Passion (.82; .78; .80; tt = .82)

Fascination (.68; .67; tt = .77)

21. Does this person dominate your thoughts?
22. Does it give you pleasure just to watch or look at this person?
23. Do you think about this person even when you are not with him/her?

Exclusiveness (.71; .65; tt = .77)

24. Are there things that you do only with this person?
25. Do you have feelings about this person that you couldn't have about others?
26. Would you feel betrayed or hurt if this person had the same relationship with someone else that s/he now has with you?
27. Do you and this person have your own way of doing things?

Sexual Intimacy (.65; .75; tt = .77)

28. Are you sexually intimate with this person?
29. Do you find this person sexually attractive?
30. Do you enjoy being touched by this person and touching him/her?

Care (.89; .89; .97; tt = .78)

Giving the utmost (.79; .78; tt = .79)

31. Can you count on this person to lend you a substantial sum of money?
32. Can you count on this person to risk personal safety to help you if you were in danger?
33. Can you count on this person to give the utmost on your behalf.
34. Are you prepared to make a significant sacrifice on this person's behalf.

Championing (.82; .80; tt = .60)

35. Can you count on this person to let you know how others feel about you?
36. Can you count on this person to support you in an argument or dispute with others?
37. Can you count on this person to champion your interests where there is a conflict between your interests and those of others?

Assistance (.76; .78; tt = .75)

38. Can you count on this person to come to your aid when you need help?
39. Can this person count on you for help when s/he is in need?
40. Can you count on this person to tell you what s/he really thinks about issues regardless of whether he or she agrees with you?
41. Do you tell this person exactly what you think about important issues regardless of whether he or she agrees with you?

Global Satisfaction (.90; .93; .93; $tt = .73$)

Success (.83; .87; $tt = .66$)

42. Are you happy in your relationship with this person?
 43. Has your relationship with this person satisfied your needs?
 *44. Has your relationship with this person been a success?

Enjoyment (.81; .78; $tt = .75$)

45. Do you enjoy doing things with this person more than with others?
 46. Do you enjoy doing things with this person that you otherwise would not enjoy?
 47. Do you enjoy this person's company?

Reciprocity (.77; .84; $tt = .74$)

48. Does your partner share the same feeling for you that you have for him/her?
 49. Does this person really care about you as a person?
 50. Do you feel that your partner cares for you as much as you care for him/her?

Esteem (.90; .86; $tt = .60$)

51. Does your partner make you feel worthwhile and special?
 52. Does your partner make you feel proud of yourself?

Conflict/Ambivalence (.73; .79; .83; $tt = .68$)

Conflict (.73; .72; $tt = .64$)

53. Do you fight and argue with this person?
 54. Does this person treat you in unfair ways?
 55. Is there tension in your relationship with this person?

Ambivalence (.70; .71; $tt = .65$)

56. Are you confused or unsure of your feelings toward this person?
 57. Do you feel that this person demands too much of your time?
 58. Do you feel trapped in this relationship?

Scales not included in global scales

Maintenance (.71; .68; $tt = .80$)

59. Do you talk with this person about your relationship?
 60. Do you and this person try to work out difficulties that occur between you?
 61. Are you trying to change things that you do to make the relationship better between the two of you?

Commitment (NA; .89; .89; $tt = .81$)

62. Are you committed to staying in your relationship?
 63. Does this person measure up to your ideals for a life partner?
 *64. How likely is it that your relationship will be permanent?
 *65. How committed is your partner to this relationship?

Coercion (.85; .91; $tt = .60$)

66. Has your partner ever forced you to do something that you did not want to do?
 67. Have you ever forced your partner to do something that s/he did not want to do?

Equality

68. Is your relationship one of equals? $(tt = .64)$
-

Note. Ns = 140 and 175. If a third value exists, it is for the 1987 study (N=227). tt (test-retest) stabilities came from the 1987 study, N=62. (R) = reversed scores item. * denotes items included in the scales for the first time in the 1986 study.

Instructions & Response Format & Instructions: "Below you will find questions about your relationship with your friend, partner, lover or spouse. To answer the questions, write the number between 1 and 9 that best reflects your feelings about your relationship with this person. Use the following key to the meaning of the numbers: "1 = Not at all; 2 = very little; 3 = Slightly (or rarely); 4 = somewhat (not often); 5 = a fair amount; 6 = very much; 7 = a great deal; 8 = strongly (almost always), and 9 = Completely or extremely"; While a 9-point scale is preferred, a 7-point scale will give approximately the same results. To use a 7-point format delete responses 4 and 6 from the 9-point format.