To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Laurie L. Couch entitled "The Development of the Trust Inventory." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.

Warren H. Jones, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of The Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under the rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgement of the source is made:

Requests for permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis in whole or in parts may be granted by the copyright holder. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Laurie A. Couch

Date October 31, 1994

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRUST INVENTORY

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Laurie L. Couch

December 1994

Copyright © Laurie L. Couch, 1994
All rights reserved

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my family. The love, support, and confidence they have given instilled in me the desire and self-confidence to reach ever higher.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to express heartfelt appreciation to Dr. Warren H. Jones for his role as my trusted guide. His insight, expertise, and friendship, as well as support, encouragement, and advice have been a driving force in my graduate career. I would further like to thank Greg Carlisle and my family for their love and support. Also, I would like to thank the other committee members including Dr. Kathleen Lawler and Dr. John Lounsbury for their comments and advice, the members of the Personality and Relationships Lab for their continued support, Dr. B. Michael Thorne for his mentorship, and Ms. Connie Dyke for all her help.

ABSTRACT

Previous research involving trust has conceptualized the construct as a generalized tendency to rely on the words or actions of others as potentially beneficial or nonthreatening. This conceptualization has been applied to some studies of specific relationships. Unfortunately, it has been demonstrated that such generalized trust measures do not accurately assess trust of a specific relational partner. This distinction has been drawn in the literature and several researchers have developed instruments to measure a relational type of trust. These instruments, however, have limitations. The present research sought to develop an inventory that represented a generalized trust, a type of trust specific to a romantic partner (Partner Trust), and a type of trust specific to one's social network members (Network Trust). Items were generated to represent these a priori classifications and administered to a group of 187 college students for the purposes of conducting reliability analyses. These analyses resulted in the revised version of the Trust Inventory which meets normal standards for reliability. This version was presented with other trust measures and other construct measures to a group of 552 college students for the purposes of assessing the validity of the Inventory scales. Results indicated that the scale is a reliable measure of the three types of trust and each is related differentially, as would be expected, to constructs theoretically related to the three a priori classifications of trust. Additional analyses across individual scales revealed a similar pattern of results at the level of the construct. These findings support the validity of interpretations of the Inventory scale scores, as well as the utility of a

distinction between the conceptualizations of a generalized type of trust and a relational type of trust.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 4

    Generalized Trust 5

    Relational Trust 12

        Theoretical Approaches 16

        Measures of Relational Trust 28

    Future Concerns 33

3. METHODS 35

    Participants 35

    Procedure 36

        Measures 36

            Measures of relational trust 36

            Measures of global trust 38

            Other measures 39

4. RESULTS 44

    Item Selection and Scale Development 44

    Reliability 45

    Validity 45

        Concurrent and Convergent/Discriminant Validity 51

        Construct Validity 53

    Secondary Results 58

        Conceptual Issues in the Measurement of Trust 58

        An Extreme Group Analysis 62

5. DISCUSSION 73

REFERENCES 81
VITA 92

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Items of the Trust Inventory	46
2.	Scale characteristics of the Trust Inventory	50
3.	Correlations between Trust Inventory scales and alternative measures	52
4.	Correlations between Trust Inventory scales and measures of love	54
5.	Correlations between Trust Inventory scales and selected relationship measures	56
6.	Correlations between Trust Inventory scales and selected emotional states and traits	57
7.	Average correlations between measures of trust and groups of trust measures	60
8.	Average correlations between trust measures and groups of relational and trait/emotion measures	63
9.	Extreme group comparisons between the Partner Trust Scale and other measures	64
10.	Extreme group comparisons between the Network Trust Scale and other measures	67
11.	Extreme group comparisons between the Generalized Trust Scale and other measures	69

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Trust seems to be a basic ingredient in determining whether each party in a relationship will benefit from contact with the other and whether a relationship will continue. An individual involved in a relationship must believe that their concerns and expectations will be met for the relationship in question to be mutually satisfying. This is true of the initial relationships involving strangers, relationships among peers and equals, as well as relationships within a group context, and in intimate associations among persons varying in power and status.

A great deal of research pertaining to trust has dealt with the construct as a tendency to accept the actions or words of other people in general as nonthreatening and/or potentially beneficial to an individual (Rotter, 1967; 1971; 1980). This research focus is usually referred to as generalized or interpersonal trust. Several theories as to the nature of generalized trust have emerged.

One problem in the literature has been the relatively common application of the generalized trust construct to the study of specific relationships. This not only applies to the study of romantic relationships, but also to the study of the attachment process and how that process carries over into later life. The problem derives from the fact that generalized trust measures do not significantly predict the trust experienced in specific relationships (Holmes, 1991; Tardy, 1988).

The research focused on trust in specific close relationships has been limited. Three main theoretical models of trust in close relationships have emerged, including a developmental approach (Holmes, 1991; Braiker & Kelley, 1979; Levinger, 1979), a component model of trust (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985), and an appraisal model of trust (Holmes & Rempel, 1989; Holmes, 1991). A few measures of trust in close relationship situations have also been developed to correspond roughly with these theoretical frameworks (Holmes, Rempel, & Zanna, 1985; Lazelere & Huston, 1980; Johnson-George & Swap, 1982), and tend to focus exclusively on the romantic relationship experience. However, important questions are left unanswered regarding the conceptualization of a relational type of trust as a separate and distinct entity. Some of these questions include the focus of the items on the relational partner's qualities vs. the experience of trust, the role of relational processes such as self-disclosure in relation to trust, behavioral correlates of trust, how trust differs as a function of the target, and the personality and situational factors which may be related to trust in close relationships. A further limitation in previous research is a dominant conceptualization of trust which envisions only two kinds of relational experiences: relationships with strangers/people with whom no close relationship is formed, and relationships with romantic partners. The existing literature does not consider the role of trust in relationships of intermediate levels of intimacy (e.g. with friends and family).

Extant measures of trust do not necessarily distinguish the trust experience and the perceived trustworthiness from the actual trustworthiness of the other party in the relationship. Most studies have found a strong relationship between an individual's trust

scores and his/her trustworthiness (Rotter, 1980; Wright & Kirmani, 1977), but few studies have directly addressed how the partner's actual trustworthiness may affect an individual's trust of that partner. This may result because, in generalized trust studies the target may be someone the individual has little information about with which to make that assessment. By contrast, in studies of existing relationships (where the information is available), the actual trustworthiness of the partner should be distinguished from respondent's trust of the partner.

This research seeks to develop a comprehensive, reliable, and valid measure of trust at differing levels of relationship involvement. The levels to be included in the instrument are generalized trust, social network trust (trust of friends and family excluding one's romantic partner), and partner trust (trust of a specific romantic partner). In providing evidence as to the instrument's validity, it is hoped that more can be learned about the nature of trust and the utility of the distinction between trust and trustworthiness at each level.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

TRUST IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS

Trust is an important aspect of life. Some writers have suggested that trust is necessary for human existence (Stack, 1978; Rotter, 1967; Corazzini, 1977; Grace & Schill, 1986; Rotenberg, 1991; Deigh, 1989), and is critical to effective functioning of all levels of human organization: nations, organizations, groups, dyads, and individuals (Butler, 1986). Livingston (1969) and Scott (1980b) both argued that trust is an essential ingredient in the process of organizational effectiveness. Moreover, several researchers have found that high-trust groups perform better on some tasks than low-trust groups (Golembiewski & McConkie, 1975; Boss, 1978). In fact, it has been argued that trust lies at the heart of effective group processes. For example, Lindskold (1978) described strategies for effectively handling problems of mistrust between nations, and offered ways to enhance the resulting trust.

Previous scholars have proposed a variety of definitions for trust. In this literature review, we will first consider statements as to the importance and appropriate level of analysis of trust. Next we consider the empirical literature on generalized or interpersonal trust and relational trust -- the two main categories of trust. The latter discussion will include discussion of the theoretical models and measures used to study

the developmental approaches, the appraisal model of trust, and the component model of trust in close relationships.

Generalized Trust

Generalized trust is a term which has be used to represent a body of research focusing on trust in people in general. This research has looked at the development of trust in early life and how early life experiences affect the later expression of this tendency, how trust is related to other tendencies, and differing conceptualizations of the trust as it relates to people in general.

Erikson (1963) offered a general theory of trust as part of his description of the development of personality early in life. In his view, the first crisis one is confronted with in development is the decision to trust or distrust the primary caregiver. Every person must learn to trust at least one other to care for them, or fail to thrive. This sense of initial trust, according to Erikson, is imperative for all other aspects of personality development since it sets the stage for social growth.

Various theorists have suggested that a critical ingredient in the early social development is the attachment process. The infant is deeply influenced by the caregiver's responsiveness and sensitivity to the mood of the infant. The infant basically forms an impression of the predictability and/or dependability of the caregiver. Trust in the caregiver's responsiveness and sensitivity is essential for a secure attachment to be formed. Thus the foundation of normal development is the resolution of the trust issue. Furthermore, the attachment styles engaged in by the infant are believed to be the

same styles which continue throughout life. In fact, a sufficient sense of trust and independence are seen as developmental milestones that allow adolescents to form a positive identity and move successfully through the crisis of intimacy in the young adult years (Holmes, 1991).

In dating couples, studies of adult attachment styles revealed that, among persons low in generalized trust, unconscious anxieties about being either misused or abandoned were apparent. Another important finding was that individuals high in generalized trust may not appear to observers to be very strongly attached (at least in terms of display of affiliative behaviors) to their dating partners because they are more independent or secure in their attachment. Whereas trusting individuals expect others to be responsive to them, perhaps just as they did as securely attached infants, it is expected that they have fewer fears because they state their needs in relationships.

Some scholars have argued that because trusting individuals work on the assumption that people will respond to them and are more likely to make their needs known, a sense of personal control may develop (Holmes, 1991). For example, internal locus of control, or the feeling that one has some voice as to the outcome of situations he/she is in, has consistently been found to be related to generalized trust. Rotter (1971) argued that it is logical that the relationship should exist because those who distrust probably do so in reaction to their lack of control over situations in their life. If a person exercised greater control over the things that happened to him or her, trust in the situation would naturally follow according to this line of reasoning.

Many conceptualizations have emerged as to a generalized trust. One of the first

to be presented was by Deutsch (1958). According to Deutsch, an individual may be said to have trust in someone (or an event) if he or she expects that person to behave (or event to occur) in a certain way, and that expectation is perceived to have greater negative consequences if his/her expectation is not fulfilled than positive consequences if it is. Deutsch (1958) explained that risk-taking is very important part of trust because one puts oneself at risk with an expectation of certain behaviors or events in the future. He proposed that trust would be dependent on the perceived power of the object to cause desired events, the power relationship between the individual and the other person, the influence of communication, third party influence, and the individual's level of self-esteem. Deutsch's work generated a considerable amount of research on the construct of trust.

Deutsch (1958) also claimed that trust and trustworthiness are strongly related, implying that one's beliefs about the characteristics of the object of trust would have some bearing on the amount of trust placed in him/her by an individual. Wrightsman (1992) states, however, that whereas the two are very closely related, trust and trustworthiness are not the same thing. Deutsch failed to address whether an individual's beliefs about the trustworthiness of the object of trust were associated with the actual trustworthiness of the object (as assessed by that object and/or by others). A related finding involves the relationship between an individual's tendency to trust others and their own trustworthiness. Much of the research addressing the issue of generalized trust has demonstrated that the trust and the trustworthiness of the individual are strongly related. Deutsch (1958) found that subjects who are trusting are likely to be trustworthy, even

when they could gain considerably by being untrustworthy. Rotter (1980) found that individuals high in generalized trust are more likely to be sought out as a friend, and are less likely to lie, cheat, or steal. In addition, Wright and Kirmani (1977) found that those low in trust showed significantly greater feelings of being distrusted. Another related finding suggests that ones person's trust of another strongly influences the other's trust in that person. For example, Butler (1983) found reciprocation of trust to be more significant in explaining trust than any personality variables or situational variables tested.

One area which received a great deal of attention is the role of generalized trust in communication, specifically in the study of source credibility. Giffin (1967) proposed a list of factors or dimensions which directly influence trust in the communication process. These dimensions appear to include the listener's perceptions of the expertness of the speaker relevant to the topic, the reliability of the speaker as an information source, and the intentions of the speaker toward the listener (the speaker's trustworthiness). In addition, other characteristics, such as personal attraction to the speaker, the rating of the speaker's dynamism, and majority opinion of the amount of trust which should be placed in the speaker, influence the amount of trust one will invest in a communicator. Source credibility, in turn, is a major factor in successful persuasion attempts (e.g. Hemsley & Doob, 1978; Miller, Maruyama, Beaber, & Valone, 1976; Pratkanis & Aaronson, 1992; Zimbardo & Leippe, 1991). These characteristics that were found to be related to trust could be applied not only to communicators, but to any target.

The concept of a generalized tendency to trust was further developed by Rotter (1967), who focused on what he termed "interpersonal trust." Rotter defined interpersonal trust as a generalized expectancy that the promise of an individual or a group can be relied upon. This conceptualization, and the scale he developed for its measurement (Rotter, 1967) have been used in numerous studies. Relevant research has treated a range of topics, from studies about interpersonal trust in particular, to examinations of client-therapist trust, trust in work/team situations (including game playing), the development of trust in children, and political or public trust. Many of these studies used Rotter's definition in a general way to mean expectancies about the trustworthiness of people in general (Stack, 1978). Generalized trust is conceptualized by Rotter (1967; 1971; 1980) as a generalized expectancy, meaning that it is not just related to a specific situation where one has had experience, but also to all situations or experiences that the individual perceives as similar. It is important to note that trust of a generalized other is trust in a person or group with whom an individual has not necessarily had a great deal of personal experience.

Lindskold (1978) argued that interpersonal trust may arise in four ways. The first of these ways deals with the target's objective credibility, or perceived trustworthiness. If a person's words are considered reliable and agree with his/her actions, he/she will be considered trustworthy. Second, the attribution of benevolence indicates that one who seems motivated to help or reward, rather than to injure the perceiver is liked more and will be trusted more often. Thirdly, a person is more likely to be trusted if he/she appears nonmanipulative. And fourth, if there are great costs associated with lying in

a situation, it is assumed that most individuals will not take the risk of lying. In that case, the individual is trusted because one believes that the sanctions against lying protect him/her from being lied to. Each of these four ways that may foster trust does so because attribution principles come into play. Dispositional attributions are made based on situational evidence reflected by an individual's actions. It appears that Lindskold's conceptualization of interpersonal trust corresponds with Rotter's ideas that interpersonal trust is a generalized expectancy, and also employs the notion that trust may be greatly tempered by the dynamics of the situation.

One fundamental argument about the nature and implications of interpersonal trust arises from the question of whether trust is best conceptualized as a more-or-less enduring attitudinal tendency, as Deutsch (1958) and Giffin (1967) suggest, or as a transitory situational variable (Rotter, 1971; Kee & Knox, 1970). Later research (Driscoll, 1978; Scott, 1980a) has suggested that the best conceptualization of interpersonal trust may be to include both in explaining the functioning of trust. Whereas it could be considered that interpersonal trust is an attitude in the classic sense because, like all attitudes, it is determined to some degree by an affective tendency/component and then revised by a cognitive ingredient which limits the scope of the attitude to a specific trust object (Scott, 1980a), it can be seen that the attitude is expressed differentially in differing situations as well.

Some researchers have argued that a concept of situational trust may itself be a more important concept than generalized trust. The concept of situational trust refers to a dynamic process of balancing between trust and mistrust, dependent upon the attributes

of a given situation. Using this distinction, Driscoll (1978) and Scott (1980a) report that although the situational trust component significantly predicted outcome variables in some laboratory studies, the attitudinal or generalized trust component did not.

The trait or attitudinal approach, however, does not have to be seen as totally independent from the situational approach. In fact, most theorists incorporate the idea of a generalized tendency to trust into their models of situational trust. Stack (1978) proposed five determinants of situational trust: communication, risk, credibility of promises, social evaluation, and generalized trust. Each of these determinants are viewed in terms of past, present, and future events to ascertain the likelihood of trusting behavior. Of these determinants in the literature on trust, risk is perhaps the most extensively studied. Trusting another (or in the occurrence of an event) implies a certain amount of vulnerability for an individual, which he/she must be willing to tolerate in order to trust another and experience full intimacy (Garrett, 1989). When one is placed in a vulnerable position and experiences a negative outcome, it is speculated that he/she is less likely to risk trusting another in that particular situation in the future. But, this is only speculation and there has not been any substantial confirmation presented in the literature.

Regardless of which conceptualization is adopted, it is evident that trust is an important part of how we function in our relational lives. Numerous scholars including Erikson (1950), Wrightsman (1974), and Rotter (1967) have argued that generalized trust is the essential basis for the development of any person's interpersonal relationships. Schill, Toves, and Ramanaiah (1980) even suggest that the development of trust is a

central ingredient in the healthy personality. They found participants low in trust to have higher stress scores, and more emotional and physical distress than those high in trust. In short, trust permeates most every interaction in which we engage with our environments, as well as with each other.

Generalized trust has also been ~~be~~ related to giving others a second chance and respecting the rights of others, as well as reduced conflict in one's life, happiness, and adjustment. In addition, work by Hochreich (as cited in Rotter, 1980) indicated that high trusters were found to be most attractive to the opposite sex, but low trusters were expected to possess more common sense that the high trusters. High trusters, however, were not found to be more gullible though, as the previous finding seems to indicate. High trusters were no less able to determine who should be trusted or not. In the face of evidence as to the untrustworthy nature of a target individual, high trusters were less trusting than normal, but in a novel situation where information is not readily available as to the target's trustworthiness, the high truster was likely to give that individual the benefit of the doubt.

Relational Trust

In contrast to the extensive literature on interpersonal and generalized trust, relatively little work has reflected trust in close relationships. This seems peculiar considering the amount of research recently directed toward the study of personal relationships, and considering that trust is conceptualized as a major part of such relationships (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1983; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985; Larzelere

& Huston, 1980).

Whereas generalized trust refers to a person's belief about the character of people in the aggregate (Rotter, 1967, 1971; Wrightsman, 1964), relational trust is focused on a specific individual or group of individuals that a person has relationships with. Trust in close relationships can also be called dyadic trust. Dyadic trust can be distinguished from generalized trust in that the former refers to one's beliefs about the benevolence and honesty of a significant other toward the individual making the judgement (Larzelere & Huston, 1980). Relational trust is like dyadic trust in that, it refers to a person's level of confidence in the strength of the relationship and the caring of the partner (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). One's expectations relevant to trust may become more focused when considering his/her perceptions of their partner's attitude toward the relationship (Holmes & Rempel, 1989). The relational trust level of an individual and his/her perceptions of the partner's trustworthiness, however, should not be confused with the partner's actual trustworthiness.

Some researchers have discussed trust (or distrust) in the close relationship as having the effect of influencing one's capacity to develop feelings of confidence in specific relationships (Holmes & Rempel, 1989). This perspective argues against those who might suggest that trust can be assessed by the intensity of attachment displayed and the degree to which partners rely or depend on each other. Indeed, Holmes and Rempel (1989) argue against the latter position citing their findings that trust tends to be negatively correlated with more excessive drive toward affiliation or autonomy in the relationship.

Although trust in close relationships seems a topic of obvious relevance, the literature is a fairly new one. Most of the theoretical work involving the conceptualization of relational trust has been recently proposed by Holmes and Rempel (Holmes, Rempel, & Zanna, 1985; Holmes & Rempel, 1989; Holmes, 1991). Some of their work will be presented below. Because research on relational trust is new, much of the theoretical work is insufficiently supported by empirical data. But, trust as a relational variable is not a new idea. Many studies of self-disclosure, marital satisfaction, relational exchange, conflict in relationships, attachment processes, commitment, and investment in relationships have examined trust in relation to other relational processes and dynamics. Some general findings relating these relational variables with trust are presented below.

Studies examining self-disclosure have shown inconclusive results as to its relationship to trust. Altman and Taylor (1973) stated that trust is quite necessary for self-disclosure in continuing relationships, and they suggested that reciprocity of disclosure may be based on reciprocity of trust. Many studies have shown trust and self-disclosure to be positively correlated (Steel, 1991; Roark & Sharah, 1989), both self-disclosure and trust to be the most important indicators of friendship satisfaction (Jones, 1991) and intrinsic rewards of friendship (Giordano, Cerbkovich, & Pugh, 1986), and trust has been shown a major aspect of self-disclosure (Broder, 1987). Also, Hale, Lundy, and Mongeau (1989) have found that as relational intimacy (through self-disclosure) increases, so did messages communicating trust. However, researchers such as Vondacek and Marshall (1971), and MacDonald, Kessel, and Fuller (1972) have found

self-disclosure to be unrelated to at least some measures of interpersonal trust.

Work on relationship satisfaction has definitely placed trust in an important role. Goldberg (1987) suggested that problems with trust can seriously affect marital satisfaction. Canary and Spitzberg (1989) found a significant positive correlation between relationship satisfaction and trust. Other researchers (e.g. Canary & Cupach, 1988; Lazelere & Huston, 1980) agreed suggesting that trust is a central component in a satisfying relationship.

A considerable amount of research has been devoted to the role of trust in conflict situations. Most scholars appear to consider lack of trust as a starting point for some types of conflict. For example, Ponzetti and Cate (1986) found trust to be the strongest (inverse) predictor of conflict during the marital dissolution process. In work on conflict strategies, Canary and Cupach (1988) have suggested that constructive strategies of dealing with conflict includes expressing trust in the other. Furthermore, they argued that the dynamics of a conflict situation, such as attempts to gain relational power, severely undermine trust.

Another area of research which encompasses the construct of trust is the attachment process literature. Many studies which attempt to classify attachment styles revealed a relationship between various styles and trust (Simpson, 1990; Collins, & Read, 1990). Also some studies have indicated that early problems with attachment appear to predispose individuals to be distrustful of others (Mills, Taricone, & Bordieri, 1990).

Love has been strongly related to trust in a number of studies (Rempel, Holmes,

& Zanna, 1985; Lazelere & Huston, 1980; Kurdek, 1988). And finally, many researchers' findings reveal a strong relationship between commitment toward a relational partner and trust (Fichman & Levinthal, 1991; Grauerholz, 1987; Becker, 1987; Helm, 1986; Lazelere & Huston, 1980).

Theoretical approaches. Three main theoretical approaches to the study of relational trust have emerged. These have been introduced by Holmes, Rempel, and others. Each supposes that trust is a critical element in close relationships, but each addresses different aspects of trust. The first approach involves theories regarding the development of trust in romantic relationships. Another is a model of the effects of trust on established relationships. The last to be discussed is a component model of trust.

The first approach to be addressed involves a group of theories by several different researchers, all working on separate models. This approach looks at how trust develops and changes throughout a relationship. One such model has involved the study of children and the development of their peer relationships. Rotenberg (1984) found that children develop differential gender-related patterns of trust at an early age, specifically before the second grade. From this developmental period, a same-sex pattern of peer trust was found; boys trusted boys more than they trusted girls, and girls trusted girls more than boys. He suggests that peer group formation contributes to the development of peer trust. This finding corresponds to the "social group" hypothesis suggesting that children develop social groups that enhance trust in their members and minimize trust in individuals who are not members (Rotenberg, 1984).

But, perhaps of more importance to relational trust issues are those "closer"

relationships -- adolescent and adult friendships and romantic love relationships. For ease of discussion, consideration of trust in close romantic relationships will be broken down into the relational stages which correspond roughly to those proposed by Braiker and Kelley (1979) and Levinger (1979) in their theories of relationships: the early stages of romantic love, the evaluative stage, and the accommodation stage.

During the early stages of romantic love, it is generally agreed that trust is overshadowed by the overwhelming absorption of the individual into the love experience. Rempel and Holmes (1989) describe trust in the early stages as tantamount to a naive expression of hope. The individual is aware of his/her expectations regarding the relationship, which are dependent on intimacy and trust, but instead of facing the potential pain of rejection, he or she denies trust as an issue. The individual may choose to accept only the possibility that the partner's feelings are similar to their own. Larzelere and Huston (1980) found that trust does tend to be strongly related to feelings of love at this early stage of relationship development, and Dion and Dion (1973) reported that love and a sense of trust emerged together during this unstable period of infatuation. Trust will only become salient if feelings of asymmetric attachment emerge; that is, feelings of neediness may arise that are not satisfied. For example, if an individual who is invested in a relationship begins to feel that his/her partner is losing interest, ideas of mistrust about the partner's actions or verbalizations may ensue.

From this point on, as relationships progress, the risk of becoming increasingly dependent on the partner becomes more salient. If one entrusts the feelings that are growing as the relationship develops to another and expects them to be returned, greater

vulnerability is introduced. This is characteristic of the next stage, the evaluative stage. During this stage, three main ideas surface as to the role of trust. The first claims that love and trust are likely to promote one another in a circular fashion (Holmes, 1991). However, at this stage, if trust is not established, a satisfying relationship cannot result. Another theory concerning the evaluative stage that trust can be described as a process of uncertainty reduction. Kelley and Thibaut (1978) characterized the development of trust as an exchange of actions and messages that reduces uncertainty regarding whether the relationship will endure. The ultimate aim is to reach secure conclusions about the strength and quality of the partner's attachment to the relationship (Holmes & Rempel, 1989). Once the basics of the relationship have been "tended to", questions start to arise as to the future. According to this view, the partner's behaviors indicate a pattern which will likely continue. If the partner behaves predictably and dependably during the initial stage, the more likely an individual is to trust that partner. The third theoretical perspective involving the evaluative stage is one of reciprocal attachment. Each partner must provide the other with a confidence that their feelings will be returned equally at every stage in the relationship in order for trust to develop. Researchers have found that the probable best predictor of the dissolution of dating relationships is the perception that love is not reciprocated (Brehm, 1985; Hill, Rubin, & Peplau, 1976; Walster, Walster, & Traupmann, 1978). When putting one's emotions "on the line", the risk the individual faces of not having his/her feelings reciprocated is obvious. But, if the partner reciprocates the individual's feelings and his/her actions seem to demonstrate an adequate level of commitment, this exchange offers some validation for the individual by ensuring

equality in the bearing of risks and in involvement in the relationship (Holmes & Rempel, 1989; Holmes, 1991).

Once the relationship is sufficiently established, new concerns seem to arise that have to be addressed. Conflicts may occur as each person begins to see his/her partner in a new and different light. Attempts to work out differences and/or compromises are carried out during the accommodation stage. This is seen as a time when a couple engages in diagnostic processes which test their respective levels of trust (Holmes, 1991). While accommodation occurs, trust is seen as developing separately from feelings of love. Findings seem to indicate that this conceptualization of trust during the accommodation stage is accurate (Dion & Dion, 1976; Driscoll, Davis, & Lipetz, 1972; Lazelere & Huston, 1980). Since this point in relationships is often characterized by frequent and/or heated conflict, (a time when risk is very salient), actions on the part of the partner which show empathy or sensitivity to one's personal needs are seen as more significant and act to pull the couple closer. Security in this stage comes from the feelings of control over "fate" which are brought about through this closeness (Holmes, 1991).

Although this stage proposal has not lead to complete agreement among researchers as to the development of trust in specific stages, it is possible that each may offer a view of the process which may be correct. It seems that different stages of commitment to a relationship do engender different issues relating to trust for a couple. To fully understand the developmental role of trust, it may prove advantageous to consider an integration of these theoretical presentations.

The next approach to be presented is a very recent and important addition to the literature by Holmes and Rempel (1989), and Holmes (1991). This model focuses on the consequences of trust in established relationships. Persons who vary in their degree of trust are seen to assess their relational interactions differently, and thus "color" their interpretation of events both in specific encounters and in overall evaluations (Holmes, 1981). According to this view, trusting persons tend to measure the course of events in a relationship over a more extended period of time (Holmes, 1991). Similarly, individuals with high trust do not judge single events as having much weight in the appraisal process. Positive events are viewed as confirming the trust that has been given, and single negative events are not seen as a threat to the relationship. This is ostensibly the case even for repeating negative aspects of the partner's behavior (Holmes, 1991).

Individuals uncertain about trusting (those with more moderate levels of trust) may display a very different pattern. According to the theory, because they are very motivated to reduce uncertainty, these individuals actively assess their partner's motives and levels of responsiveness in every interaction. These moderate trusters are hopeful that their assessments will yield positive results and allow them to trust their partner, but their hopes are constrained by vulnerability (Holmes, 1991). Positive behaviors are readily viewed as relevant to greater matters of loving or caring. Negative behaviors are also perceived as very important relating to the overall appraisal of the relationship. According to the theory, the risk is greatest at this level of trust because the potential for hurt is intensified when a single negative event has heightened implications for the relationship.

Low trust couples may have had negative experiences which caused a lack of trust in the first place. This deficiency in trust may imply that a breach of security has occurred previously. It is important to note, however, that little research has been done to establish the factors that contribute to this decline of trust (Holmes & Rempel, 1989), so researchers have been left only to speculate as to any connections between betrayal and low-trust.

Low trust partners are likely to approach their relationship with a relatively closed mind, which is very similar to the strategy of high trust couples. They react as though they have concluded that their partner is not concerned about them or the relationship (Holmes, 1991). They will perceive positive behaviors suspiciously, and thus proceed more conservatively. Negative behaviors are likely to reinforce the distrusting attitude that has already been formed (Holmes & Rempel, 1989). The low truster may still have hopes for the relationship, but the disadvantage of weighing positive behaviors too heavily are well understood.

Unfortunately, since this appraisal model for differing trust levels is still very new, little empirical work has been done to substantiate its claims. However, one study was offered by Holmes (1991) as support for the differences in the appraisal model, but Holmes acknowledges that the ideas that have been proposed are difficult to test in any direct manner. The couples that participated in the study all had been living together for a period of at least two years. They began by completing a questionnaire containing a Trust Scale (Rempel, et al., 1985) and a Problem Inventory which was used to determine problem areas within the relationship. While the couple engaged in a five minute warm-

up exercise to relax them in front of a video camera, the experimenter used the Problem Inventory to locate areas of stress within the relationship to be discussed by the couple. Then the individuals were separated, and they each completed another short questionnaire consisting of polarized adjectives assessing expectations about the partner's behavior and motives (Holmes, 1991) in the forthcoming discussion. At this point, an experimental manipulation was administered; specifically, participants were divided into three groups: negative recall, positive recall, and a control group.

The members of the negative recall group were asked to remember a time when they were in a conflict situation with the partner where that partner did not respond positively to their needs, and they were left feeling disappointed. They were also asked about certain things that made them feel this way. The positive recall group received similar instructions, except they were told to remember a time when the partner responded positively to them. Then they were asked to tell about the particular things that made them feel good about the experience. These descriptions were audiotaped. The control group simply waited for several minutes for the interaction to begin. A discussion of the topic identified by the Problem Inventory (about 15 minutes long) was then videotaped. From here each participant was moved into a room with a television screen and a button-box. As the videotape was played back, the individual was asked to rate, by pressing certain buttons, any behaviors that had an impact on them (either positively or negatively). A judge blind to the experiment simultaneously rated the partner's performance on the video. Then the subject again responded to the polarized adjectives with respect to their partner's actual performance during the interaction, and

responded to the inferred motives. For the purposes of analyses participants were divided into high, moderate, and low trusting groups. Results showed that the low trusting individuals were mistrusting of their partners in the negative recall condition. Positive recall did induce the low trusters to make more favorable attributions, but changed their behavior very little. Low trust individuals, consistent with the model, tended to avoid focusing on the present situation, and instead concentrated on a more general picture based on many past events. Moderate trusters, sometimes referred to as uncertain individuals, showed evidence of ambivalent, volatile reaction (Holmes, 1991). Their feelings about their partner mirrored the manipulation. This is consistent with the idea that uncertain individuals engage in a constant appraisal process with a readiness to observe both positive and negative cues from the partner. They seemed unable to decide between past experience and hopes for the future. Their tendency to be reactive to their companion's actions was apparent. These moderate trusters made fewer strongly positive responses than the high trusters, but more than the low trusters. High trust couples showed that they anticipated positive outcomes from their interactions, and interpret events in ways that support these expectations. High trusting then, like low trusting, may result in a self-fulfilling prophecy. These couples did, as the theory suggests, fail to attach importance to specific negative behaviors. In the negative recall condition, the high trusters showed less evidence of manipulation effects than any other group. It is suggested by the authors that this is due to their ability to remember their positive feelings while paying less attention to their negative feelings at any given time.

The appraisal process model does seem to be a good representation of the effects

of trust on already established relationships, but it seems to be deficient in several areas. Mainly, the approach seems to leave many important issues unaddressed. For example, the development of trust and explanations of why individuals possess differing levels of trust remain unaddressed. The model might be more useful if it were combined with a developmental model to produce a comprehensive view of trust. In addition, the appraisal process does not address the possibility of fantasy representations versus true actions of a partner in the attribution process. It may be possible that the individual's perception of the partner is all that influences trust, and this causes them to overlook some positive or negative actions. But, reality most certainly will intervene at some point, and then the patterns the model proposes may be overridden.

The study that Holmes (1991) used as theoretical support seemed to show evidence for the approach, but several methodological questions may be raised. First, the experimental manipulation effects can be interfering with the actual trust patterns that exist due to the possible intrusion of memories or present experiences. Memories can be misrepresentative of an actual occurrence, and their presence may serve to bias any effects they mediate.

Another consideration might be the use of videotape during the discussions. Even with the warm up period, the self-presentational concerns of the subject induced by the presence of the video camera may also change the interactions from their more natural patterns. The same may be the case during the audiotaped manipulation section of the experiment.

A final comment about the methodology concerns the recall manipulations of the

subjects. All participants were divided into three groups, and all groups except the control group were subject to manipulation. The effect of each of the partners in the dyad having received a manipulation prior to the discussion poses serious questions about the nature of the subsequent interaction. Each partner is no doubt behaving differently than normal due to recall. It seems that this could easily have been avoided by selecting only one of the partners to receive the manipulation.

Perhaps a stronger concern regarding this study relates to the problem of the researchers attempting to measure attributions made by their subjects. It is difficult to get a clear representation of another's attribution process, even if that subject is willing to attempt its description. Since this measurement is critical to this study's support of the model, this difficulty is certainly a significant consideration.

Another theoretical approach to be presented describing relational trust in close relationships is a component theory proposed by Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna (1985). This model is based on four assumptions. First, trust is seen as developing as a consequence of relationship maturity and evolves from prior interactions. Second, reliability, dependability or other dispositional attributes of trustworthiness are attributed to the partner. Third, trust involves taking interpersonal risks. This is accomplished by relying on a partner's word, through intimate disclosure, and sacrificing present rewards for future gains. Fourth, trust finally evolves to become confidence in the responses of the partner and the stability of the relationship (Rempel, et al., 1985). The authors of the paradigm believe that these four assumptions describe a three component model of trust. The three components are labeled as predictability, dependability, and faith.

Predictability, dependability, and faith are posited to arise out of differing levels of cognitive and emotional abstraction. The first component, predictability, is regarded as the most concrete and specific. Predictability simply refers to an expectation of the occurrence of specific behavioral patterns by the partner. If the partner conforms to this expectancy, the individual is able to move from concerns about the stability of his/her partner to more pressing matters of trust. Predictability is influenced by many factors, including the amount of past experience in the relationship, consistency of recurrent behavior, and stability of the social environment (Rempel, et al., 1985). This component is the most basic and probably accounts for most trusting behavior early in a relationship.

As relationships grow and change there is an inexorable shift in focus from specific actions to broad evaluative categories. At this stage then, one begins to trust a person rather than his or her specific behaviors or actions (Rempel, et al, 1985). This is known as dependability, the second component of relational trust. Dependability is very closely related to predictability. This is because a partner's predictability is a meaningful basis of information from which to draw dispositional attributions. For example, if a partner behaves in a stable manner and in doing so is always responsive to the individual's needs, one may attribute dependability to that partner. These dispositional attributions can be transformed into what an individual views as his or her partner's trustworthiness (which is conceptually distinguishable from an individual's level of trust regarding that partner, but not predictability and dependability).

This second component (or hierarchical stage) also marks the necessary presence of risk as a factor in an individual's decision to trust another. As noted earlier, learning

to rely on another's dependability leaves one vulnerable. Ironically according to Rempel, et al. (1985) focusing on vulnerability helps to explain the origins of feelings of security and trust. If one can resolve the question of dependability, he/she may progress to higher concerns. However, if one does not risk reliance on the partner's dependability, he/she cannot move past this apprehension and ever fully trust the partner. In failing to do so, it may be that the individual cannot fully experience satisfaction with that relationship.

The first two components of trust, predictability and dependability, require attention to past experiences. But, the future is where the unknown experiences which require trust lie. After all, the true "test" of trust comes when new situations arise, or future knowledge is unavailable. So, we must contemplate the impact of the future on trust in close relationships. To do so requires considerable confidence on the part of an individual that his/her partner will remain faithful and responsive despite future uncertainties (Rempel, et al., 1985). This requisite is faith, the author's third component of trust. Faith is considered the most important component, and the one which really expresses what trust is all about. It may be the inherent quality in an individual that allows one to accept the unknown future and deal with it gracefully.

Faith goes beyond an emphasis on dispositional attributions, but is possibly related to both predictability and dependability in that the past is an important basis for generalizing to future situations. Predictability and dependability are seen as suggesting the partner's underlying motives of caring which, in turn, enhances emotional security in the face of the uncertainty of the future (Rempel, et al., 1985). Faith can be seen as

a quality of the individual who does the trusting, and may also be influenced by personal dynamics, such as self-esteem and personal security.

It might also be noted when discussing assessments made by an individual, that the authors include in the component model a distinction between three types of dispositional attributions. The type of attribution one holds about his or her reason for being in the relationship, as well as what he or she believes the partner's motives to be, will influence the individual's decision to trust. The types of attributions include: intrinsic motivation, instrumental motivation, and extrinsic motivation.

Intrinsic sources of motivation in a close relationships refer to the belief that the relationship generates its own rewards. Extrinsic motives are not inherent in the relationship, but result as a consequence of it. These include the belief that the relationship is a vehicle for obtaining desired rewards. And, instrumental motivations may include a host of "more or less explicit rewards partners provide for each other, such as direct services, goods, praise, sex, and support" (Rempel, et al., 1985). The individual may be motivated largely by interpersonal rewards received largely from the partner. Rempel, et al. (1985) and Holmes (1991) found that assuming a partner's motivations are intrinsic will promote the most trusting of that partner, instrumental attributions will lessen feelings of love and trust, and the least trusting will be promoted by a partner's extrinsic motivations.

Measures of Relational Trust. Most of the empirical work concerning a relational type of trust has involved some scale construction tailored to research questions. Perhaps this is due to the fact that research has shown that generalized trust does not accurately

assess trust among relational partners (Tardy, 1988). In fact, generally speaking, efforts to predict trust in specific close relationships from measures of generalized trust have been unsuccessful (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Lazelere & Huston, 1980). Some of the specific relational trust scales which do exist are very situationally oriented. There are measures of trust in close relationships, such as the Trust Scale, the Dyadic Trust Scale, and the Specific-Interpersonal Trust Scale, but unfortunately there appears to be no scale which could be used to measure trust within the differing levels of interpersonal relationships across various situations.

Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna's (1985) work generated the Trust Scale in conjunction with their empirical assessment of the component model of trust. From this model they took the deductive approach to scale construction. Specifically, prototypes of predictability, dependability, and faith were formulated and used in the construction of the Trust Scale. The Trust Scale was structured to represent the three component model yielding a score for each of the three levels of trust. In addition, a Motivation Scale for use in the experiment which assessed intrinsic, instrumental, or extrinsic motivations was generated using identical deductive scaling procedures.

Forty-five couples were recruited to complete questionnaires consisting of Rubin's (1973) Loving and Liking Scale followed by global measures of happiness, satisfaction, and current success, the Trust Scale described above, and the Motivation Scale (also described above). The latter measure was completed twice in counterbalanced order. The Motivation Scale was first completed to assess their own motives in the relationship, and then completed again to reflect their beliefs about their partner's motives. The

partners completed their questionnaires separately, and confidentially.

Analysis of the Trust Scale yielded high reliabilities for each of the subscales. Men and women did show some difference in their scores. Women followed the predicted hierarchical pattern discussed in the model, but men seemed to display patterns that would indicate that each component is independent of the others. The Motivation Scale analysis also yielded support for the hierarchical pattern of motivations discussed earlier. Results indicated that individuals tend to project their own motives onto their partners.

Love was strongly related to the faith component of trust, moderately related to the dependability component, and weakly correlated with predictability. The correlations were stronger for women than men. Love was also strongly related to reports of partners having intrinsic motivations and instrumental motivations, but only weakly to partner's extrinsic motivations. Women were more likely to feel love strongly when their partner was viewed as having instrumental motivations. This, along with the previously mentioned sex differences are interpreted as evidence that women are more concerned than men about the basics of interpersonal behavior, and appear to have a more integrated view of trust. Faith and intrinsic motivations were strongly related to each other, but instrumental and extrinsic motivations generated no significant correlations with faith. Predictability was related to instrumental and extrinsic motivations, and dependability was related to instrumental motives.

This research does seem to clearly support the hierarchical model proposed. The faith component is observed to make the greatest contributions to feelings of trust, and

intrinsic, followed by instrumental motives also contribute significantly. But, there may be several problems with both the model and the study designed to support its claims.

Although the model is a welcome addition to the relatively barren theoretical literature addressing relational trust, the three components may not subsume the totality of the trust construct. For example, it appears that the focus of trust is placed on the faith component, and only support-types of activities are assigned to predictability and dependability. Furthermore, it appears that faith may only be another name for trust (instead of a component) with dependability and predictability being factors which influence it. And, if the component model is correct, it seems a little incomplete. Trust is complicated (Holmes, Rempel, & Zanna, 1985). It may even be more complex than involving just three components, or at least those components may not include such trustworthiness variables as dependability and predictability.

Another criticism involves the lack of an empirical distinction between intrinsic and instrumental motivations for being in the relationship. It seems that the explicit rewards provided by the partners in a relationship (instrumental) are indistinguishable from what the authors define as intrinsic rewards (rewards inherent in the relationship itself). For a complete understanding of the model, this distinction must be made.

With regard to the Trust Scale, the authors indicated that the participants were asked to respond to the level of trustworthiness of their partner on each question. Although trustworthiness of one's partner may have some influence on an individual's decision to trust, it is important to understand that the scale is not designed to measure an individual's level of trust, but instead the attributes of the partner. Therefore, in

addition to measuring something other than what the authors suggest, this trust scale may fall into the category of other limited trust scales which have been created for a somewhat narrow purpose.

Overall, the component model offered by Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna seems to offer promise to the stark literature on the topic. Perhaps with some additional research and definition, the model will prove to be a useful explanation of trust.

Other research by Larzelere & Huston (1980) has produced The Dyadic Trust Scale. This scale is an eight item self-report questionnaire which appears to be relatively free from response biases (Larzelere & Huston, 1980). This scale, and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (1964) were administered to dating and married persons. Of this sample, 40 of the dating couples, 20 of the newlywed couples, and 20 of the longer married couples were given part of Rubin's (1970) Loving Scale, 60 items from Taylor and Altman's (1966) self-disclosure measure, items from Wrightsman's (1964) Trustworthiness subscale of the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale, and Rotter's (1967) Interpersonal Trust Scale. The Dyadic Trust Scale proved highly reliable, and unaffected by social desirability. In addition, dyadic trust proved operationally distinct from generalized trust (Larzelere & Huston, 1980). Dyadic trust and love were strongly associated with one another, as were this trust and intimacy of self-disclosure, particularly for longer married couples. But, it was reported that trust is reciprocated more than either love or level of intimacy. Also of note, it was demonstrated that trust varies with level of commitment, specifically, trust was highest for those living together, for newlyweds, and those married over 20 years and lowest for ex-partners (Larzelere

& Huston, 1980). This finding seems to offer support for the models regarding developmental stages previously discussed. However, in considering this study, it may be relevant to consider the possibility of order effects. Each of the scales may have caused some demand characteristics in the responses given by the participants on the other measures. Even though the Social Desirability Scale showed that there were no effects on the responses of the Dyadic Trust Scale, it is not safe to assume that order effects could not have influenced responses to the other scales in some way. In particular, responding to items on the Love Scale may have served to prime subjects toward more positive feelings about their partner. Subsequently, their appraisal of their feelings of trust toward that individual may have been contaminated.

Of greater concern, the Dyadic Trust Scale contains items which refer to the partner's trustworthiness, and not to the individual's own level of trust. Although interpersonal trust and trustworthiness are undoubtedly related, the two concepts are distinguishable (Wrightsman, 1992). With this distinction in mind, it is difficult to determine what the results of the analysis really indicate about trust.

Future Concerns

In reviewing part of this very small literature dealing with trust in close personal relationships, many opportunities for future research can be found. Both theorizing and empirical work needs to be undertaken as to the genuine role of relational trust and how it is different from generalized trust. An important step would be a more comprehensive and integrative theoretical model of trust. This model would need to include such things

as: the distinction between trustworthiness and trust, how trust differs depending on the target, the effects of betrayal on trust, the idealization of partners, and situational exceptions to trusting behavior.

Another issue that should be addressed is the construction of a comprehensive relational trust scale which can be used in many situational interactions. This instrument must also be shielded from the effects of social desirability.

A final concern regarding future work on relational trust is experimental design. Up to this point, studies have been almost exclusively correlational in nature. This approach, although providing valuable information, is similar to all research designs in that it is inherently limited. Overall, it would appear that additional research on trust in close relationships is necessary.

The purpose of this research is to address the limitations regarding existing scales that were presented in the review of the literature. This research seeks to create a valid and reliable inventory which could measure trust with respect to different relational levels and also explore how trust might function at each of these levels.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

PARTICIPANTS

Data collection involved three groups of participants. College students (107 females and 80 males), mean age of 20.4 years, comprised the first sample. The participants in this group were primarily caucasians (89.3%), and all were involved in casual to serious romantic relationships (mean length of relationship = 24.8 months). This sample completed the original version of the Trust Inventory and their responses were used for psychometric analyses. The second sample consisted of 552 college students. Of this group, 445 (80.6%) reported being involved in a romantic relationship (273 females and 177 males). These individuals were used in all subsequent analyses. The mean age of this group was 20.2 years, mean length of relationship was 22.9 months; also, this sample was 89.8% caucasian. These participants completed the Trust Inventory and one or more validity measures. The third group was the test-retest sample. This group consisted of a subset of the second sample, (24 females and 21 males), with a mean age 19.5, 87.5% of whom were involved in romantic relationships at the time. The mean relationship length reported for this group was 18.4 months. All participants were recruited from undergraduate psychology classes at a large public University.

PROCEDURE

For all three samples, college student volunteers completed questionnaires in out-of-class sessions in exchange for nominal course credit. The first sample (n = 187) completed the 73 items of the original version of the Trust Inventory. The second sample (n = 552) completed a packet of several questionnaires containing: (a) biographical questions (e.g. age, romantic involvement, etc.), (b) the revised Trust Inventory, and (c) various measures of attitudes, emotions, and relationship experience included for the purpose of validity analyses. Specifically, these questionnaires contained existing measures of trust (including both measures of trust of specific romantic partners and people in general) as well as measures of love, liking, relationship satisfaction and commitment, loneliness, self-disclosure, shyness, betrayal, jealousy, suspicion, and guilt. These instruments are described in detail below. Finally, the third sample (n = 45) completed the revised Trust Inventory a second time approximately nine weeks after having participated in the second sample.

Measures

Measures of relational trust. In addition to the three subscales of the Trust Inventory, participants in the second sample completed three alternative measures of relational trust. These included the 10-items from the faith subscale of the Trust Scale (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985), 7-items from the emotional trust subscale of the Specific Interpersonal Trust Scale (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982), and the Dyadic Trust

Scale (Larzelere & Huston, 1980).

The Trust scale is a 26-item measure of trust-related issues in romantic relationships. The faith subscale is a reliable (alpha = .80) and valid measure of the feelings of confidence in a romantic relationship and romantic partner. Responses are obtained on a 5-point scale. Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna (1985) have found the subscale to correlate highly with feelings of love for one's partner and happiness. Furthermore, these items can be distinguished from the dependability and predictability of the partner subscales in that the individual uses the past in order to judge the predictability or dependability of their partner, whereas the faith subscale emphasizes going beyond the available evidence and making the decision to trust.

The emotional trust subscale of the Specific Interpersonal Trust Scale is a 9-item measure of one individual's trust in another in situations involving confiding, freedom from criticism and embarrassment, and other emotion-laden interactions. Two of the nine items were gender specific (i.e. items for females only), so only the remaining seven items from this subscale were used. All of the subscales of the Specific Interpersonal Trust Scale were determined to be reliable (alphas > .71), including emotional trust. Johnson-George and Swap (1982) found the construct of trust in a specific other person to be distinct form both love and liking. Discriminant validity has been shown in that respondents high in emotional trust were unwilling to use evidence of unreliability of the target to generalize about another's trustworthiness, and the respondents scoring high in emotional trust were most effected by a manipulation in which the target broke a confidence that was placed in him/her.

The Dyadic Trust Scale is an 8-item measure of trust in close relationships. It has demonstrated reliability (coefficient alpha = .93) and there is some evidence suggesting construct validity. Lazelere and Huston (1980) found dyadic trust to be related to love and intimacy of self-disclosure. Partners were found to reciprocate dyadic trust more than self-reports of love and self-disclosure. It was also found to vary by the level of commitment an individual felt toward their relationship with another (i.e. lowest trust from ex-partners and highest trust found for engaged and married couples). The measure has also been found to be operationally distinct from generalized trust. Dyadic trust refers to the goodwill and honesty of a significant other toward the individual making the trust decision, whereas generalized trust refers to one's belief about the character of people in the aggregate.

Measures of global trust. Measures of global trust included the Interpersonal Trust Scale (Rotter, 1967) and the Trustworthiness subscale of the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (Wrightsman, 1974). The Interpersonal Trust Scale is a 25-item measure intended to assess trust (the expected reliability of others' words or promises) regarding a variety of people and situations. The scale is designed to assess trust in ambiguous, novel, or unstructured situations, in which one's generalized expectancy is all one can rely on. Items are rated using a 5-point Likert-type rating scale with higher scores indicating more trust. Coefficient alpha of .79, a split-half reliability of .76, and test-retest reliability of .58 and .68 have been reported (Pereira & Austrin, 1980) for the scale. In addition, the Interpersonal Trust Scale has been widely used to study a range of topics. Rotter (1980), for example found that interpersonal trust was inversely

correlated with telling a lie, or cheating, unhappiness, maladjustment, and directly correlated with the size of social networks. Stein, Soskin, and Korchin (1973) factor analyzed the scale and found three consistent factors labelled as follows: institutional trust, sincerity, and caution.

The trustworthiness subscale of the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale is a 14-item measure of one's beliefs that human nature or people in general are trustworthy, moral, and responsible/reliable. Coefficient alpha has been reported to be .79, and the scale correlates .76 with Rotter's Interpersonal Trust Scale (Chun & Campbell, 1975). A cluster and factor analysis by Chun and Campbell (1975) yielded two components: global morality and specific acts of honesty.

Other Measures. The Rubin Love and Liking Scale (1970) is a 26-item instrument, with 13-items designed to measure love and the other 13-items created to measure liking. Subjects are asked to indicate agreement with statements about their partner on a 5-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". The scale has proven reliable (alpha = .84 for women and .86 for men) and is widely used in relational studies. Rosenman (1978) found that the Love subscale was strongly related to the giving (r = .52), possessive (r = .46), and friendship (r = .26) styles of love proposed by Lee (1973). He also found the Love subscale to have three components: affiliative and dependent need, predisposition to help, and orientation of exclusiveness and absorption. The Liking subscale, has been characterized as a more traditional conception of interpersonal attraction (Lee, 1973).

The Attitudes About Love scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986) was designed to

distinguish between six basic love attitudes or styles as defined by Lee's (1973) theory of love styles: Eros (passionate love), Ludus (game-playing love), Storge (friendship love), Pragma (logical love), Mania (possessive or dependent love), and Agape (selfless love). The love styles are ostensibly independent ways of approaching the love experience and are related to both personality and attitudes (Raciti & Hendrick, 1992) The questionnaire is a 42-item inventory, with 7-items measuring each of the love styles. Each of the six scales shows substantial internal reliability (coefficient alpha ranged from .62 to .84 and test-retest reliabilities from .60 to .78; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986), and the scales have relatively low correlations with each other.

A revised version of the Marital Satisfaction and Commitment Scale (Jones, Adams, Monroe, & Berry, 1994) was used to assess the level of satisfaction with, and commitment to one's relationship. The questionnaire is a 25-item measure, with 10-items measuring commitment to one's relationship and partner, and 15-items measuring one's satisfaction with the romantic relationship. The inventory was designed to assess satisfaction and commitment in a marriage relationship. Because the participants from this study are primarily unmarried individuals, all references to "spouse" or "marriage" in the items was changed to "partner" or "romantic relationship". The satisfaction and commitment scales have demonstrated validity (e.g. they discriminate between married and divorced couples) and reliability (alphas $>.75$, and $>.80$), and show adequate test-retest reliability of (rs $>.85$).

The UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980) is the most widely used measure of loneliness. It is a valid and reliable (alpha = .96, test-retest r

= .73) measure. The scale is a 20-item instrument designed to measure subjective feelings of loneliness and the discrepancy between perceived and idealized relationships. The UCLA Loneliness Scale has been widely used in studies of loneliness and relationship problems.

A self-disclosure questionnaire (Chaikin & Derlega, 1976) was used to measure the respondent's willingness to tell their romantic partner things about themselves. The 26-items present the respondent with types of information previously rated for depth (intimacy) of disclosure that they may disclose to their partner. Willingness to disclose that item to their partner is rated on a 5-point scale. No evidence of reliability or validity of this scale is available.

The Social Reticence Scale (Jones & Briggs, 1986) is a 20-item, self-report measure of shyness. The scale has shown to have substantial internal consistency (alpha = .91) and test-retest reliability ($\underline{r}$ = .88 over an eight week period, and $\underline{r}$ = .78 over twelve weeks). Criterion, construct validity evidence has been reported. For example, self-report ratings of how shy an individual was correlated with the scale's items at an average of $\underline{r}$ = .38 ($p > .01$), shyness was inversely correlated with the frequency of dating and number of close friends, and there were positive correlations between this measure and public and private self-consciousness, social anxiety, loneliness, speech anxiety, and neurosis (Jones & Russell, 1982).

The Guilt Inventory (Kugler & Jones, 1992) was designed to measure trait guilt (a continuing sense of guilt), state guilt (present guilty feelings), and moral standards (subscription to a code of moral values). The inventory contains 45-items, with each

subscale demonstrating acceptable validity and reliability. Twenty-items measure trait guilt (alpha = .89), 10-items measure state guilt (alpha = .84), and 15-items measure moral standards (alpha = .88). Only the trait guilt items were used in the current research. Participants endorse items on a 5-point scale. The inventory has shown concurrent validity in that it correlates highly with most other existing measures of guilt, and items tapping the experience of guilt show the greatest differential in correlations with the subscales of the Differential Emotions Scale (i.e. guilt, sadness, fear, disgust, contempt, anger, shyness, surprise, interest, and joy), thus suggesting discriminant validity.

The Interpersonal Betrayal Scale (Jones & Burdette, 1994) contains 30-items measuring the tendency to betray one's friends and family members and the corresponding perception of having been betrayed by one's relational partners. Research supports the internal reliability of the scales (alphas > .75). Validity of scale interpretations was suggested by inverse correlations with measures of morality and direct correlations with alternative measures of relationship betrayal and conflict, self-labelling (e.g. contemptuous, envious, cynical, exploitive, jealous, etc.), and measures of harm-doing within the family (Carver & Jones, 1993) and social support network (Jones & Burdette, 1994). Also some evidence of discriminant validity has been reported (e.g. betrayal scores are not identical to scores on measures of antisocial personality).

The Interpersonal Jealousy Scale (Mathes & Severa, 1981) is a 28-item measure of the amount of negative emotion resulting from actual or threatened loss of a loved one to a rival (jealousy). The measure presents the respondent with situations that involve

their romantic partner and other people, and asks them to rate how distressed they would be in the situation. The scale has been found to be internally reliable (alpha = .92) and valid. For example, Mathes and Severa (1981) found the scale to correlate well with Rubin's love scale indicating that those individuals who are most vulnerable to jealousy are in love with their partners. It also correlates positively with a threat manipulation, and negatively with a permission manipulation (asking an individual's permission to engage in a date with their partner), and has also been shown to be predict jealousy across situations (those scoring high in jealousy for romantic partners also score high when the target is a same-sex friend). Discriminant validity has been shown in that a jealousy and a liking factor were both found, indicating that the scale is not just a measure of interpersonal attraction.

The suspicion subscale of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (Buss & Durkee, 1957) was used to measure projection of hostility onto others. The 10-item subscale asks respondents to indicate their agreement with statements about being distrustful and wary of people, and beliefs that others are being derogatory or planning harm to them. Normative and descriptive data are available for the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory and each of its subscales, but no evidence of internal reliability has been presented. The suspicion subscale has been shown to be a valid measure of distrustfulness. Correlations have been reported by Biaggio (1980) between suspicion and social desirability (r = -.44 to -.68), authoritarianism (r = .25), and aggression (r = .36).

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

ITEM SELECTION AND SCALE DEVELOPMENT

Seventy-three trust items were generated using the rational approach to scale construction. Three a priori classifications of trust were hypothesized (partner trust, social network trust, and generalized trust) and items were written to conform to each of these types. Partner trust was defined as faith or confidence in a romantic partner or in romantic relationships, both in the present and the future. Initially, 32 items were written to comprise the Partner Trust Scale of the inventory. Network Trust referred to the feelings of confidence and security one has in relationships with family and friends (excluding a romantic partner). Twenty initial items were generated for the Network Trust Scale. Generalized trust is the tendency to assume positive characteristics of people in general, or attribute such characteristics to "human nature." The Generalized Trust scale originally consisted of 31-items. From a sample of 187 college undergraduates, the initial Partner Trust scale showed a mean inter-item correlation of .21, and coefficient alpha was .89. The initial Network Trust scale had a mean inter-item correlation of .17, and a coefficient alpha of .75. The initial Generalized Trust scale yielded a mean inter-item correlation was .26, and coefficient alpha of .90. Items which did not correlate at the .40 level or greater with the appropriate scale were

removed from further consideration.

RELIABILITY

The resulting scales comprise the current version of the Trust Inventory. Coefficient alphas ranged from .87 to .92, and the mean inter-item correlations for the scales ranged from .33 to .40. The Partner Trust subscale consists of 20-items with corrected item-total correlations for the subscale ranging from .43 to .75, with a mean of .58. The Network Trust subscale consists of 10-items with corrected item-total correlations for the subscale ranging from .48 to .66, with a mean of .58. The Generalized Trust subscale is 20-items with corrected item-total correlations ranging from .45 to .69, with a mean of .55. The items from the resulting scales are presented in Table 1. The specific scale characteristics for each of the scales of the Inventory are presented in Table 2.

Analysis from participants in the third sample yielded information about the Inventory's test-retest reliability over a nine-week period. The Partner, Network, and Generalized Trust test-retest correlation were .82, .74, and .80, respectively.

VALIDITY

Respondents completed trust scales and a subset of the remaining measures. The validity of the Trust Inventory was assessed in three ways: (1) scores from the Trust

Table 1

Items of the Trust Inventory

Scales	Item #	Item
P	1.	My partner makes me feel safe.
*N	2.	Close relationships can be dangerous.
G	3.	I tend to be accepting of others.
*P	4.	My partner sometimes makes me uncomfortable.
G	5.	My relationships with others are characterized by trust and acceptance.
*N	6.	I find it difficult to fully trust anyone.
P	7.	I do not worry that my partner will leave me.
G	8.	Basically I am a trusting person.
G	9.	It is better to trust people until they prove otherwise than to be suspicious of others until they prove otherwise.
G	10.	I accept others at "face value."
*N	11.	It is better to be safe than sorry when it comes to the people in one's life.
*P	12.	I am skeptical that relationships ever work out.
*N	13.	I worry that the people I trust will get the better of me.
G	14.	Most people are trustworthy.
P	15.	I believe in my partner.
*P	16.	In relationships, I tend to be alert for the possibility of rejection or betrayal.

Table 1 continued.

Scales	Item #	Item
*N	17.	I often find myself wondering about the motives of others in my life.
*G	18.	It is better to be suspicious of people you have just met, until you know them better.
G	19.	I make friends easily.
P	20.	I am sure about how my partner feels about me.
*G	21.	Only a fool would trust most people.
*N	22.	I often worry about letting friends and family "get too close to me."
*P	23.	I am doubtful that my partner will always be there for me if I need him/her.
P	24.	I tell my partner that I trust him/her completely.
G	25.	I find it better to accept others for what they say and what they appear to be.
*G	26.	I would admit to being more than a little paranoid about people I meet.
*P	27.	Relationships will only lead to heartache.
G	28.	I have few difficulties trusting people.
*N	29.	Frequently, I am suspicious of friends and family.
P	30.	I am rarely ever suspicious of people with whom I have a relationship.
*N	31.	It is fair to say that I am more than a little cynical about people I know.
*G	32.	Basically, I tend to be distrustful of others.

Table 1 continued.

Scales	Item #	Item
*P	33.	I am afraid my partner will hurt me emotionally.
*P	34.	I am afraid my partner will betray me.
*G	35.	Experience has taught me to be doubtful of others until I know they can be trusted.
P	36.	I generally believe what my partner tells me.
*P	37.	I never believe my partner when he/she tells me how he/she feels about me.
G	38.	I have a lot of faith in the people I know.
*N	39.	If the truth be known, I am more than a little doubtful of the motives of many of the people in my life.
G	40.	Even during the "bad times", I tend to think that things will work out in the end.
P	41.	I feel that I can be myself in the presence of my partner.
*P	42.	I am uncertain about how my partner feels about me.
G	43.	I tend to take others at their word.
G	44.	When it comes to people I know, I am believing and accepting.
*P	45.	It is dangerous to "let your guard down" with your partner.
G	46.	I feel I can depend on most people I know.
*P	47.	I am sometimes doubtful of my partner's intentions.

Table 1 continued.

Scales	Item #	Item
*N	48.	When it comes to people I know, I tend to be a skeptic.
*P	49.	When my partner is with others, I worry that he/she will not be faithful.
G	50.	I almost always believe what people tell me.

Notes: * = reverse-scored item; P = Partner Trust Scale item; N = Network Trust Scale item; G = Generalized Trust Scale item.

Table 2

Scale Characteristics of the Trust Inventory

Characteristic	Partner Trust	Network Trust	Generalized Trust
# of items	20	10	20
n	167	181	175
mean	73.02	33.62	71.34
standard deviation	13.70	6.93	11.39
Low score	37.00	14.00	33.00
High score	100.00	50.00	97.00
Range	63.00	36.00	64.00
alpha	.92	.87	.91
mean inter-item r	.37	.40	.33
test-retest r	.82	.74	.80

Inventory were compared to scores on extant measures of trust in order to determine concurrent validity; (2) the Trust Inventory scales were compared separately to measures of both global/generalized trust and relational trust in order to assess convergent and discriminant validity evidence; and (3) the Trust Inventory scales were compared to scores from measures of constructs theoretically related to trust in order to estimate the degree of construct validity.

Concurrent and Convergent/Discriminant Validity

It was expected that the Partner Trust scale would correlate more strongly with other relational measures of trust (Faith, Dyadic Trust, the Emotional Trust subscale of Specific Interpersonal Trust) than with instruments designed to measure a more global trust (i.e. Rotter's Interpersonal Trust Scale and Wrightsman's Trustworthiness subscale). Table 3 presents correlations between scales of the Trust Inventory and measures of both relational and global trust. As may be seen, Partner Trust is more highly correlated with faith, dyadic trust, and specific interpersonal trust than with the global trust measures of trust such as, Wrightsman's Trustworthiness of Human Nature or Rotter's Interpersonal Trust, indicating concurrent, as well as convergent and discriminant validity evidence.

By contrast, the Generalized Trust scale was also expected to correlate more strongly with global trust measures, thereby suggesting concurrent and convergent validity evidence. As indicated in Table 3, these results were not as clearly differentiated. Specifically, the Generalized Trust scale was related to Wrightsman's trustworthiness and Rotter's Interpersonal trust only slightly more strongly than it was

Table 3

Correlations Between Trust Inventory Scales and Alternative Measures

Variable	Partner Trust	Network Trust	Generalized Trust
Relational Trust			
Faith	0.82**	0.47**	0.42**
Dyadic Trust	0.82**	0.47**	0.40**
Specific Trust	0.77**	0.47**	0.45**
Global Trust			
Trustworthiness	0.29**	0.47**	0.46**
Interpersonal	0.41**	0.59**	0.56**

Notes: ** = p. < .01; Faith = the faith subscale of the Trust Scale (Holmes, Rempel, & Zanna, 1985); Dyadic Trust = the Dyadic Trust Scale (Lazelere & Huston, 1980); Specific Trust = the Specific Interpersonal Trust Scale (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982); Trustworthiness = the Trustworthiness subscale of the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (Wrightsman, 1974); Interpersonal = the Interpersonal Trust Scale (Rotter, 1967).

to faith, dyadic trust, and specific trust.

The Network Trust scale was expected to show moderate correlations with each of the two groups of trust measures. As may be seen in Table 3, the Network Trust scale was related moderately to faith, dyadic trust, and specific trust. Also, the scale showed similarly moderate, but slightly stronger relationships with Wrightsman's trustworthiness and Rotter's Interpersonal Trust scales, indicating that Network trust may be slightly more representative of global trust than relational trust. Whereas concurrent and convergent validity evidence are suggested by these results, clear discriminant validity evidence is lacking.

Construct Validity

It was anticipated that the scales of the Trust Inventory would correlate differentially with measures of attachment expressed toward romantic partners, such as liking and love. Table 4 presents correlations between the Trust Inventory Scales and Rubin's Love and Liking scales. Specifically, it was assumed that Partner Trust would have the strongest relationship with liking and loving of any of the Trust Inventory scales. As may be seen, Partner Trust showed the strongest correlations among the three with love and with liking. Similarly, one would expect the Trust Inventory scales to correlate differentially with the scales of Hendrick and Hendrick's Attitudes about Love scale measuring love styles. As is indicated in Table 4, Eros, Ludus, and Agape were most strongly related to Partner Trust as would be expected, whereas Pragma and Mania were most strongly related to Network Trust. Storge was not significantly related to any

Table 4

Correlations Between Trust Inventory Scales and Measures of Love

Variable	Partner Trust	Network Trust	Generalized Trust
Rubin's Love and Liking			
Love	0.50**	0.23**	0.29**
Liking	0.64**	0.37**	0.41**
Hendrick & Hendrick			
Eros	0.55**	0.26**	0.24**
Ludus	-0.60**	-0.47**	-0.38**
Storge	0.02	-0.03	0.06
Pragma	-0.21**	-0.26**	-0.17*
Mania	-0.23**	-0.29**	-0.16*
Agape	0.46**	0.19**	0.25**

Notes: * = p. < .05; ** = p. < .01; Rubin's Love and Liking = the Rubin Love and Liking Scale (Rubin, 1970); Hendrick & Hendrick = The Attitudes About Love Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).

of the three trust scales.

The three trust scales were also compared to other relational measures for the purposes of assessing construct validity. Table 5 presents correlations between each of the Trust inventory scales and selected relationship measures. As would be expected theoretically, loneliness was inversely related to all three scales, but not surprisingly was most strongly related to Network Trust and Partner Trust. Consistent with expectations, self-disclosure to the romantic partner was moderately related to Network Trust and Partner Trust, but was not significantly related to Generalized Trust. Satisfaction with one's current romantic relationship and commitment to that relationship as measured by the revised Marital Satisfaction and Commitment Scales were both most strongly related to Partner Trust, as would be expected.

The literature on trust strongly suggests that trust is an essential part of any close relationship. As a consequence, trust should be related to indices of emotional betrayals of, or by one's social network members. The Interpersonal Betrayal Scale measures betrayals by members of one's social network and because of this was expected to show the highest inverse correlations with Network Trust of the three Trust Inventory scales. As Table 5 indicates, this expectation was confirmed for the betrayal by others measure. By contrast, the betrayal of others measure was most strongly related to Generalized Trust.

Trust scores were also found to be related to selected emotional states and traits. Table 6 presents correlations between the Trust Inventory scales and measures of emotional states and traits. Interestingly, shyness is most strongly correlated with

Table 5

Correlations Between Trust Inventory Scales and Selected Relationship Measures

Variable	Partner Trust	Network Trust	Generalized Trust
Loneliness	-0.63**	-0.64**	-0.55**
Self-Disclosure	0.27**	0.14*	0.13
Satisfaction	0.81**	0.46**	0.35**
Commitment	0.69**	0.38**	0.33**
Betrayal of Others	-0.22**	-0.23**	-0.27**
Betrayal by Others	-0.32**	-0.46**	-0.33**

Notes: ** = p. < .01; Loneliness = The UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980); Self-Disclosure = a self-disclosure questionnaire (Chaikin & Derlega, 1976); Satisfaction = the revised version of the Marital Satisfaction and Commitment Scale(Jones, Adams, Monroe, & Berry, 1994); Commitment = the revised version of the Marital Satisfaction and Commitment Scale (Jones, Adams, Monroe, & Berry, 1994); Betrayal of Others = the Interpersonal Betrayal Scale (Jones & Burdette, 1994); Betrayal by Others = the Interpersonal Betrayal Scale (Jones & Burdette, 1994).

Table 6

Correlations Between Trust Inventory Scales and Selected Emotional States and Traits

Variable	Partner Trust	Network Trust	Generalized Trust
Shyness	-0.28**	-0.38**	-0.41**
Jealousy	-0.26**	-0.29**	-0.26**
Suspicion	-0.50**	-0.72*	-0.65**
Guilt	-0.25*	-0.37**	-0.06

Notes: * = p. < .05; ** = p. < .01; Shyness = the Social Reticence Scale (Jones & Briggs, 1986); Jealousy = the Interpersonal Jealousy Scale (Mathes & Severa, 1981); Suspicion = the Suspicion scale of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (Buss & Durkee, 1957); Guilt = the Guilt Inventory (Kugler & Jones, 1992).

Generalized Trust, followed by Network Trust and then Partner Trust. This seems to indicate that shy individuals distrust people in general more than specific other individuals. Jealousy in a romantic relationship was also inversely correlated with trust, but each of the three scales was significantly related to the construct, with Network Trust most strongly related. Measures of generalized suspicion were the most strongly (inversely) related, as one would expect, to Network Trust and Generalized Trust. And trait guilt as measured by the Guilt Inventory is related most strongly to Network Trust followed by Partner Trust. Trait Guilt was not significantly related to Generalized Trust. These findings are consistent with research on guilt suggesting that what people feel guilty about are transgressions against significant others (Jones, Kugler, & Adams, in press).

SECONDARY RESULTS

Conceptual Issues in the Measurement of Trust

In reviewing the literature, several issues regarding the nature of trust were raised. One of these issues, the distinction between a relational type of trust and a more generalized/global type of trust, was also considered in the development of the Trust Inventory, since both relational and generalized measures were included. Thus far, little attention has been given to differentiating between the two types of scales. In this section, measures already described will be examined in this regard. Whereas this analysis dealt with the issues underlying trust as a construct, it may also be considered

as providing validation for the Trust Inventory.

The correlations comparing the Trust Inventory scales and other measures were presented in Tables three through six. In order to further explore the relationship between relational trust and generalized trust, the intercorrelations of all the relational trust measures were computed and a mean correlation for each scale with all other relational trust measures was obtained. These measures included the Partner Trust Scale, the faith subscale of the Trust Scale, the Dyadic Trust Scale, and the Specific Interpersonal Trust Scale. The mean correlation was obtained by first converting each Pearson r to Fisher's z, calculating the mean and re-converting to r. For these computations, the absolute value of each correlation was used. The same procedure was used to form a global/generalized group consisting of the Interpersonal Trust Scale, the trustworthiness subscale, the Network Trust Scale, and the Generalized Trust Scale.

Results from the average correlation comparisons of each scale with the measures of the relational trust group and the global/generalized trust group are presented in Table 7. As can be seen, each scale in the relational trust group correlates very highly with the others in the relational trust group. This is further evidence of the concurrent validity of the Partner Trust Scale. These comparisons also demonstrate that each of the relational trust measures are better measures of relational trust than of global trust. This finding supports the convergent and discriminant validity of all the trust scales included. The Partner Trust Scale's correlations looked much as would be expected, but are not as highly correlated with all measures of trust. The faith subscale and Dyadic Trust Scale also correlated very highly with the rest of the group. The Specific Interpersonal

Table 7

Average Correlations Between Measures of Trust and Groups of Trust Measures

Measure	Relational Trust Measures	Global Trust Measures
Partner Trust	0.81	0.49
Faith	0.82	0.36
Dyadic Trust	0.81	0.36
Specific Interpersonal Trust	0.80	0.37
Mean	0.81	0.40
Trustworthiness	0.24	0.55
Interpersonal Trust	0.35	0.49
Network Trust	0.52	0.60
Generalized Trust	0.45	0.47
Mean	0.39	0.53

Notes: Partner Trust = the Partner Trust Scale of the Trust Inventory; Faith = the faith subscale of the Trust Scale (Holmes, Rempel, & Zanna, 1985); Dyadic Trust = the Dyadic Trust Scale (Lazelere & Huston, 1980); Specific Interpersonal Trust = the Specific Interpersonal Trust Scale (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982); Trustworthiness = the Trustworthiness subscale of the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (Wrightsman, 1974); Interpersonal Trust = the Interpersonal Trust Scale (Rotter, 1967); Network Trust = the Network Trust Scale of the Trust Inventory; Generalized Trust = the Generalized Trust Scale of the Trust Inventory.

Trust Scale, while still showing a very high average correlation, was the lowest of the group. No significant differences were found between the average correlations within the group. Also, as a coherent group, the mean of the average correlations of the relational trust measures is significantly higher than the mean of those measures' average correlations with the global trust measures, thus providing support for the distinction between the two types of trust.

A similar, but "mirror image" pattern of correlations emerged in comparisons involving the group of global trust measures. The Network Trust Scale proved to have the highest average correlation with the relational trust measures. This is as would be expected in that the scale measures trust for one's social network. But, the scale also showed a very high average correlation with the global trust measures, substantially higher even than the Generalized Trust Scale's average correlation. This suggests that whereas Network Trust is more closely associated with the construct of global trust, it is in fact a measure of both relational and global trust. The other scales in the group also correlated highly with each other, and no significant differences within the group were found. These results suggest that while the Generalized Trust Scale is a valid measure of a global type of trust, it is the least strongly differentiated measure of the Trust Inventory.

In addition, this procedure was also used to allow for the comparison of each scale's average correlations with a group of relational measures (including: the Rubin Love and Liking Scale, the Self-Disclosure Test, the revised Marital Satisfaction and Commitment Scale, the UCLA Loneliness Scale, and the Interpersonal Betrayal Scale)

and a group of traits and emotions (including: the Social Reticence Scale, the Interpersonal Jealousy Scale, and the suspicion subscale). Results from comparisons of the relational trust group of measures and the global trust group of measures with relational measures and trait/emotion measures are presented in Table 8. The overall pattern of results again supported the validity of the Partner Trust Scale. Its average correlation with the group of relational measures was significantly higher than its average correlation with the group of trait and emotion measures; however, the faith subscale seemed to show the strongest difference in performance across the two categories. At the level of the construct, the mean of the relational trust group was significantly higher for the relational measures than for the trait/emotion measures. It also can be seen that the group of global trust measures seemed to be more highly related to measures of traits and emotions than relational issues. These findings again, provided convergent and discriminant validity evidence and support for the distinction between the types of trust.

An Extreme Group Analysis

By dividing the sample into thirds based on their scores on each of the three scales on the Trust Inventory and analyzing the differences between the two extreme groups for each distribution, a "profile" of high and low partner trusters, network trusters, and generalized trusters was created. Table 9 presents the results from the Partner Trust analysis. It was found that high partner trust individuals scored significantly higher on measures of love for their romantic partner, liking of their romantic partner, self-disclosure, relationship satisfaction, commitment to their romantic

Table 8

Average Correlations Between Trust Measures and Groups of Relational and Trait/Emotion Measures

Measure	Relational Measures	Trait and Emotion Measures
Partner Trust	0.54	0.35
Faith	0.55	0.19
Dyadic	0.38	0.23
Specific Interpersonal Trust	0.49	0.21
Mean	0.49	0.25
Trustworthiness	0.19	0.28
Interpersonal Trust	0.25	0.41
Network Trust	0.37	0.49
Generalized Trust	0.35	0.46
Mean	0.29	0.41

Notes: Partner Trust = the Partner Trust Scale of the Trust Inventory; Faith = the faith subscale of the Trust Scale (Holmes, Rempel, & Zanna, 1985); Dyadic Trust = the Dyadic Trust Scale (Lazelere & Huston, 1980); Specific Interpersonal Trust = the Specific Interpersonal Trust Scale (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982); Trustworthiness = the Trustworthiness subscale of the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (Wrightsman, 1974); Interpersonal Trust = the Interpersonal Trust Scale (Rotter, 1967); Network Trust = the Network Trust Scale of the Trust Inventory; Generalized Trust = the Generalized Trust Scale of the Trust Inventory.

Table 9

Extreme Group Comparisons Between the Partner Trust Scale and Other Measures

Measure	High Partner Truster Mean	Low Partner Truster Mean	df	t
Love	52.46	44.08	267	10.30**
Liking	55.92	43.95	237	14.25**
Jealousy	81.78	89.21	160	3.39**
Satisfaction	69.88	50.72	210	21.81**
Commitment	41.69	31.39	280	17.41**
Shyness	42.38	49.06	307	4.92**
Suspicion	21.98	28.30	162	7.14**
Loneliness	32.26	46.33	129	9.02**
Eros	30.84	24.49	130	8.77**
Ludus	11.91	19.08	136	10.10**
Storge	24.34	24.07	163	0.36
Pragma	18.90	20.68	162	3.19**
Mania	18.35	21.05	163	3.36**
Agape	29.69	23.78	162	6.73**

Notes: ** = p. < .01; Love = the Love subscale of the Rubin Love and Liking Scale (Rubin, 1970); Liking = the Liking subscale of the Rubin Love and Liking Scale (Rubin, 1970); Jealousy = The Interpersonal Jealousy Scale (Mathes & Severa, 1981); Satisfaction = the Satisfaction subscale of the Marital Satisfaction and Commitment

Scale, revised for dating couples; Commitment = the Commitment subscale of the Marital Satisfaction an Commitment Scale, revised for dating couples; Shyness = The Social Reticence Scale (Jones & Briggs, 1986); Suspicion = the Suspicion subscale of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (Buss & Durkee, 1957); Loneliness = The UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980); Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania, and Agape = the subscales of the Attitudes About Love Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).

relationship, and eros, storge, and agape styles of love. Low relational trust individuals, on the other hand, scored significantly higher on measures of shyness, betrayal of others, betrayal by others, jealousy, suspicion, loneliness, and ludus, pragma, and manic styles of love.

Respondents scoring higher on social network trust showed a similar pattern of results. Results are presented in Table 10. High social network trust participants scored significantly higher on measures of love, liking, relational satisfaction, and commitment to a relationship, as well as the eros style of love. The low social network trusters scored significantly higher on measures of jealousy, shyness, loneliness, suspicion, and the ludus, pragma, and manic styles of love. The agape style of love was not significantly different for the two groups.

High generalized trusters also showed a similar pattern of results with two exceptions: no significant difference was found between high and low generalized trusters on the manic love style, and scored significantly higher on the agape style of love. Table 11 presents the results from the Generalized Trust analysis.

Although beyond the primary purpose of the present study, these and other data afforded the opportunity to explore interesting issues regarding relationships. More specifically, the personality/relationship variables of this study were subjected to analyses to determine differences associated with gender, length of romantic relationship, age, and ethnicity.

Overall, females were more trusting. Females scored higher on Partner Trust [$t(444) = 3.20$, $p < .01$], Network Trust [$t(446) = 3.00$, $p < .01$], and Generalized

Table 10

Extreme Group Comparisons Between the Network Trust Scale and Other Measures

Measure	High Network Truster Mean	Low Network Truster Mean	df	t
Love	49.48	45.96	282	3.72**
Liking	53.17	46.13	284	6.97**
Jealousy	80.10	89.90	160	4.07**
Satisfaction	65.88	54.98	234	8.90**
Commitment	38.76	33.22	283	7.21**
Shyness	40.43	50.25	285	7.73**
Suspicion	20.90	30.04	164	11.54**
Loneliness	31.74	47.32	120	10.67**
Eros	28.96	26.36	157	3.07**
Ludus	13.11	18.42	163	6.79**
Storge	24.34	24.94	161	0.74
Pragma	18.37	21.13	163	3.27**
Mania	17.97	21.39	163	4.26**
Agape	27.41	25.57	163	1.86

Notes: ** = p. < .01; Love = the Love subscale of the Rubin Love and Liking Scale (Rubin, 1970); Liking = the Liking subscale of the Rubin Love and Liking Scale (Rubin, 1970); Jealousy = The Interpersonal Jealousy Scale (Mathes & Severa, 1981); Satisfaction = the Satisfaction subscale of the Marital Satisfaction and Commitment

Scale, revised for dating couples; Commitment = the Commitment subscale of the Marital Satisfaction and Commitment Scale, revised for dating couples; Shyness = The Social Reticence Scale (Jones & Briggs, 1986); Suspicion = the Suspicion subscale of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (Buss & Durkee, 1957); Loneliness = The UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980); Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania, Agape = the subscales of the Attitudes About Love Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).

Table 11

Extreme Group Comparisons Between the Generalized Trust Scale and Other Measures

Measure	High Generalized Truster Mean	Low Generalized Truster Mean	df	t
Love	50.20	44.32	361	7.44**
Liking	53.21	44.72	354	9.35**
Jealousy	81.80	88.17	166	2.85**
Satisfaction	63.86	53.67	351	8.94**
Commitment	38.26	32.99	360	7.88**
Shyness	40.13	51.23	365	9.53**
Suspicion	20.82	28.95	170	10.67**
Loneliness	31.55	45.10	166	9.82**
Eros	29.29	26.42	163	3.73**
Ludus	13.78	18.36	168	5.84**
Storge	24.75	24.24	162	0.64
Pragma	18.51	20.78	169	2.63**
Mania	18.97	20.14	170	1.39
Agape	27.94	24.88	170	3.30**

Notes: ** = p. < .01; Love = the Love subscale of the Rubin Love and Liking Scale (Rubin, 1970); Liking = the Liking subscale of the Rubin Love and Liking Scale (Rubin, 1970); Jealousy = The Interpersonal Jealousy Scale (Mathes & Severa, 1981); Satisfaction = the Satisfaction subscale of the Marital Satisfaction and Commitment

Scale, revised for dating couples; Commitment = the Commitment subscale of the Marital Satisfaction and Commitment Scale, revised for dating couples; Shyness = The Social Reticence Scale (Jones & Briggs, 1986); Suspicion = the Suspicion subscale of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (Buss & Durkee, 1957); Loneliness = The UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980); Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania, Agape = the subscales of the Attitudes About Love Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).

trust [$t(444) = 4.22$, $p < .01$) than did males. They also scored higher on other measures of trust, such as Rotter's Interpersonal Trust [$t(443) = 2.28$, $p < .05$], the Specific Interpersonal Trust [$t(446) = 3.24$, $p < .01$], and Faith [$t(444) = 3.50$, $p < .01$]. Females also reported being more satisfied with their romantic relationships [$t(446) = 2.24$, $p < .05$], reported liking their partners more [$t(445) = 2.95$. $p < .01$] and showed higher scores on the Storge measure than males [$t(223) = 2.28$, $p < .05$]. Males were more suspicious [$t(235) = 2.40$, $p < .05$], but scored higher on measures of Ludus [$t(233) = 3.05$, $p < .01$], and Agape [$t(237) = 2.01$, $p < .05$].

It was found that the length of one's romantic relationship was related to one's scores on a number of measures. Those involved in a relationship which had lasted 36 months or longer reported higher levels of Partner Trust [$t(441) = 3.57$, $p < .01$], Network Trust [$t(443) = 3.12$, $p < .01$], and Generalized Trust [$t(441) = 2.65$, $p < .01$], and Wrightsman's trustworthiness [$t(439) = 2.52$, $p < .05$]. These individuals also scored higher on measures of love [$t(439) = 1.99$, $p < .05$], satisfaction [$t(443) = 1.93$, $p < .06$], and commitment [$t(439) = 3.68$, $p < .01$]. Those in relationships of length 35 months or less reported being more suspicious [$t(234) = 2.02$, $p < .05$], and were more likely to report having been betrayed by significant others [$t(204) = 2.56$, $p < .05$], as well as having betrayed significant others [$t(204) = 2.52$, $p < .05$]. These findings may offer support for the theories of how trust develops in a close relationship which indicate that trust evolves with time.

One's age was also found to influence an individual's scores on a number of measures. Those 23 years of age or older group scored higher on Rotter's Interpersonal

Trust [$t(441) = 2.08$, $p < .05$], and Wrightsman's Trustworthiness [$t(440) = 3.73$, $p < .01$] than those 22 years old, or younger. Not surprisingly, the younger participants (22 years of age or younger) were more likely to score high on Rubin's measure of love [$t(440) = 2.73$, $p < .01$], to be jealous [$t(230) = 2.90$, $p < .05$], and to experience Mania [$t(234) = 2.63$, $p < .01$) than those in the older group.

Finally, one's ethnic classification was also related to scores on some measures. Caucasian individuals were found to be more trusting overall. They scored higher on Partner Trust [$t(444) = 3.70$, $p < .01$], Network Trust [$t(446) = 3.37$, $p < .01$], Generalized Trust [$t(444) = 3.50$, $p < .01$], Rotter's Interpersonal Trust [$t(443) = 3.41$, $p < .01$], Faith [$t(444) = 2.22$, $p < .01$], and Dyadic Trust [$t(446) = 3.48$, $p < .01$]. Caucasians also scored higher than non-caucasian individuals on other relational measures including: love [$t(442) = 3.30$, $p < .01$], liking [$t(70) = 2.33$, $p < .05$], commitment [$t(442) = 2.05$, $p < .05$], and agape [$t(237) = 4.12$, $p < .01$]. Non-caucasian individuals scored higher on measures of suspicion [$t(235) = 3.27$, $p < .01$], ludus [$t(233) = 3.16$, $p < .01$] and pragma [$t(234) = 3.63$, $p < .01$].

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Each of the three scales of the Trust Inventory proved to be a reliable measure of differing conceptualizations of trust. Each met normal standards of internal reliability including coefficient alpha, mean inter-item correlation, and item-total correlation. In addition, the Trust Inventory proved to be a reliable instrument over time in that it yielded high test-retest correlations over a nine week period.

There is also substantial evidence regarding the validity of scale interpretations from the Inventory. This evidence includes information about each of the scale's concurrent, convergent/discriminant validity and construct validity. Concurrent and discriminant validity of the Partner Trust Scale was supported in that the scale correlated more strongly with other relational measures than with measures of global trust. This seems to indicate that, as conceptualized, Partner Trust is a type of relational trust directed toward a specific person instead of just a general tendency directed toward humanity. By contrast, the Generalized Trust Scale showed higher correlations with other global trust measures than with relational measures, although this evidence was not as strong as for the Partner Trust Scale. This, too, supports the conceptualization of Generalized Trust as a distinct type of trust -- one that is not well suited for use in making assumptions about specific relational situations or partners. Moderate correlations were expected between the Network Trust Scale and both relational trust

measures and global trust measures. This was based on the assumption that conceptually, network trust ought to be the trust level in between trust of one's romantic partner and the trust one places in people in general. In fact, the Network Trust Scale showed significant, but moderate correlations with measures of both relational and global trust. This finding does offer support for the intermediate level of relationship closeness and trust (in between romantic partner and people in general) that is experienced with friends and family. These findings support the concurrent and convergent/discriminant validity interpretations of the three instruments.

Evidence as to the construct validity was found by comparing scores on the three scales of the Trust Inventory with other relational and trait/emotion measures. Specifically, it was hypothesized that Partner Trust should be most strongly related to indices of relational attachment and satisfaction, whereas Generalized Trust should be more strongly related to trait/emotion measures. Network Trust should be related somewhat to each type of scale.

As was expected, Partner Trust showed the strongest relationship with love and liking, and with the eros (passionate), ludus (game-playing), and agape (selfless) styles of love. These findings are interesting in that these three styles seem to be the most "pure" in terms of what most people think relationships should (or should not) be like. It seems that Partner Trust may represent the kind of trust that we tend to think of as what we "should" experience in a satisfying romantic relationship. Love and Liking are, of course, an important part of romantic relationships, and it is interesting that liking was most strongly related to Partner Trust. This could be interpreted in that one of the things

we like about our respective romantic partners is that they behave in such a way that we can trust them.

The Partner Trust scale was also related to satisfaction with the current romantic relationship and commitment to that relationship. This finding is not at all surprising because trust is, after all, at the heart of what most people think of as fulfillment in the relational experience, or what we think of as a "good" relationship. An inverse relationship was also found between Partner Trust and loneliness, as well as with betrayal. The relationship between trust and betrayal is one that is expected, but more study as to the specific dynamics of the betrayal experience (e.g. what types of betrayal are most related to trust, etc.) is needed. A strong relationship between Partner Trust and self-disclosure was expected; however, only a moderate relationship was found. This finding, unfortunately, does not offer any clarification to the problem of inconsistency within the findings in the literature regarding the relationship between self-disclosure and relational trust.

Network Trust was found to be strongly related to the pragma, ludus (inverse), and manic styles of love, as well as suspicion (inverse). The findings regarding the love styles are interesting in that the ludus and mania (possessive) styles of love seem to be more related to the experience of passion. The pragma (logical) style, however, would have been expected to be more strongly related to trust in friends and family members. Suspicion, as a general personality characteristic, should be related somewhat to the experience of trust with friends and family, as well. Again, although a strong correlation was expected, a moderate correlation was found with self-disclosure. Network Trust was

not related to the storge style of love as would be expected. This is somewhat surprising because the storge style of love refers to a friendship-type of love which one would tend to associate with the social network list members. Interestingly, the strongest (inverse) correlations with loneliness, the measure of betrayal by others and trait guilt were with the Network Trust Scale. This is to be expected considering that each of these measures a construct that relates directly to one's social network. These findings seem to support best the utility of conceptualizing Network Trust as a separate "level" of trust.

Generalized Trust was more strongly related to measures of traits and emotions overall. Generalized Trust was not very strongly related to love and most of the love styles. It was however, strongly related to liking and moderately related to satisfaction, commitment, loneliness, and betrayal. This is not unexpected since generalized trust is conceptualized as an underlying personality trait which should be related to interpersonal functioning to some degree. But, it also demonstrates that using a generalized trust measure to look at trust in a romantic relationship may not be prudent. There was no significant relationship found between self-disclosure and Generalized Trust. Generalized Trust was highly related to other measures of personality traits such as shyness, jealousy, and suspicion, but there was no relationship found with trait guilt.

These findings concerning the scales of the Trust Inventory, including the differential relationships between relational measures and trait/emotion measures with respect to each of the three scales, support the validity of the scale interpretations of the instrument. Whereas the scale has proven to be a reliable and valid measure of the three types of trust, the results do seem to be stronger for the validity interpretation of Partner

Trust Scale than the other two. This finding may be due to the nature of the measures used to assess each scale's validity. More measures focusing on romantic relationships were included than measures focusing on either friends and family or people in general. Regardless, we can now begin to further study the role of trust in many situations with the use of only one instrument. This is an opportunity that has, as of yet, been unavailable.

Interestingly, the analyses do not provide evidence to support the distinction between an individual's level of trust and the trustworthiness estimate of the target individual/partner. The scales which ask respondents to focus on the other's trustworthiness seem to perform just as well as the measures which focus on the respondent's level of trust. Whereas an individual's level of trust undoubtedly influences his/her perceptions of another's trustworthiness, the two constructs are closely related and should to a great degree produce similar responses. Thus lack of results demonstrating the distinction between the two are difficult to interpret. Further study is needed to determine if the distinction should be made.

When focusing on the nature of trust without specific attention to any one measure of trust, a similar pattern of results emerges. Average correlations between groups of relational trust measures and global trust measures indicated again that the two types of trust are in fact distinct. Each of the relational trust measures were more closely related on average with other relational trust measures than on average with global trust measures. These findings offer support at the level of the construct that relational trust is not the same as generalized trust. The same pattern occurred with the global trust

measures in that each measure more closely correlated on average with the other global trust measures than with relational trust measures. However, the performance of the global trust measures in this regard was not as impressive. In addition, the average correlations of each of the relational measures was more closely related to the relationship variables than to the measures of traits/emotions on average. This does indicate that relational trust measures, on average measure what they purport to. Furthermore, global trust measures were more closely related to the average of the trait/emotion measures. This is to be expected since generalized trust is also conceptualized as a personality trait. Taken together, these findings support further the need for distinction between the different types of trust.

The study indicates both at the level of the Inventory and at the level of the construct that relational trust and global or generalized trust should be conceptualized as distinct experiences. A third type, social network trust, may also be important to consider. In addition, each of these types of trust is related to relational variables and emotional and personality traits differentially. Unfortunately, it is still unclear what the relationship is between an individual's trust of others at each of the three levels is to his/her perception of the target's trustworthiness. The two constructs are undoubtedly so interrelated that distinctions are not possible without further conceptualization.

The study offered insights into the process of trust, but several questions remain unanswered due to vulnerabilities in methods of data collection and/or results obtained. One potential problem arises in that participants were primarily caucasian college students. These college students tended to be in mainly romantic relationships for a short

period of time, and may not be representative of the general population. Further research is needed to assess the role of trust in longer term relationships, and using more representative samples. In addition, since the study involved self-report methods of data collection from only one individual in a romantic relationship, comparisons between the members of a dyad could not be made to assess how trust operates within the couple. It is possible, too, that behavioral ratings of an individuals, or ratings by others of an individual would provide information about the individual's trust orientation that self-report methods cannot assess.

The results obtained through the study provide somewhat ambiguous information with respect to Network Trust. It is clear that it is related specifically to members of the social network by its relationship to relational and trait/emotion measures specifically focusing on friends and family. But, its relationship to other variables has not clearly demonstrated the role of this level as a separate, distinct, and useful type of trust. Further study is needed to determine just how important this differentiation will be.

The primary purpose of the study was to create a reliable and valid inventory of the three conceptualized types of trust. This was accomplished, but the resulting Partner Trust and Generalized Trust scales have been shown to perform roughly equally to the best extant measures for measuring each specific type. The Network Trust is, however, a scale which measures a type of trust not presented before. This allows for a new avenue of research in the area, and opportunities for further investigation into the dynamics of the trust construct.

The findings from this research were unable to provide any clear evidence as to

the nature of the relationships that exist between Partner Trust and self-disclosure, specific types of betrayals, and issues of jealousy. These are questions which deserve further attention. Also, whereas gender differences were found in this study, some inconsistencies exist in the literature concerning these findings. Further replication is needed to clarify that this tendency is a consistent one with respect to the different types of trust.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Altman, I., & Taylor, D.A. (1973). Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Becker, C.S. (1987). Friendship between women: A phenomenological study of best friends. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 18, 59-72.

Biaggio, M.K. (1980). Assessment of anger arousal. Journal of Personality Assessment, 44, 289-298.

Boss, R.W. (1978). Trust and managerial problem-solving revisited. Group and Organizational Studies,3, 331-342.

Braiker, H.G., & Kelley, H.H. (1979). Conflict in the development of close relationships. In R.L. Burgess & T.L. Huston (Eds.), Social exchange in developing relationships (pp. 135-168). New York: Academic Press.

Brehm, S.S. (1985). Intimate Relationships. New York: Random House.

Broder, S.N. (1987). Helping students with self-disclosure. School Counselor, 34, 182-187.

Buss, A.H. & Durkee, A. (1957). An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21, 343-349.

Butler, J.K. (1983). Reciprocity of trust between professionals and their secretaries. Psychological Reports, 53, 411-416.

Butler, J.K. (1986). Reciprocity of dyadic trust in close male-female relationships. The Journal of Social Psychology, 126, 579-591.

Canary, D.J., & Cupach, W.R. (1988). Relational and episodic characteristics associated with conflict tactics. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5, 305-325.

Canary, D.J., & Spitzberg, B.H. (1989). A model of the perceived competence of conflict strategies. Human Communication Research, 15, 630-649.

Carver , M.D., & Jones, W.H. (1992). The family satisfaction scale. Social Behavior and Personality, 20, 71-84.

Chaikin, A.L., & Derlega, V.J. (1976). Self-disclosure. In J.W. Thibaut, J.T. Spence, and R.C. Carson (Eds.). Contemporary Topics in Social Psychology. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Chun, K., & Campbell, J.B. (1975). Notes on the internal structure of Wrightsman;s measure of trustworthiness. Psychological Reports, 37, 323-330.

Collins, N.L., & Read, S.J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 644-663.

Corazzini, J.G. (1977). Trust as a complex multi-dimensional construct. Psychological Reports, 40, 75-80.

Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive. New York: Wiley.

Deigh, J. (1989). Morality and Personal Relationships. In G. Graham & H. Lafollette (Eds.), Person to Person (pp. 106-123). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. Conflict Resolution, 2, 265-279.

Dion, K.L. & Dion, K.K. (1973). Correlates of romantic love. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41, 51-56.

Dion, K.L. & Dion, K.K. (1976). Love, liking, and trust in heterosexual relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 2, 187-190.

Driscoll, J.W. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 44-56.

Driscoll, R., Davis, K.E., & Lipetz, M.E. (1972). Parental interference and romantic love: The Romeo & Juliet effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24, 1-10.

Erikson, E.H. (1950). Childhood and Society. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E.H. (1963). Childhood and society. New York: Norton. Second edition.

Fichman, M. & Levinthal, D.A. (1991). Honeymoons and the liability of adolescence: A new perspective on duration dependence in social and organizational relationships. Academy of Management Review, 16, 442-468.

Garrett, R. (1989). Love's way. In G. Graham & H. Lafollette (Eds.), Person to Person (pp. 124-148). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Giffin, K. (1967). The contribution of studies of source credibility to a theory of interpersonal trust in the communication process. Psychological Bulletin, 68, 104-120.

Giordano, P.C., Cernkovich, S.A., & Pugh, M.D. (1986). Friendships and delinquency. American Journal of Sociology, 91, 1170-1202.

Goldberg, M. (1987). Patterns of disagreement in marriage. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 21, 42-52.

Golembiewski, R.T., & McConkie, M. (1975). The centrality of interpersonal trust in group processes. In C.L. Cooper (Ed.), Theories of Group Process (pp.131-185). London: Wiley.

Grace, G.D. & Schill, T. (1986). Social support and coping style differences in subjects high and low in interpersonal trust. Psychological Reports, 59, 584-586.

Grauerholz, E. (1987). Balancing the power in dating relationships. Sex Roles, 17, 563-571.

Hale, J.L., Lundy, J.C., & Mongeau, P.A. (1989). Perceived relational intimacy and relational message content. Communication Research Reports, 6, 94-99.

Helm, D.J. (1986). Commitment and the loving relationship. Education, 106, 419-420.

Hemsley, G., & Doob, A. (1978). The effect of looking behavior on perceptions of a communicator's credibility. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 8, 136-144.

Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1983). Liking, loving and relating. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S.S. (1986). A theory and method of love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 392-402.

Hill, C.T., Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L.A. (1976). Breakups before marriage: The end of 103 affairs. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 147-168.

Holmes, J.G. (1981). The exchange process in close relationships: Microbehavior and macromotives. In M.J. Lerner & S.C. Lerner (Eds.), The justice motive in social behavior (pp. 261-284). New York: Plenum.

Holmes, J.G. (1991). Trust and the appraisal process in close relationships. In W.H. Jones & D. Perlman (Eds.), Advances in personal relationships (pp. 57-106). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Holmes, J.G., & Rempel, J.K. (1989). Trust in Close Relationships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), Close Relationships (pp. 187-220). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Johnson-George, C., & Swap, W. (1982). Measurement of specific interpersonal trust: Construction and validation of a scale to assess trust in a specific order. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 1306-1317.

Jones, D.C. (1991). Friendship satisfaction and gender: An examination of sex differences in contributors to friendship satisfaction. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8, 167-185.

Jones, W.H., Adams, J.M., Monroe, P.R., & Berry, J.O. (1994). Development of the Marital Satisfaction and Commitment scales. Unpublished manuscript.

Jones, W.H., & Briggs, S.R. (1986). Manual for the Social Reticence Scale. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Jones, W.H., & Burdette, M.P. (1994). Betrayal in close relationships. In A.L. Weber and J. Harvey (Eds.). Perspectives on close relationships. New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Jones, W.H., Kugler, K., & Adams, P.L. (In press). Adult transgressions and the experience of guilt. In K. Fischer & J.P. Tangney (Eds.). Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride: Empirical studies of self-conscious emotions. New York: Guilford.

Jones, W.H., & Russell, D. (1982). The social reticence scale: An objective instrument to measure shyness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 629-631.

Kee, R., & Knox, R. (1970). Conceptual and methodological considerations in the study of trust and suspicion. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 14, 357-366.

Kelley, H.H., & Thibaut, J.W. (1978). Interpersonal Relations: A Theory of Interdependence. New York: John Wiley.

Kugler, K., & Jones, W.H. (1992). On conceptualizing and assessing guilt. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 318-327.

Kurdek, L.A. (1988). Relationship quality of gay and lesbian cohabitating couples. Journal of Homosexuality, 15, 93-118.

Larzelere, R.E. & Huston, T.L. (1980). The dyadic trust scale: Toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 595-604.

Lee, J.A. (1973). The colors of love: An exploration of the ways of loving. Don Mills, Ontario: New Press.

Levinger, G. (1979). A social exchange view of the dissolution of pair relationships. In R.L. Burgess & T.L. Huston (Eds.), Social exchange in developing relationships (pp. 169-193). New York: Academic Press.

Lindskold, S. (1978). Trust development, the GRIT proposal, and the effects of conciliatory acts on conflict and cooperation. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 772-793.

Livingston, J.S. (1969). Pygmalion in management. Harvard Business Review, 47, 81-89.

MacDonald, A.P., Kessel, V.S., & Fuller, J.B. (1972). Self-disclosure and two kinds of trust. Psychological Reports, 30, 143-148.

Mathes, E.W., & Severa, N. (1981). Jealousy, romantic love, and liking: Theoretical considerations and preliminary scale development. Psychological Reports, 49, 23-31.

Miller, N., Maruyama, G., Beaber, R.J., & Valone, K. (1976). Speed of speech and persuasion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 615-624.

Mills, J.K., Taricone, P.F., Bordieri, J.E. (1990). Oral character and alcoholism. Psychology - A Journal of Human Behavior, 27, 1-6.

Pereira, M.J., & Austrin, H.R. (1980). Interpersonal trust as a predictor of suggestibility. Psychological Reports, 47, 1031-1034.

Ponzetti, J.J., & Cate, R.M. (1986). The developmental course of conflict in the marital dissolution process. Journal of Divorce, 10, 1-15.

Pratkanis, A.R., & Aaronson, E. (1992). Age of Propaganda: The everyday use and abuse of persuasion. New York: Freeman.

Raciti, M., & Hendrick, S.S. (1992). Relationships between eating disorder characteristics and love and sex attitudes. Sex Roles, 27, 553-564.

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

Roark, A.E., & Sharah, H.S. (1989). Factors related to group cohesiveness. Small Group Behavior, 20, 62-69.

Rosenman, M.F. (1978). Liking, loving, and styles of loving. Psychological Reports, 42, 1243-1246.

Rotenberg, K.J. (1984). Sex differences in children's trust in peers. Sex Roles, 11, 953-957.

Rotter, J.B. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. Journal of Personality, 35, 651-665.

Rotter, J.B. (1971). Generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. American Psychologist, 26, 443-452.

Rotter, J.B. (1980). Interpersonal trust , trustworthiness, and gullibility. American Psychologist, 35, 1-7.

Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 265-273.

Rubin, Z. (1973). Liking and loving: An invitation to social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Russell, D., Peplau, L., & Cutrona, C. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 472-480.

Schill, T., Toves, C., & Ramanaiah, N. (1980). Interpersonal trust and coping with stress. Psychological Reports, 47, 1192.

Scott, C.L. (1980a). Interpersonal trust: A comparison of attitudinal and situational factors. Human Relations, 33, 805-812.

Scott, D. (1980b). The causal relationship between trust and the assessed value of management by objectives. Journal of Management, 6, 157-175.

Simpson, J.A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 971-980.

Stack, L. (1978). Trust. In H. London & J.E. Exner (Eds.), Dimensions of Personality (pp. 561-599). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Steel, J.L. (1991). Interpersonal correlates of trust and self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 68, 1319-1320.

Stein, K.B., Soskin, W.F., & Korchin, S.J. (1973). Dimensions of the Rotter Trust Scale. Psychological Reports, 35, 999-1004.

Tardy, C.H. (1988). Interpersonal Evaluations: Measuring attraction and trust. In C.H. Tardy (Ed.), For the study of human communication: Methods and instruments for observing, measuring, and assessing communication processes (pp. 269-284). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing.

Taylor, D.A. & Altman, I. (1966). Intimacy-scaled stimuli for use in studies of interpersonal relations. Psychological Reports, 19, 729-730.

Vondracek, F.W., & Marshall, M.J. (1971). Self-disclosure and interpersonal trust: An exploratory study. Psychological Reports, 28, 235-240.

Walster, E., Walster, G.W., & Traupmann, J. (1978). Equity and premarital sex. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 82-92.

Wright, T.L. & Kirmani, A. (1977). Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and shoplifting in high school. Psychological Reports, 41, 1165-1166.

Wrightsman, L.S. (1964). Measurement of philosophies of human nature. Psychological Reports, 14. 743-751.

Wrightsman, L.S. (1974). Assumptions About Human Nature: A Social-psychological Approach. Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole.

Wrightsman, L.S. (1992). Assumptions About Human Nature: Implications for Researchers and Practitioners. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Second Edition.

Zimbardo, P.G., & Leippe, M.R. (1991). The psychology of attitude change and social influence. New York: McGraw-Hill.

VITA

Laurie L. Couch was born in Huntsville, Alabama on September 14, 1970. In 1992, she graduated Summa cum Laude with a Bachelor of Arts degree from Mississippi State University. In August, 1992 she entered the University of Tennessee as a doctoral student in Psychology. She received her Master of Arts degree in Psychology in December, 1994.