

TRUST IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS SCALE

Reference:

Rempel, J.K., Holmes, J.G. & Zanna, M.P. (1985). Trust in close relationships., 95-112.
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49

Description of Measure:

A 17-item measure designed to gauge levels of trust in one's relationship partner. Each item is answered based on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

The scale can be divided up into the following subscales:

- 1.) Predictability
- 2.) Dependability
- 3.) Faith

Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Bradbury, T. N. & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Attributions in marriage: Review and critique.
Psychological Bulletin, 107, 3-33.

The prevailing behavioral account of marriage must be expanded to include covert processes. This article therefore examines the attributions or explanations that spouses make for marital events. A review indicates that dissatisfied spouses, compared with satisfied spouses, make attributions for the partner's behavior that cast it in a negative light. Experimental, clinical outcome, and longitudinal data suggest further that attributions may influence marital satisfaction. Rival hypotheses for these findings are examined. Because continued empirical development in this domain depends on conceptual progress, a framework is presented that integrates attributions, behavior, and marital satisfaction. This framework points to several topics that require systematic study, and specific hypotheses are offered for research on these topics. It is concluded that the promising start made toward understanding marital attributions holds considerable potential for enriching behavioral conceptions of marriage.

Ryan, R. M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes.
Journal of Personality, 63, 397-427.

The assumption that there are innate integrative or actualizing tendencies underlying personality and social development is reexamined. Rather than viewing such processes as either nonexistent or as automatic, I argue that they are dynamic and dependent upon social-contextual supports pertaining to basic human psychological needs. To develop this viewpoint, I conceptually link the notion of integrative tendencies to specific developmental processes, namely intrinsic motivation; internalization; and emotional integration. These processes are then shown to be facilitated by conditions that fulfill psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, and forestalled within contexts that

frustrate these needs. Interactions between psychological needs and contextual supports account, in part, for the domain and situational specificity of motivation, experience, and relative integration. The meaning of psychological needs (vs. wants) is directly considered, as are the relations between concepts of integration and autonomy and those of independence, individualism, efficacy, and cognitive models of "multiple selves."

Yamagishi, T. (1986). The provisioning of a sanctioning system as a public good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 110-116.

Both the rational-structural approach and the goal/expectation approach to the problem of public goods have theoretical difficulties. The structural approach requires the provision of a sanctioning system to solve the free rider problem. However, a sanctioning system is also a public good because its benefits can be enjoyed by all members regardless of their contribution to its provision. A new problem of the same kind is thereby created in the process of solving the original public good problem. The goal/expectation approach assumes the inducement of other members to mutual cooperation through individuals' cooperative actions, a situation which will be almost impossible in larger groups. To overcome these theoretical difficulties in the existing approaches, a new approach called the structural goal/expectation approach is proposed. According to this new approach, members who have realized the undesirable consequence of free riding and the importance of mutual cooperation will cooperate to establish a sanctioning system which assures other members' cooperation instead of trying to induce other members into mutual cooperation directly through cooperative actions. One important condition for their voluntary cooperation in the establishment of a sanctioning system is their realization that voluntarily based cooperation is impossible. Predictions derived from the new approach are supported in an experiment using 48 four-person groups.

Scale:

(taken from <http://www.yorku.ca/rokada/psyctest/trust.doc>)

Instructions:

Using the 7 point scale shown below, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements as they relate to someone with whom you have a close interpersonal relationship. Place your rating in the box to the right of the statement.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

1. My partner has proven to be trustworthy and I am willing to let him/her engage in activities which other partners find too threatening. D
2. Even when I don't know how my partner will react, I feel comfortable telling him/her anything about myself, even those things of which I am ashamed. F
3. Though times may change and the future is uncertain, I know my partner will always be ready and willing to offer me strength and support. F
4. I am never certain that my partner won't do something that I dislike or will embarrass me. P
5. My partner is very unpredictable. I never know how he/she is going to act from one day to the next. P
6. I feel very uncomfortable when my partner has to make decisions which will affect me personally. P
7. I have found that my partner is unusually dependable, especially when it comes to things which are important to me. D
8. My partner behaves in a very consistent manner. P
9. Whenever we have to make an important decision in a situation we have never encountered before, I know my partner will be concerned about my welfare. F
10. Even if I have no reason to expect my partner to share things with me, I still feel certain that he/she will. F
11. I can rely on my partner to react in a positive way when I expose my weaknesses to him/her. F
12. When I share my problems with my partner, I know he/she will respond in a loving way even before I say anything. F
13. I am certain that my partner would not cheat on me, even if the opportunity arose and there was no chance that he/she would get caught. D
14. I sometimes avoid my partner because he/she is unpredictable and I fear saying or doing something which might create conflict. P
15. I can rely on my partner to keep the promises he/she makes to me. D
16. When I am with my partner, I feel secure in facing unknown new situations. F
17. Even when my partner makes excuses which sound rather unlikely, I am confident that he/she is telling the truth. D

Scoring

The items marked with a D are the Dependency items. Items marked with an F are the Faith items, and Items marked with a P are the Predictability items.

One can score the questionnaire based on the 3 subscales separately, or combine the subscales to create an overall trust in close relationships score.