Factors of Attraction and Relationship Satisfaction: The Love-is-Blind Bias and Perceived Risk of Infidelity

Jeanie Shults
Abstract

Attraction and relationship satisfaction have been topics of increased investigation over the past several decades (Yela & Sangrador, 2001; Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Hall & Taylor, 1976). The love-is-blind bias hypothesizes that individuals within fulfilling relationships exhibit the phenomenon of rating their partner’s attractiveness higher than self-ratings of their own attractiveness, a product of positive partner illusions (Swami & Furnham, 2008; Gagné, & Lydon, 2004). Using the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) and novel measures for attraction and perceived infidelity, this study applied the love-is-blind hypothesis against relationship satisfaction and perceived risk of infidelity. The creation of two new subscales for measuring the love-is-blind bias, self-perceived love-is-blind bias (SPB) and externally-perceived love-is-blind bias (EPB) were instrumental in computations. Significant positive interactions between both scales of the love-is-blind bias and both attraction, and relationship satisfaction were found.

Perceived risk of infidelity was negatively related to all positive scales. The findings suggest a system of interactions among the love-is-blind bias, perceived risk of infidelity, relationship satisfaction, and overall partner attraction. Preliminary analysis suggests perceived past infidelity may also predict lessened relationship satisfaction in current relationships.
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Factors of Attraction and Relationship Satisfaction: 

The Love-is-blind Bias and Perceived Risk of Infidelity

Intimate relationships satisfy more than basic biological prerogatives; those reporting rich social lives exhibit higher levels of both psychological and physiological health, live longer and are less likely to commit suicide than socially isolated individuals (House, Landis & Umberson, 1988). As such, a broad variety of research has been conducted on relationship factors, a large part of which focuses upon the internal processes of romantic attachments. Mate-seeking behaviors, a common topic of evolutionary psychologists, have been widely examined in the literature (Barber, 1995; Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Buss, 1989; Gangestad, 1993; Gitter, Lomranz & Saxe, 1982). With rising percentages of non-traditional families and escalating rates of divorce, the last several decades have also been marked by research investigating functions predicting relationship satisfaction (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2013; Funk & Rogge, 2007; Hendrick, 1988; Meeks, Hendrick & Hendrick, 1998). Conversely, evolutionary psychology has also focused on the dark side of attraction and relationships: the processes underlying infidelity and how it relates within the framework of human attraction (Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Nannini & Meyers, 2000; Wilson, Mattingly, Clark, Weidler, & Bequette, 2011).

**Love-is-blind bias**

An interesting phenomenon reported in the human perception of attraction is that individuals in committed relationships rate their partner’s attractiveness significantly higher than their own (Swami & Furnham, 2008). This is known as the love-is-blind bias (Gagné, & Lydon, 2004; Swami, Furnham, Georgiades, & Pang, 2007). Past studies have found that both female and male participants display the bias similarly, with little gender differences documented.
(Swami, Stieger, Haubner, Voracek, & Furnham, 2009). As a tactic for relationship satisfaction management, the love-is-blind bias may lead to higher levels of reported relationship satisfaction. Physical attraction factors often scale similarly with other factors of stable relationships such as intimacy, commitment, and passion (McNulty, Neff, & Karney, 2008; Yela & Sangrador, 2001). Several researchers have suggested that the love-is-blind bias is less a function of objective attractiveness rather than partner idealism, positive partner illusions, or optimism bias (Barelds-Dijkstra & Barelds, 2008; Fowers, Lyons, Montel, & Shaked, 2001; van Lange & Rusbult, 1995). Positive partner illusions, or the pattern of participants to rate partners’ perceived attractiveness as greater than empirical measures of attractiveness, have been associated with relationship satisfaction (Martz, Verette, Arriaga, Slovik, Cox, & Rusbult, 1998; Murray & Holmes, 1993; Murray, 1999; Murray & Holmes, 1997, Yela & Sangrador, 2001). These illusions have also been found to be related to greater short- and long-term measures of relationship stability, self-perception, and self-esteem (Flannagan, Marsh & Fuhrman, 2005; Taylor & Brown, 1988).

**Infidelity**

A simple scan of news media outlets and recent box-office hits reveal the pervasive interest humanity has in infidelity. This isn’t delegated only to the general public; in the past decades, infidelity has grown as a popular subject within attraction studies and evolutionary psychology (Buss, 1995; Buunk, Angleitner, Oubaid, & Buss, 1996; DeSteno, Bartlett, Braverman, & Salovey, 2002; Spanier & Margolis, 1983; Thompson, 1983). Infidelity is a tremendously difficult subject to operationalize efficiently, with contrasting opinions existing on the treatment of how to conduct infidelity research, what causes infidelity, why it occurs, and even how infidelity is even defined (Blow & Hartnett, 2007). High levels of variance in past
research and a lack of cohesive literature suggest that little hard evidence exists to explain why infidelity occurs and the factors that predict infidelity (Glass & Wright, 1992; Olson, Russell, Higgins-Kessler, & Miller, 2002; Prins, Buunk, & VanYperen, 1993; Weis & Jurich, 1995). Due to the ethical implications of imposing empirical manipulations of infidelity, most research has focused upon self-report data and the perception of infidelity. One classic experiment has reported that women rate that partners’ emotional infidelity causes more distress than physical infidelity, whereas males report significantly more distress over perceived physical infidelity than emotional (Buss, Larsen, Westen, & Semmelroth, 1992). Infidelity has only become widespread as a topic of investigation in the past several decades, though humanity has certainly anecdotally hypothesized reasons why infidelity occurs (Allen & Baucom, 2004; Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001; Buunk, 1987).

**Measuring relationship satisfaction**

Various measures of relationship satisfaction in use over the last several decades include the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMS), the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS), the Couples Satisfaction Index (CSI), the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS), among others (Crane, Middleton, & Bean, 2000; Funk & Rogge, 2007; Hendrick, 1988; Schumm, Nichols, Schectman, & Grinsby, 1983; Spanier, 1976; Vaughn & Baier, 1999). Some inventories consist of hundreds of questions in rather large question batteries, while others are short Likert-scaled questionnaires. In this case, the amount and variety of inventories indicate the difficulty of assessing relationship satisfaction (Graham, Diebels, & Barnow, 2011). The Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) was selected for use to evaluate relationship satisfaction due to the scale’s well-validated measure of relationship satisfaction while being only seven questions in length.
The current research

The current study applied the love-is-blind hypothesis to perceived risk of infidelity, relationship satisfaction, and self-reported measures of attraction. This study hypothesized that participants will confirm the love-is-blind bias by rating partners as more attractive than themselves. It was also expected that the love-is-blind bias will positively relate to relationship satisfaction and negatively relate to perceived risk of infidelity. Finally, it was hypothesized that moderate love-is-blind bias would predict higher relationship satisfaction and lower perceived risk of infidelity, whereas high love-is-blind bias would predict lower relationship satisfaction and higher rates of perceived risk of infidelity.

Method

Participants

Forty-five (45) undergraduates enrolled in psychology classes in at a university in the southeast United States volunteered for this study. Seventeen of the forty-five respondents were not currently in a committed relationship and only completed demographic variables and the infidelity battery. The final sample, including single respondents, included 11 males and 34 females with a mean age of 26.89 years ($SD = 8.67$). One participant indicated a homosexual preference, two bisexual, and the remaining 42 participants indicated that they were heterosexual. Participants ranged in age from 19 to 52 years and included both traditional and nontraditional students. A diverse population of races was represented within the sample, the majority of which were Caucasian (68%); minorities represented include African-American (12%), Hispanic (12%), American Indian/Native Alaskan (4%), and Asian/Pacific Islander (4%). Of the sample, 15 participants (33.3%) reported being single, two in casual dating (4.4%), and 28 were within committed relationships (62.3%). All participants within the committed relationship
status indicated monogamy. The majority of participants cohabitate with partners (75%), while a 25% do not live together. Of the sample, more than 46% of participants had children and 54% did not.

Measures

All participants completed a four-page questionnaire comprised of four subject areas, presented in the following order:

Demographics General demographic questions such as gender, age, sexual orientation, ethnicity and current relationship status were presented. Additionally, participants were asked to report their relationship length if applicable, in years and months, as well as listing the ages of any applicable children and if they currently resided with their parents.

Partner attraction Nine questions were used to examine aspects of attraction (see Appendix A). Each question required participants rating on a 9-point Likert-type scale (1=least, 9=most). Items including rating partner physical attractiveness, physical attractiveness of self, and the extent to which they feel attracted to their partner physically, emotionally, and intellectually were examined. A factor analysis was conducted to determine a single factor score for attraction to partner as a subset of attraction/attractiveness scores. Three questions were chosen for this scale to represent overall attraction (What is the extent to which you find yourself attracted to your partner physically?, What is the extent to which you find yourself attracted to your partner emotionally?, and What is the extent to which you find your partner’s personality characteristics attractive?). A principle components analysis indicated that the measures were valid (75.45% of the variance explained, with no factor loading less than .819). The factor score for attraction to partner was computed by averaging the responses to those three items (Cronbach’s α = .82).
**Relationship satisfaction** A modified version of the *Relationship Assessment Scale* (Hendrick, 1998) was utilized in the third section of the questionnaire, wherein participants rated factors of their current relationship. Scoring for the RAS was computed by taking the average of the questions, “how well does your partner meet your needs”, “how good is your relationship compared to most”, and “to what extent has your relationship met your original expectations”. A factor analysis was completed to ensure validity (74.61% of the variance explained to a minimum of .863 factor loading). Cronbach’s $\alpha$ coefficient for the modified RAS was .91.

**Infidelity** Four questions were used to examine participants’ histories with cheating, perceived risk of partner infidelity, and likelihood of participant to cheat on their partner. An unused item from the RAS (“How often do you wish you hadn’t gotten into this relationship”) was averaged with the rating of partners’ perceived likelihood to cheat. This stood as the measure of perceived risk of infidelity (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .90$).

In addition to the preceding four scales, two subscales were created from the attraction scale. These subscales, self-perceived love-is-blind bias (SPB) and externally-perceived love-is-blind bias (EPB), were used to assess the differences in the love-is-blind bias.

**Self-perceived love-is-blind bias (SPB)** This difference score was computed by subtracting the rating of *How would you rate your own physical attractiveness* from *How would you rate your partner’s physical attractiveness*.

**Externally-perceived love-is-blind bias (EPB)** This difference score was computed by subtracting the rating of *How do you feel others would rate your own physical attractiveness* from *How do you feel others would rate your partner’s physical attractiveness*. A factor analysis of EPB and SPB revealed a significant load factor of .935 with 87% of variance explained.
(Cronbach’s α = .852); a Pearson’s correlation, calculated for redundancy, was additionally found to be significant, r(28) = .748, p < .01.

**Procedure**

All participants were recruited at a nontraditional branch campus of Florida State University from psychology classes; see Appendix B for sample consent form. No compensation was provided upon completion of surveys. Due to the sensitive nature of the data collected, each pen-and-paper survey was packaged in individual privacy folders. Three data collectors were trained and given a written protocol for conducting the survey. This protocol included a script statement involving the nature of the study, how to collect informed consent, and directions for maximizing privacy and anonymity of participants. All participants provided informed consent and were given contact information for voluntary debriefing (no usage of deception within this study). Participants were given approximately fifteen minutes to finish the survey. At the end of the survey, participants returned completed surveys within privacy folder in a different location from the written informed consent sheet.

**Results**

Three forms of data analyses were used to analyze the dataset: paired t-tests, Pearson’s r-correlation coefficient, and analyses of variance (ANOVA). Two types of analyses were performed to test the first hypothesis to confirm the existence of the love-is-blind bias.

**Paired subject t-test**

To analyze the relationship between attractiveness ratings, paired t-tests were conducted in three permutations. Self-ratings versus partner-ratings, and partner-ratings versus evaluation of external partner ratings did not yield significant data. However, significance was found when comparing evaluation of external partner attractiveness to evaluation of external self-
attractiveness, \( r(27) = 3.936, p < .001 \). Evaluation of external partner attractiveness received higher ratings than evaluation of external self-attractiveness, confirming the love-is-blind bias. This is consistent with past studies findings that found that participants rate their own attractiveness systematically lower than their own attractiveness (Swami & Furnham, 2008).

**Correlations**

Pearson’s correlation coefficients were calculated among the following variables: EPB, SPB, perceived risk of infidelity, general partner attraction, and relationship satisfaction. The results of this test are available in Table 1. These results indicate statistically significant associations between attraction and satisfaction, \( r(28) = .732, p < .01 \); attraction and perceived risk of infidelity, \( r(28) = -.608, p < .01 \); satisfaction and perceived risk of infidelity, \( r(28) = -.825, p < .01 \); SPB and satisfaction, \( r(28) = .511, p < .01 \); SPB and perceived risk of infidelity, \( r(28) = -.405, p < .05 \); and EPB and satisfaction, \( r(28) = .413, p < .05 \). This indicates that as attraction increases, so does relationship satisfaction; as these values increase, perceived risk of infidelity decreases. This may be an effect of optimism bias. The correlation of both SPB and EPB to satisfaction may indicate that the love-is-blind model may have stronger associations with satisfaction than to attraction. SPB reflects a larger range of association to satisfaction than EPB, negatively correlating to perceived risk of infidelity; that is to say, as self-evaluative love-is-blind bias increases, perceived risk of infidelity decreases.

**Analyses of Variance**

Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were performed to assess interactions. Externally-evaluative love-is-blind bias (EPB) and self-evaluative love-is-blind bias (SPB) scores were coded into levels of ‘high’, ‘moderate’, ‘low’, and ‘zero/reverse’; these parameters were generated by natural breaks in reported scores. EPB did not yield significant interaction with
attraction, satisfaction, or perceived risk of infidelity. However, SPB was found to have a significant effect upon satisfaction, $F(1, 24) = 4.874, p < .05$. Additional analyses were performed to assess the impact of gender differences on various scales. No significant differences were found in any of the three main measures and gender, indicating that males and females respond similarly across attraction, $F(1, 26) = 1.642, p > .05$; satisfaction, $F(1, 26) = 1.540, p > .05$; and perceived risk of infidelity, $F(1, 26) = 2.130, p > .05$. To further assess the relevance of infidelity, a 2x2 ANOVA using dichotomous measures of cheating (history of cheating X participant likelihood of cheating) was conducted on relationship satisfaction, also leading to a lack of significant data, $F(1, 26) = 2.400, p > .05$, suggesting that history of cheating or probability of self-infidelity in the future does not predict satisfaction. However, interactions were found when analyzing perceived partner infidelity in current or past relationships against the general attraction scale, $F(1, 26) = 7.501, p < .05$, suggesting that participants are more concerned with partners’ infidelity than their own. This assumption is supported by the further findings of a statistically significant main effect between participant’s level of emotional attraction to partner and perceived partner infidelity, $F(1, 26) = 10.103, p < .05$. These two analyses indicate that if you believe your partner has cheated on you or is likely to cheat on you, you have lessened emotional attraction and decreased relationship satisfaction.

**Discussion**

The results of this study support the findings of previous research confirming the love-is-blind bias. Over 80% of the population surveyed fit the expected pattern. The remaining 19% included 11% who indicated that they were in fact more physically attractive than their partners, with the remaining eight percent rating their partners equally as attractive as themselves. This bias does not seem to be mediated or moderated by age, gender, relationship length, or history of
infidelity. There do seem to be significant associations between the two separate measures of the love-is-blind bias (EPB and SPB), as well as associations with attraction, relationship satisfaction, and perceived risk of infidelity. Measures of attraction, satisfaction, and infidelity were also all correlated (see Table 1). One point of interest is that high rates of relationship satisfaction and attraction were reported with very low perceived risk of infidelity. These rates are less than the reported average of cheating (Blow & Hartnett, 2007), and may be explained by optimism bias: that is, that individuals have unrealistic expectations of positive outcomes. Alternatively, the general pattern of high relationship satisfaction ($M=8.129$, $SD=1.061$) and attraction ($M=8.024$, $SD=0.956$) versus low perceived risk of infidelity ($M=1.929$, $SD=1.676$) may be explained by impression management, or the tendency to report more positively to meet expectations.

The self-evaluative and externally-evaluative subscores used to compute the love-is-blind bias may offer insight into future directions on how to measure the love-is-blind bias. Self-evaluative love-is-blind bias was computed as a difference score calculated by deducting How would you rate your own physical attractiveness? from How would you rate your partner’s physical attractiveness?. The results from that scale ($M=2.21$, $SD=2.13$) follow previous findings about the love-is-blind bias in that participants readily and systematically rated partners higher in attractiveness than themselves (Swami et al., 2009). The second difference score for external-evaluative love is blind bias was calculated by deducting How do you feel others would rate your own physical attractiveness? from How do you feel others would rate your partner’s physical attractiveness?. The results of this score ($M=1.39$, $SD=1.87$) differed from the self-evaluative score in 64% of the population. In some individual cases, EPB and SPB differed considerably. While self-evaluative and externally-evaluative scores yielded a significant correlation, there
may be patterns of difference between them. This suggests that research is merited within examining the difference between how an individual perceives attractiveness versus how they believe the rest of the world perceives attractiveness.

The results from the Pearson’s correlation test may be viewed in Table 1. The specific lack of significance between attraction scores and both love-is-blind scores indicates that feeling attracted to one’s partner does not necessarily require an inflated perception of that partner’s physical attractiveness. Due to the small sample size, the lack of significance is suggested as a preliminary result. It may be the case that with larger sample sizes, the lack of interaction will prove insightful to the relationship between attraction and physical attractiveness.

Measures of attraction were statistically significantly correlated with relationship satisfaction, such as that the more attractive you perceive your partner to be, the more satisfied you are with your relationship. These scores negatively correlate with perceived risk of infidelity, indicating that participants that were high in attraction and satisfaction perceived to be at a lower risk of partner infidelity. This is supported by the strongest correlation of all assessed, the relationship between perceived risk of infidelity and satisfaction, $r(28) = -.825$.

A large confirmation of the love-is-blind bias may lie within the rejection of the novel EPB scale in terms of the ANOVAs performed. As EPB measures the perception of the participants’ objective rating of attractiveness, it may simply be confirmation that self-rated attractiveness is more pertinent to the proposed bias. Therefore, individuals may remain conscious of the fact that they view their partner more favorably than the rest of the world would. In contrast to the lack of significant ratings of EPB, SPB did significantly interact with satisfaction. Higher rates of either SPB and EPB did not, however, support the hypotheses projected after confirmation of the love-is-blind bias; that is, moderate love-is-blind bias did not
correlate or predict lessened relationship satisfaction or heightened perception of infidelity. Instead, the love-is-blind bias appears to have a strong positive correlation with satisfaction without diminishing returns at the highest levels.

The findings of this study, while significant, merit further investigation. Shortcomings of the study such as the small sample size (N=45), underrepresentation of males, remain valid criticisms of resulting statistical analyses. As a pilot study for a new method of measuring the love-is-blind bias, the results suggest that future efforts may find systematic differences between EPB and SPB. Future applications may include replication across a larger population, or with extensions such as using matched dyads in committed relationships. Another validating factor that could be added to future studies would be to control for objective attractiveness by rating matched dyads and comparing objective measures to self-reported ratings.

In conclusion, the present study increases the body of work performed on the love-is-blind bias by confirming the bias and introducing new methods of measurement. It also indicates that future directions of love-is-blind researchers may include controlling for objective attractiveness, and examining the influence of undue optimism on the love-is-blind hypothesis. Optimism bias could be a third variable to explain both higher ratings of attractiveness and low perceived risk of infidelity and could prove to be an interesting body of future work. The confirmation of the love-is-blind bias remains a challenge to previous bodies of work regarding the tendency of individuals to self-inflate personal attributes in the presence of social comparisons (Brown, 1986; Taylor & Koivumaki, 1976). Another contrast is the negative correlation between partner attractiveness and perceived risk of infidelity. This tendency of high partner attractiveness ratings and low perceived risk of infidelity defies many prior studies which indicate that high rates of physical attractiveness are a risk factor for infidelity (Buss,
Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, Choe, Lim, Hasegawa, Hasegawa, & Bennett, 1999; Harris, 2003; Wiederman & Kendall, 1999). The previous assumption that partners with high attractiveness are more likely to take part in extra-relationship affairs, when contrasted with the findings of the current study, provide implications for future avenues of research.
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Appendix A
Attraction and Satisfaction Questionnaire

Please **DO NOT** write your name on this form.

1. Please indicate your gender.
   - Male
   - Female

2. Please indicate your age.
   _____ years

3. Please indicate your sexual orientation.
   - Heterosexual
   - Homosexual
   - Bisexual

4. What is your ethnicity?
   - Caucasian
   - African American
   - Asian/Pacific Islander
   - American Indian/Native Alaskan
   - Hispanic
   - Other: _____________

5. Please indicate your current relationship status.
   - Single
   - Casual Dating
   - Committed relationship

   **If “single” or “casual dating”, please proceed to question 31.**

6. Please indicate the length of your current relationship.
   _____ years, _____ months

7. Is your current relationship monogamous (ie, you and your partner are exclusive)?
   - Yes
   - No
8. Do you and your partner currently live together?
   o Yes
   o No

9. Are you married to your partner?
   o Yes
   o No
   o Engaged

10. Do you and your partner have children?
    o Yes; born of this relationship
    o Yes; pre-existing from past relationships
    o No

    If “no”, proceed to question 12.

11. Do your children live at home?
    o Yes
    o No

12. Please list the ages of your youngest and oldest child(ren):
Youngest: _____ years, _____ months; Oldest: _____ years, _____ months

13. How did you meet your partner?
    o Work
    o Social event (in person)
    o Mutual friends
    o Online dating site
    o Other: ___________

Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 – 9, 1 being LEAST and 9 being MOST.

14. How would you rate your partner’s physical attractiveness?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
    Least attractive          Moderately attractive        Very attractive

15. How do you feel others would rate your partner’s physical attractiveness?
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
    Least attractive          Moderately attractive        Very attractive
16. How would you rate your own physical attractiveness?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  
   Least attractive  Moderately attractive  Very attractive

17. How do you feel others would rate your own physical attractiveness?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  
   Least attractive  Moderately attractive  Very attractive

18. What is the extent to which you find yourself attracted to your partner physically?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  
   Least attracted  Moderately attracted  Very attracted

19. What do you feel is the extent to which your partner is attracted to you physically?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  
   Least attracted  Moderately attracted  Very attracted

20. What is the extent to which you find yourself attracted to your partner emotionally?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  
   Least attracted  Moderately attracted  Very attracted

21. What is the extent to which you find your partner’s personality characteristics attractive?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  
   Least attractive  Moderately attractive  Very attractive

22. How intellectually stimulating do you find your partner?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  
   Least stimulating  Moderately stimulating  Very stimulating

23. How well does your partner meet your needs?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  
   Not well  Moderately well  Very well

24. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  
   Not satisfied  Moderately satisfied  Very satisfied
25. How good is your relationship compared to most?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not good</td>
<td>Moderately good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. How often do you wish you hadn’t gotten into this relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not often</td>
<td>Moderately often</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not well</td>
<td>Moderately well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. How much do you love your partner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. How many problems are there in your relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not many</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Very many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. What do you feel the likelihood is of your partner cheating in your current relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not likely</td>
<td>Moderately likely</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. What do you feel the likelihood of you cheating on your partner is?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not likely</td>
<td>Moderately likely</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Do you feel that you have been cheated on, in this or past relationships?

- Yes
- No

33. Have you cheated on a partner in this or past relationships?

- Yes
- No
Appendix B
Informed Consent Sheet

STUDENT CONSENT FORM
For the Research Study Entitled
The Relationship between Attraction and Relationship Satisfaction

You are invited to participate in a research study aimed at investigating the relationship between partner attraction and relationship satisfaction. We hope to learn more about the significance of attraction in long-term relationships via this research.

This survey has been developed to gain information regarding particulars of attraction, both physical and emotional, and relationship satisfaction. We understand that the content of the survey is personal and sensitive; however, it is very important to answer the questions in the survey as honestly as possible. To protect the potential risk of a breach of confidentiality, all information that you provide will remain completely anonymous to the extent allowed by law. Moreover, any data you provide will not be identifiable to you.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete a short questionnaire. Your participation will require approximately 10 to 15 minutes of your time. You may withdraw from participation at any time, without penalty; however, after your data have been collected, you will be unable to withdraw your data because there will be no way to identify your individual information.

Your decision whether to participate will not jeopardize your future relations with Florida State University or the Psychology Department at Florida State University. Information collected through your participation may be published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional conference or meeting.

If you have any questions, we invite you to ask them now. If you have questions later, you may contact the student researcher Beth Shults at bshults@fsu.edu or Professor Kelley Kline at kkline@pc.fsu.edu or 850-770-2252. Both will be happy to answer any questions you may have. For more information regarding your rights as a research participant you may contact the FSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) at 850-644-8633 or you may access their website at http://www.fsu.research.edu.

Please print your name and sign below if you give consent to participate in this study.

Your name: ________________________

Your signature ___________________________ Date _____________
### Table 1. Correlations between the love-is-blind bias and supplemental scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SPB bias</td>
<td>.748**</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>-.405*</td>
<td>.511**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EPB bias</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>-.357</td>
<td>.413*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.608**</td>
<td>.732**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceived Risk of Infidelity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.825**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Modified Relationship Assessment Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *p < .05, **p < .001.*