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24. One of the reasons I chose my sexual partner is because of our similar backgrounds.
25. Before I made love with my sexual partner, I considered how s/he would reflect on my family.
26. It was important to me that my sexual partner be a good parent.
27. I thought about the implications for my career before I made love with my sexual partner.
28. I didn’t have sex with my partner until after I had considered our hereditary backgrounds.
29. When sex with my partner isn’t going right, I become upset.
30. If my sexual relationship with my partner ended, I would become extremely despondent and depressed.
31. Sometimes I am so sexually attracted to my partner that I simply can’t sleep.
32. When my partner sexually ignores me, I feel really sick.
33. Since my partner and I started having sex, I have not been able to concentrate on anything else.
34. If my partner became sexually involved with someone else, I wouldn’t be able to take it.
35. If my partner doesn’t have sex with me for a while, I sometimes do stupid things to get her/his sexual attention.
36. If my partner were having a sexual difficulty, I would definitely try to help as much as I could.
37. I would rather have a sexual problem myself than let my partner suffer though one.
38. I could never be sexually satisfied unless first my partner was sexually satisfied.
39. I am usually willing to forsake my own sexual needs in order to let my partner achieve her/his own sexual needs.
40. My partner can use me the way s/he chooses in order for him/her to be sexually satisfied.
41. When my partner is sexually dissatisfied with me, I still accept him/her without reservations.
42. I would do practically any sexual activity that my partner wanted.
43. It would bother me if my sexual partner neglected my needs.
44. If I were to make love with a sexual partner, I’d take that person’s needs and feelings into account.
45. If a sexual partner were to do something sensual for me, I’d try to do the same for him/her.
46. I expect a sexual partner to be responsive to my sexual needs and feelings.
47. I would be willing to go out of my way to satisfy my sexual partner.
48. If I were feeling sexually needy, I’d ask my sexual partner for help.
49. If a sexual partner were to ignore my sexual needs, I’d feel hurt.
50. I think people should feel obligated to repay an intimate partner for sexual favors.
51. I would feel somewhat exploited if an intimate partner failed to repay me for a sexual favor.
52. I would probably keep track of the times a sexual partner asked me for a sensual pleasure.
53. When a person receives sexual pleasures from another, s/he ought to repay that person right away.
54. It’s best to make sure things are always kept “even” between two people in a sexual relationship.
55. I would do a special sexual favor for an intimate partner, only if that person did some special sexual favor for me.
56. If my sexual partner performed a sexual request for me, I would probably feel that I’d have to repay him/her later on.
57. I responded to the following items based on:
   (A) A current sexual relationship.
   (B) A past sexual relationship.
   (C) An imagined sexual relationship.

Sexual Relationship Scale
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Clark and Mills (1979) proposed a theory of relationship orientation based on the rules governing the giving and receiving of benefits. An exchange-relationship orientation was defined as one in which benefits are given on the assumption that a similar benefit would be reciprocated. The recipient of a benefit in such a relationship presumably incurs a debt to make a suitable, comparable return. By contrast, a communal-relationship orientation was defined by Clark and Mills as one in which benefits are given on the assumption that they are in response to some need. In

1Address all correspondence to William E. Snell, Jr., Department of Psychology, Southeast Missouri State University, One University Plaza, Cape Girardeau, MO 63701; e-mail: wesnell@semo.edu
communal relationships, concern for a partner’s welfare mediates interpersonal giving rather than anticipation of a reciprocated benefit. Sexual relationships may also be viewed from a communal perspective, which emphasizes caring and concern for a partner’s sexual needs and preferences, or else from an exchange perspective, which emphasizes a quid pro quo approach to sexual relations.

The Sexual Relationship Scale (SRS; Hughes & Snell, 1990) is an objective self-report instrument that was designed to measure communal and exchange approaches to sexual relationships. More specifically, the SRS was developed to assess chronic dispositional differences in the type of orientation that people take toward their sexual relations. Some individuals take a communal approach to their sexual relations in which they feel responsible for and involved in their partner’s sexual satisfaction and welfare. They want to respond to their partner’s sexual needs and desires. In this sense, they contribute to their partner’s sexual satisfaction and welfare in order to please the partner and to demonstrate a desire to respond to that person’s sexual welfare. Moreover, people who take a communal approach to sexual relations also expect their partner to be responsive and sensitive to their own sexual welfare and needs. In contrast, those who approach sexual relations from an exchange orientation do not feel any special responsibility for their partner’s sexual satisfaction and welfare. Nor do they feel any inherent need or desire to be attuned to or responsive to their partner’s sexual pleasure. Rather, they give sexual pleasure only in response to sexual benefits they have received in the past or have been promised in the future. An exchange approach to sexual relations often involves sexual debts and obligations. The individuals involved in this type of sexual relationship are usually concerned with how many sexual favors they have given and received, and the comparability of these sexual exchanges. To examine these ideas, the SRS was developed to measure exchange and communal approaches to sexually intimate relations. The SRS was based on the Communal Orientation scale developed by Clark, Ouellette, Powell, and Milberg (1987) and the Exchange Orientation scale developed by Clark, Taraban, Ho, and Wesner (1989) and was intended to represent an extension of their ideas.

Description

The SRS consists of 24 items arranged in a 5-point Likert-type format, in which respondents rate how characteristic the SRS items are of them from (A) not at all characteristic of me to (E) very characteristic of me.

Response Mode and Timing

Typically, individuals respond to the items on the SRS by indicating their responses on a computer scan sheet, using a response range from A to E. The questionnaire usually takes about 10–15 minutes to complete.

Scoring

People are asked to respond to the SRS items by indicating how much each statement describes them, using a 5-point Likert-type scale: (0) not at all characteristic of me, (1) slightly characteristic of me, (2) somewhat characteristic of me, (3) moderately characteristic of me, and (4) very characteristic of me. The SRS items are coded so that A = 0, B = 1, C = 2, D = 3, and E = 4. Items 6, 8, 10, and 18 are reverse coded so that 0 = 4, 1 = 3, 2 = 2, 3 = 1, and 4 = 0. The SRS consists of two subscales, each containing eight separate items. The labels and items for these two subscales are (a) The Exchange Approach to Sexual Relations (Items 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18) and (b) The Communal Approach to Sexual Relations (Items 1, 3, 4, 9, 13, 15, 21, and 24). Finally, the eight items on each subscale are summed so that higher scores indicate a stronger communal and exchange approach, respectively, to sexual relations.

Reliability

The internal consistency of the two SRS subscales was determined by computing Cronbach alpha coefficients for both females and males, as well as for the combined group of subjects (Hughes & Snell, 1990). For the sexual communion subscale, the coefficients were .77 for males, .79 for females, and .78 for both together. The coefficients for the sexual exchange subscale were .59 for males, .67 for females, and .67 for both. These findings indicate that the two subscales had sufficient internal consistency to justify their use in research. Other analyses have revealed that among females the two SRS subscales are essentially orthogonal to one another (Hughes & Snell, 1990).

Validity

Factor analysis (a principal components factor analysis with oblique rotation) was performed on the SRS items to determine whether the statements on the SRS would form two separate clusters. Because several items were unrelated to the initial factor solutions, they were first deleted, and the same factor analysis procedure was reconducted. The pattern matrix loadings for the females clearly provided support for the expected two factor structure, with conceptually similar items loading together (the results for the males were less clear, given the small sample size). Factor I consisted of sexual communion items (eigenvalue = 4.81, percent of variance = 20%), and Factor II contained sexual exchange items (eigenvalue = 2.98, percent of variance = 12%).

Hughes and Snell (1990) also found that males reported significantly higher scores than females on the sexual exchange subscale, but no difference was found for the sexual communion subscale. Further evidence for the validity of the SRS was obtained by correlating the SRS subscales with Clark’s Communal and Exchange Orientation scales. The sexual communion
subscale was significantly and positively correlated with the Communal Orientation scale for females and for the subjects as a whole. Significant and positive correlations were also found between the sexual exchange orientation subscale and scores on the Exchange Orientation scale for males, females, and both together. In addition, the SRS was found to be related to relationship satisfaction. Among males, a significant negative relationship was found between an exchange approach to sexual relations and their relationship satisfaction. The analysis for the females, in contrast, revealed a statistically significant positive correlation between relationship satisfaction and a communal approach to sexual relations.

These patterns of correlations thus provide preliminary evidence for the construct validity of the SRS, in that (a) those individuals characterized by a stronger communal approach to their sexual relations were expected to report greater satisfaction with their intimate relationships and to approach their partners with a more caring and compassionate perspective and (b) those individuals characterized by an exchange approach to their sexual relations were expected to have a similar exchange approach to their adult romantic relationships and to report less satisfaction with their romantic relationships.
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Exhibit

**Sexual Relationship Scale**

*Instructions*: Listed below are several statements that concern the topic of sexual relationships. Please read each of the following statements carefully and decide to what extent it is characteristic of you. Some of the items refer to a specific relationship. Whenever possible, answer the questions with your current partner in mind. If you are not currently dating anyone, answer the questions with your most recent partner in mind. If you have never had a relationship, answer in terms of what you think your responses would most likely be. Then, for each statement fill in the response on the answer sheet that indicates how much it applies to you by using the following scale:

A = *Not at all* characteristic of me.
B = *Slightly* characteristic of me.
C = *Somewhat* characteristic of me.
D = *Moderately* characteristic of me.
E = *Very* characteristic of me.

Note: Remember to respond to all items, even if you are not completely sure. Your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence. Also, please be honest in responding to these statements.

1. It would bother me if my sexual partner neglected my needs.
2. When I make love with someone, I generally expect something in return.
3. If I were to make love with a sexual partner, I’d take that person’s needs and feelings into account.
4. If a sexual partner were to do something sensual for me, I’d try to do the same for him/her.
5. I’m not especially sensitive to the feelings of a sexual partner.
6. I don’t think people should feel obligated to repay an intimate partner for sexual favors. (R)
7. I don’t consider myself to be a particularly helpful sexual partner.
8. I wouldn’t feel all that exploited if an intimate partner failed to repay me for a sexual favor. (R)
9. I believe sexual lovers should go out of their way to be sexually responsive to their partner.
10. I wouldn’t bother to keep track of the times a sexual partner asked for a sensual pleasure. (R)
11. I wouldn’t especially enjoy helping a partner achieve their own sexual satisfaction.
12. When a person receives sexual pleasures from another, s/he ought to repay that person right away.
13. I expect a sexual partner to be responsive to my sexual needs and feelings.
14. It’s best to make sure things are always kept “even” between two people in a sexual relationship.
15. I would be willing to go out of my way to satisfy my sexual partner.
16. I would do a special sexual favor for an intimate partner, only if that person did some special sexual favor for me.
17. I don’t think it’s wise to get involved taking care of a partner’s sexual needs.
18. If my sexual partner performed a sexual request for me, I wouldn’t feel that I’d have to repay him/her later on. (R)
19. I’m not the sort of person who would help a partner with a sexual problem.
20. If my sexual partner wanted something special from me, s/he would have to do something sexual for me.
21. If I were feeling sexually needy, I’d ask my sexual partner for help.
22. If my sexual partner became emotionally upset, I would try to avoid him/her.
23. People should keep their sexual problems to themselves.
24. If a sexual partner were to ignore my sexual needs, I’d feel hurt.

Note. R = reverse-coded item.

Index of Sexual Satisfaction
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The Index of Sexual Satisfaction (ISS) is a short-form scale designed to measure the degree of dissatisfaction in the sexual component of a dyadic relationship.

Description

The ISS contains 25 category-partition (Likert-type) items, some of which are worded negatively to partially offset the potential for response set bias. Each item is scored on a relative frequency scale as shown in the scoring key of the instrument. Obtained scores range from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating greater degrees of sexual discord. The ISS has a clinical cutting score of 30 such that scores above that value indicate the presence of a clinically significant degree of sexual discord in the relationship. The ISS can be used with all English speaking populations aged 12 or older.

The readability statistics for the ISS are Flesch Reading Ease: 79; Gunning’s Fog Index: 8; and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level: 5.

Response Mode and Timing

The ISS is a self-report scale that is normally completed in 5–7 minutes.

Scoring

Items 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 23 must first be reverse scored by subtracting the item response from $K+1$, where $K$ is the number of response categories in the scoring key. After making all appropriate item reversals, compute the total score as $S = (\sum X_i - N)(100) / [(K−1)N]$, where $X$ is an item response, $i$ is item, $K$ is the number of response categories, and $N$ is the number of properly completed items. Total scores remain valid in the face of missing values (omitted items) provided the respondent completes at least 80% of the items. The effect of the scoring formula is to replace missing values with the mean item response value so that scores range from 0 to 100 regardless of the value of $N$.

Reliability

Cronbach’s alpha is .92 and the SEM is 4.24. Test-retest reliability is not available.

Validity

The known groups validity coefficient is .76 as determined by the point biserial correlation between group status (troubled vs. untroubled criterion groups) and the ISS scores. Detailed information about content, factorial, and construct validity are reported in the WALMYR Assessment Scale Scoring Manual, which is available from the publisher.

Other Information

The proper use of the WALMYR assessment scales is easily mastered, and the scales can be readily understood by qualified professional practitioners. These measurement tools are not intended for use by untrained individuals. The scales are simple, powerful devices that, when used by trained professionals, are capable of revealing both minor and serious problems that individuals might have in many areas of personal and social functioning. They are not intended for use by persons who are not trained to deal with such problems and should be used only by competent professionals, researchers, scholars and those who are engaged in supervised study and training.

The ISS is a copyrighted commercial assessment scale and may not be copied, reproduced, altered, or translated into other languages. The scale may not be administered.
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