

A Complete but Very-Few-Frills Guide to the
“Codependent” Acquaintance Description Form (ADF-C5)

Paul H. Wright

Department of Psychology

University of North Dakota

March, 1998

Introductory Comment

The style and content of this guide assumes some, but not a great deal, of familiarity with the ADF-C5 on the part of the reader. My purpose in preparing the guide was to provide interested investigators with all they would need to use the ADF-C5 for their own projects (or decide not to), and little else. With this purpose in view, this booklet contains:

1. A brief overview of what the ADF-C5 is and where it came from. This overview includes a table listing the names and definitions of the scales, and a separate table summarizing data about its factor structure.
2. A table listing alpha coefficients and test-retest correlations for the scale and factor scores. This section includes a not-quite-irrelevant discussion of the uses of reliability information, and an allusion to the issue of validity.
3. A brief but adequate discussion of the very simple process of basic scoring and administration, followed by a perhaps not-quite-so simple note (and set of suggestions) about the calculation and use of factor scores.
4. Especially for users who may be interested in using the ADF-C2 on a trial basis for assessment and feedback purposes in relationship counseling, I have included some observations and suggestions about standard (z) scores.
5. A not quite relevant discussion of a 67.67% failed effort to develop measures of codependent denial.
6. A brief note on my suggested criterion for identifying “codependent relaters.”
7. An appendix with all the material one should need to use the ADF-C5, including test booklets, scoring forms, and standard score conversion guides.

I invite anyone with questions, comments, suggestions or concerns about the ADF-C5 and its use to contact me at any time.

Paul H. Wright
1901 24th Ave S #18
Grand Forks, ND 582021
Phone: (701) 772-6442
e-mail: paul_wright@und.nodak.edu

A (Very) Brief Overview of The Acquaintance Description Form-C5 (ADF-C5)

The ADF-C5 is an expanded version of the ADF-F2 (Lea, 1988; Wright, 1985; 1997 [unpub]), a self-report technique for measuring various aspects of a respondent's relationship with a specified acquaintance or "Target Person." The expansion entailed adding scales to assess presumably "dysfunctional" forms of relating, specifically those commonly ascribed to individuals identified clinically as "codependents." Arriving at the present version of the "codependent" ADF was a long and involved process that took us through four preliminary versions, hence the "C5" designation (see Wright & Wright, 1990; 1991; 1995).

The ADF-C5 yields scores ranging from 0 to 18 on 28 different scales. The respondent's score on a given scale is based on her/his estimate, on a 0 to 6-point continuum, of the frequency or probability of occurrence of each of three statements about her/his relationship with a designated partner. Thus, the ADF-C5 consists of 84 statements plus an unscored filler item to round out the length of the instrument at 85 items. The names, abbreviations, and definitions of the scales are listed in Table 1. The scales are grouped under broader headings according to their more general (intended) conceptual content.

Several Principle Components analyses utilizing varimax rotations resulted in solutions that were virtually identical across samples, and for which differences between women and men were minor. Each analysis yielded three factors. I labeled Factor 1 "Positive, Rewarding Relationship" (PRR), Factor 2 "Defensive and Overprotective Caretaking" (DOPCT), and Factor 3 "Commitment/Involvement" (Com/Inv). Table 2, summarizing the results of our most recent analysis, lists the scales loading .45 or higher on each of these factors. My practice --and my recommendation-- is to calculate factor scores for each subject and to use those scores as the primary variables in research on codependent relating and similar relationship issues.

Table 1. Names and Definitions of the ADF-C5 Scales

Relationship Commitment/Involvement

Voluntary Interdependence (VID): the degree to which the subject commits free or otherwise uncommitted time to interaction with her/his Target Person (TP) apart from pressures or constraints external to the relationship itself.

Activity Dependency (ActD): the degree to which the subject regards her/his own pattern of interests and activities as contingent upon those of TP.

"Normal" Permanence (Perm): the degree to which the subject regards her/his relationship with TP to be either difficult or inappropriate to dissolve in spite of changing circumstances and, in effect, as permanently binding.

Exaggerated Permanence (ExPerm): the degree to which the subject regards the dissolution of her/his relationship with TP a possibility with such dire consequences that (s)he maintains --or would maintain-- the relationship in spite of serious problems or personal unhappiness.

Exclusiveness (Excl): the degree to which the subject regards her/his relationship with TP as strictly dyadic by expecting and claiming proprietary access to specified activities and mutually involving forms of interaction.

Personalism and Emotional Quality of the Relationship

Person-qua-Person (PQP): the degree to which the subject responds to her/his TP with a personalized interest and concern, i.e., as unique, genuine, and irreplaceable in the relationship.

Salience of Emotional Expression (Emex): the degree to which the subject regards overt expressions of positive affect such as liking, affection, and personal appreciation an essential aspect of her/his relationship with TP.

Direct Benefits (Interpersonal Rewards) in the Relationship

Utility Value (UV): the degree to which the subject regards her/his TP as willing to use her/his time and resources to help the subject meet needs or reach personal goals.

(Continued next page)

Stimulation Value (SV): the degree to which the subject regards her/his TP as interesting, stimulating, and capable of fostering an expansion or elaboration of the subject's knowledge, perspectives, or repertoire of favored activities.

Ego Support Value (ESV): the degree to which the subject regards her/his TP as encouraging, reassuring and, in general, behaving in ways that help the subject maintain an impression of her/himself as a competent and worthwhile person.

Self-affirmation Value (SAV): the degree to which the subject regards her/his TP as behaving in ways that facilitate the recognition and expression of the subject's more important and highly valued self-attributes.

Security Value (SecV): the degree to which the subject regards her/his TP as safe and non-threatening due to a disinclination to behave in ways that would betray trust, cause embarrassment, or draw attention to the subject's points of weakness or self-doubt.

Tension/Strain in the Relationship (Maintenance Difficulty)

Maintenance Difficulty - Personal (MD-P): the degree to which the subject finds her/his relationship with TP frustrating, inconvenient, or unpleasant due to one or more of TP's habits, mannerisms, or personal characteristics.

Maintenance Difficulty - Situational (MD-S): the degree to which the subject finds her/his relationship with TP frustrating, inconvenient, or unpleasant due to factors that are circumstantial or impersonal.

Absorption of Self in the Relationship

Worth Dependency (WorD): the degree to which the subject regards her/his own sense of self-worth as contingent upon the presence of positive/complimentary responses and the absence of negative/uncomplimentary responses from TP.

Fear of Abandonment (FearAb): the degree to which the subject regards it likely that TP would terminate their relationship if (s)he considered anything in the relationship to be troublesome or inconvenient.

Jealousy (Jeal): the degree to which the subject feels resentful, deprived or threatened at the prospect of TP's forming close and rewarding relationships with other people.

Control and Responsibility in the Relationship

Control - Behavior (ConBeh): the degree to which the subject attempts to maintain influence over TP, usually in indirect and manipulative ways.

Control - Anxiety (ConAnx): the degree to which the subject feels uneasy if (s)he regards her/himself as having too little influence in her/his relationship with TP, and/or TP as having too much, too much.

Exaggerated Responsibility (ExResp): the degree to which the subject regards her/his own behavior and attitudes as a predominant influence in determining TP's actions, attitudes, and overall level of happiness and well-being.

Rescue Orientation (Resc): the degree to which the subject regards her/himself as a predominant influence in drawing TP away from personally destructive and socially ineffective behaviors, attitudes and values.

Change Orientation (Chng): the degree to which the subject regards her/himself a continuing influence in encouraging and sustaining changes in behavior, attitudes and values that TP needs to make to become an adequately effective and well-adjusted person.

Excitement/Challenge (Excit): the degree to which the subject regards any problems or difficulties in her/his relationship with TP as a source of stimulation and personal challenge, and as a factor in keeping the relationship from becoming dull or routine.

(Continued next page)

Denial

Externalization of Blame (ExBlm): the degree to which TP attributes irresponsibility, selfishness, or thoughtlessness on TP's part to extenuating circumstances in TP's life rather than to her/his personal shortcomings or unwholesome attitudes.

Miscellaneous Measures

Social Regulation (SocReg): the degree to which the subject regards specified forms of interaction in her/his relationship with TP to be influenced by social norms and the expectations of relevant other persons.

General Favorability (GF): the degree to which the subject responds to her/his TP in a globally positive or negative way. A non-substantive scale used as a correction factor for selected purposes.

*Minimization of Difficulty (MinDif): the degree to which the subject claims to regard problems and difficulties in her/his relationship with TP as minor or easily resolved in the face of evidence to the contrary.

*Unrealistic Positive Expectations (PosEx): the degree to which the subject claims to expect positive changes in TP and improvements in their relationship, sometimes in the face of evidence to the contrary.

*These scales were originally part of a largely failed effort to measure codependent denial.

User-relevant and (I Hope) User-friendly Information

Reliability

Cronbach's alphas and test-retest correlations (Pearson r_s) for the ADF-C5 scales, including the three factor scores, are shown in Table 3. In developing the ADF-C5 scales, I have not been unduly concerned about generating scales with especially high internal consistency, but have taken pains to establish adequate test-retest reliability over short periods of time. Most knowledgeable observers note that it is unusual to obtain high internal consistency with few items. Moreover, I am convinced, along with such experts as Guilford (1954) and Rosenthal (1995) that the importance of internal consistency is markedly overrated. Even so, I have several reasons for taking comfort in alpha coefficients that are in the moderate to high ranges, i.e., .60 or above. Table 3 indicates that several of the ADF-C5 scales fall a bit lower than this level and that two of them, Change Orientation for women and Social Regulation for men, fall *more* than a bit lower. Given the generally moderate to high alpha coefficients, however, I am content to live with the slight discomfort of lower-than-desirable levels for a few of them.

I suspect that the importance researchers attach to internal consistency in scale construction is that it is an easy way of convincing ourselves of two things: 1) that subjects are not responding to our scale items randomly (capriciously, arbitrarily, or carelessly), and 2) that our scales are tapping meaningful and more or less unitary concepts. Unfortunately; achieving high internal consistency does not do either of these things very well. With respect to random responding, measures of internal consistency do only half the job. Whereas high internal consistency indicates that subjects are not responding randomly, low internal consistency does not mean they are. Even if subjects respond unrandomly (discerningly and uniformly) to individual scale items, internal consistency will nonetheless be low if intercorrelations among the scale items are low to moderate. About the only safe way to detect random responding is to assess the stability of scales over short periods of time, i.e., calculate test-retest reliability. For this reason, I have made a concerted and, I believe, generally successful effort to develop scales with high test-retest reliability. The test-retest correlations presented in Table 3 were based on two administrations of the ADF-C5 to subjects

describing partners in long-standing heterosexual relationships, mostly marriages. The two administrations were separated by time intervals of ranging from one day to one week. Why short time periods? My concern was to demonstrate non-random

Table 3. Alpha Coefficients and Test-Retest Correlations (Pearson r_s) of the ADF-C5 Scales and Factor Scores

<u>Scales</u>	<u>Alpha Coefficients</u>		<u>Test-Retest Correlations</u>	
	<u>Women (n=341)</u>	<u>Men (n=248)</u>	<u>Women (n=50)</u>	<u>Men (n=43)</u>
Voluntary Interdependence	.78	.73	.89	.96
Activity Dependency	.73	.63	.91	.81
“Normal” Permanence	.60	.63	.92	.84
Exaggerated Permanence	.76	.77	.87	.94
Exclusiveness	.82	.81	.91	.91
Person-qua-Person	.74	.71	.87	.93
Salience of Emotional Expression	.58	.73	.82	.90
Utility Value	.87	.74	.96	.94
Stimulation Value	.78	.77	.94	.92
Ego Support Value	.82	.80	.91	.92
Self-affirmation Value	.86	.78	.96	.89
Security Value	.66	.63	.91	.86
Maintenance Difficulty-Personal	.58	.53	.82	.80
Maintenance Difficulty-Situational	.78	.70	.86	.77
Worth Dependency	.63	.65	.78	.76
Fear of Abandonment	.74	.55	.93	.79
Jealousy	.71	.76	.87	.86
Control -Behavior	.62	.56	.76	.79
Control -Anxiety	.68	.76	.83	.77
Exaggerated Responsibility	.66	.62	.88	.82
Rescue Orientation	.71	.56	.88	.81
Change Orientation	.44	.59	.83	.86
Excitement/Challenge	.56	.62	.79	.84
Externalization of Blame	.65	.65	.83	.92
Social Regulation	.59	.47	.77	.66
General Favorability	.80	.69	.94	.86
Minimization of Difficulty	.73	.73	.86	.76
Positive Expectations	.67	.53	.92	.95
<u>Factor Scores</u>				
Factor I (PRR)	.88	.82	.96	.98
Factor II (DOPCT)	.73	.74	.89	.95
Factor III (Com/Inv)	.62	.62	.92	.92

responding, not to establish the stability of the underlying phenomena. Indeed, because personal relationships are most often “in process,” we should expect them to change from time to time, and thus not necessarily measure out consistently over extended periods of time.

With respect to demonstrating that our scales measure meaningful concepts, researchers are pretty well stuck with the typically onerous task of identifying convincing independent criteria of the concepts in question and seeing if their scales are correlated with them. In the case of the ADF-C5, such independent validation is available for only about half of the scales (see Wright, 1969; 1974; 1985; Wright & Conneran, 1989). My confidence in the validity of the remaining scales rests on the less convincing evidence that the scales consistently factor out in meaningful ways.

Administration and Basic Scoring

Copies of the full ADF-C5 in two different formats are appended to this report. One format permits the subject to respond to each ADF-C5 item with scale numbers printed on the test booklet itself. The other format provides a reusable booklet that omits the scale numbers and utilizes a separate answer sheet. A sample answer sheet is also included in the guide. Printed instructions on the forms make administering the ADF-C5 simple and straightforward.

Calculating raw scores on the various scales is also simple and straightforward. Please refer to the ADFC5 Scoring Guide included with the booklets and answer sheet. Prior to the advent of readily accessible computer scoring, this scoring guide provided a convenient means of tabulating and summing each subject's scores. Now it can be used most efficiently as a guide for creating simple scoring programs by indicating which items constitute the various scales, and which items require reflected scoring.

Calculating Factor Scores

For researchers interested in one or a limited number of ADF-C5 variables, analyzing data on a scale by scale basis should be adequate. However, for research on codependent relating *per se*, or a similar focus on the dimensions underlying the ADF-C5, assigning each subject scores based on the PRR, DOPCT, and Com/Inv factors is by far more useful. The most suitable way for potential investigators to assign such scores would be to conduct her or his own Principle Components analyses (for women and men separately), and calculate factor scores for each subject based on factor coefficients based on these analyses.¹

In the case of some data sets (e.g., sample sizes of fewer than about 125 subjects per analysis) this direct and optimal approach may not be workable. In such cases, the researcher may wish to calculate factor scores based on the factor coefficients from one of my own sets of data. These coefficients are listed separately for female and male subjects in Table 4a. Calculating an individual's factors scores is a simple matter of multiplying each of her/his raw ADF-C5 scores by its corresponding coefficient and summing the products across the 28 scales. This procedure is illustrated in sample calculations for a female and male subject as presented in Table 4b.²

Standard Scores

At present, the ADF-C5 is best regarded a research tool. It has, however, proven useful on a trial basis for assessment and feedback in marital counseling. For persons interested in this or similar applications, my recommendation is to convert each respondent's raw scores on the various scales and factors to *z* scores and plot them on profile sheets. Sample profile sheets are included in the appendix. Because the scales are arranged on the plotting sheets by factors on which they load at or above .45, there are some differences in women's and men's forms for factors 2 and 3. If possible, *z* scores should be based on data collected locally. However, in the case of samples that are too small for this purpose, potential users might wish to convert ADF-C5 scores to their standard score equivalents derived from of my own most recent sample of 343 women and 260 men. Computational guides for converting raw to standard scores may be found on the reverse side of the plotting sheets.

A Not-Quite-Relevant Note on the Measurement of Codependent Denial

Due to the importance many counselors attach to codependent denial, we attempted to conceptualize and measure this phenomenon in a manner amenable to measurement in the ADF format.. This effort was time-consuming and at least a 66.67% failure. In line with our usual practice, we started culling through the codependency literature. We found the concept of denial to be couched in terms that were so vague and intangible that any attempt to specify clear empirical referents for measurement purposes was an exercise in futility. We then interviewed codependency counselors and ran into the same problem until we narrowed the focus of our question. Instead of asking directly about the whens, whys and hows of denial, we centered on the observations leading the counselors themselves to the judgment that a client was, in fact, "in denial." Three classes of such observations emerged. Clients were judged to be in denial if they: 1) minimized the difficulty in their relationships with their primary partners, 2) harbored unrealistic positive expectations concerning the relationship and its future, or 3) externalized the

¹Most computer programs providing factor analyses include the computation of such factor scores as an option. In exercising this option, be alert for two things. First, be sure factor scores are calculated following the varimax rotation. Second, computational quirks sometime reverse the polarity of the loadings for a given factor. For instance, scales such as SAV and ESV loading heavily on PRR show negative rather than positive coefficients. If this happens, factor scores will also be reversed. This reversal is easily corrected by multiplying each subject's factor score by -1.

²Needless to say, these calculations "by hand" are presented only for illustrative purposes. If responses from more than a few subjects are involved, using the factor coefficients to develop computerized scoring programs is clearly indicated.

blame for their partners' irresponsibility or destructiveness. We developed ADF-C scales to tap each of these tendencies, labeling them MinDif, PosEx, and ExBlm (see Table 1).

Of the three scales, only the third, which basically assesses making excuses for for one's partner, appears to measure a form of denial. In fact, MinDif and PosEx measure out as positive features of a relationship. Hindsight told us that this was to be expected. In positive, rewarding relationships (Factor 1), difficulties are minimal and positive expectations are not unrealistic. With this flash of insight, we explored ways of using derived scores that took into account and corrected for the "unrealistic" aspects of MinDif and PosEx. Our most promising solution appeared to be using residuals from relevant regression analyses. Therefore, to derive corrected MinDif scores, we regressed MD-P and MD-S on raw MinDif scores and took the residuals to indicate the degree to which the subject saw little difficulty in the relationship *in the face of evidence to the contrary*. Similarly, to derive corrected PosEx scores, we regressed Factor 1 (PRR) on raw PosEx scores and took the residuals to indicate the degree to which the subject expresses anticipation of improvements in the relationship, again in the face of evidence to the contrary. So far, we have not found these derived scores to be meaningfully related to anything. So the search is suspended --possibly only temporarily.

Identifying "Codependent Relaters"

Our work in developing, testing, and applying the ADF-C5 led us to away from a focus on codependency as a syndrome of stable personality characteristics to codependent relating as a relational process. Indeed, we have arrived at a rather complete (but as yet not adequately tested) theory of that process. We have outlined the major considerations giving rise to that theory in Wright & Wright (1991, 1995). A more detailed presentation of the theory and its implications is beyond the scope of the present report, and would not be especially useful in any case. What may be useful is our suggestion concerning the criterion for determining when an individual is, in fact, involved as a codependent in a relationship. At this point, we think it most useful to consider an individual to be relating "codependently" only if (s)he shows a full pattern involving [1] enmeshment [2] as a defensive and overprotective caretaker (enabler) in a relationship that is [3] unrewarding, stultifying, and often personally destructive. In terms of the ADF-C5, an individual would measure out as relating codependently with a specific partner if (s) scored low on Factor 1 (PRR) and high on both Factors 2 (DOPCT0 and 3 (Com/Inv). We are assuming here that a high level of commitment and involvement in a relationship that is unrewarding and difficult to maintain amounts to "enmeshment." We have not yet determined the limits of what constitutes appropriately high and low scores on these factors

A Concluding Invitation

To repeat my comment from page 1, I invite, indeed *encourage*, anyone with questions, comments, suggests or concerns about the ADF-C5 and its use to contact me.

References and Suggestions for Further Reading

- Guilford, J. P. (1954). *Psychometric methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lea, M. (1989). Factors underlying friendship: An analysis of responses to the Acquaintance Description Form in relation to Wright's friendship model. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 6, 275-292.
- Rosenthal, R. M. (1995). Methodology. In A. Tesser (Ed.). *Advanced social psychology* (pp. 16-49). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Selzer, M. L. (1971). The Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test: The quest for a new diagnostic instrument. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 127, 1653-1658.
- Wright, P. H. (1985). The acquaintance description form. In S. Duck and D. Perlman (Eds.). *Understanding personal relationships: An interdisciplinary approach* (pp. 39-62). London: Sage.
- Wright, P. H. (1997). *A bare-bones guide to the Acquaintance Description Form-F2*. (Unpub.).
- Wright, P. H. & Wright, K. D. (1990). Measuring codependents' close relationships: A preliminary study. *Journal of Substance Abuse*, 2, 335-344.
- Wright, P. H. & Wright, K. D. (1991). Codependency: Addictive love, adjustive relating, or both? *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 13, 435-454.
- Wright, P. H. & Wright, K. D. (1995). Codependency: Personality syndrome or relational process? In S. Duck and J. T. Wood (Eds.). *Confronting relationship challenges* (pp. 109-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Addendum:

- Wright, P. H. & Wright, K. D. (1999). The two faces of codependent relating: A research perspective. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 21, 527-543.

APPENDIX

1. ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM (ADF-C5) [with scale numbers]
2. ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM (ADF-C5) [reusable booklet]
3. ADF-C5 Answer Sheet
4. ADF-C5 Scoresheet
5. ADF-C5 Standard Score plotting Sheet - Female Respondent
Guide for Converting Women's ADF-C5 Responses to z -score equivalents
6. ADF-C5 Standard Score Plotting Sheet - Male Respondent
Guide for Converting Men's ADF-C5 Responses to z -score equivalents

ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM (ADF-C5)

This form lists 85 statements about your reactions to a designated partner, whom we will call the Target Person (TP). Each statement is followed by a scale ranging from 6 down to 0. Please decide which of the scale numbers best describes your reaction to that statement, and record your choice by circling that number.

You will notice that some of the statements are best answered in terms of "how often" and some are best answered in terms of "how likely." This will not be confusing. Simply read the following codes carefully and use them as guides in marking your choices.

- | | | |
|---|-------------|---|
| 6 = Always. Invarirably; Without Exception | -or- | 6 = Definitely; No Doubt About It |
| 5 = Almost Always | | 5 = Extremely Likely; Almosto Doubt About It |
| 4 = Usually | | 4 = Probably |
| 3 = About Half the Time | | 3 = Perhaps |
| 2 = Seldom | | 2 = Probably Not |
| 1 = Almost Never | | 1 = Extremely Unlikely |
| 0 = Never | | 0 = Definitely Not |

NOTE: Please try to respond to all items. However, if you feel that a statement does not apply to your relationship with your TP, put an "X" through the statement number and go on to the next item.

Statements

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 2. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on TP to help with chores and errands to make things as convenient for me as possible. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 3. TP makes it easy for me to express my most important qualities in my everyday life. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 4. When it is necessary, I quietly set things up to get TP to agree with me without letting her/him know I am influencing her/him. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 5. Because my relationship with TP is not the kind people ordinarily get jealous about, I would consider it perfectly all right if TP were to have the same basic type of relationship with another person or persons. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 6. TP's ways of dealing with people make her/him rather difficult to get along with. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 7. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on TP to notice it and appreciate my ability. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 8. TP needs the kind of relationship (s)he has with me to keep her/his life from "going down the drain." | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 9. When I get together with TP, my emotional reactions are strong enough that I am definitely aware of them. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 10. Whether TP leads a wholesome or productive life depends upon my being careful to be the kind of partner (s)he wants and needs. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

6 = Always. Invariably; Without Exception
5 = Almost Always
4 = Usually
3 = About Half the Time
2 = Seldom
1 = Almost Never
0 = Never

-or-

6 = Definitely; No Doubt About It
5 = Extremely Likely; Almost No Doubt About It
4 = Probably
3 = Perhaps
2 = Probably Not
1 = Extremely Unlikely
0 = Definitely Not

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. I can converse comfortably and freely with TP without worrying about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate, or just plain silly. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 12. If I were asked to list a few people that I thought represented the very best in "human nature," TP is one of the persons I would name. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 13. If I hadn't heard from TP for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact her/him just for the sake of keeping in touch. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 14. I feel very uneasy when I have too little influence over the things that go on in my relationship with TP. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 15. The kinds of things TP does and says make me confident that (s)he will never abandon our relationship and leave me to face life without her/him. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 16. If I thought TP had a low opinion of me, I would feel like an utter failure. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 17. I try to do and say the kinds of things that will encourage TP to give up her/his bad habits and traits, and develop good ones. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 18. If my relationship with TP were to break up for some reason, it would create personal problems for me that I would never completely recover from. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 19. If I thought realistically about it, I would conclude that at least half the things TP and I do together are necessary because of people's expectations and other social pressures that have nothing to do with the really personal aspects of our relationship. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 20. TP expresses so many personal qualities I like that I think of her/him as being "one of a kind," a truly unique person. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 21. TP has the discouraging kind of life history that makes her/his faults easy to understand and put up with. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 22. I become resentful when TP gets involved in really good relationships with people other than me. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 23. It is difficult for me to stay interested in activities unless TP is interested in them also. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 24. Because of circumstances neither TP nor I can do anything about, there is quite a bit of tension and strain in our relationship. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 25. Some of TP's actions and attitudes create situations so difficult that they are almost impossible for me to deal with. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 26. When TP behaves in thoughtless or irresponsible ways that could lead to problems, I find a certain amount of challenge and excitement in trying to keep things under control. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 27. The kinds of things TP has been doing and saying lately convince me that (s)he is determined to make our relationship better for both of us. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

6 = Always. Invariably; Without Exception
5 = Almost Always
4 = Usually
3 = About Half the Time
2 = Seldom
1 = Almost Never
0 = Never

-or 6 = Definitely; No Doubt About It
5 = Extremely Likely; Almost No Doubt About It
4 = Probably
3 = Pperhaps
2 = Probably Not
1 = Extremely Unlikely
0 = Definitely Not

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28. If my relationship with TP became too dissatisfying to be worth the trouble, I could call it off or ease out of it with little difficulty. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 29. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP introduces viewpoints that help me see things in a new light. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 30. TP is willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects, even if (s)he is not directly involved. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 31. TP treats me in ways that encourage me to be my "true self." | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 32. When I want to influence the way TP treats me or behaves in our relationship, I am especially careful to do things I know (s)he wants me to do. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 33. Considering the kind of relationship we have, there are certain kinds of things TP and I do together that I would consider inappropriate for either of us to do with anyone else. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 34. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with TP from "falling apart." | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 35. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy and congratulatory about it. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 36. My relationship with TP has helped save her/him from some very self-defeating attitudes and characteristics. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 37. When TP and I get together, we spend a certain amount of time talking about the good feelings and emotions that are associated with our relationship. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 38. I need to be careful about what I do or say, because my own mistakes and shortcomings can easily create problems or unhappiness for TP. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 39. TP is the kind of person who likes to "put me down" or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or comments. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 40. TP has the kind of personal qualities that would make almost anyone admire her/him if they got to know her/him well. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 41. If TP and I could arrange our schedules so we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 42. When I think that TP is having too much influence over the things that take place in our relationship, it makes me feel very uneasy. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 43. I am bothered by the possibility that TP may some day just "walk away" from our relationship. | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

6 = Always. Invariably; Without Exception	-or-	6 = Definitely; No Doubt About It
5 = Almost Always		5 = Extremely Likely; Almost No Doubt About It
4 = Usually		4 = Probably
3 = About Half the Time		3 = Perhaps
2 = Seldom		2 = Probably Not
1 = Almost Never		1 = Extremely Unlikely
0 = Never		0 = Definitely Not

44. When TP disapproves of things I do or say, I have a hard time feeling good about myself. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
45. My most important role in my relationship with TP is helping her/him become a better person. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
46. If my relationship with TP were in serious trouble for any reason whatsoever, I would do anything in my power to keep it from breaking up. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
47. The kinds of things that TP and I do together are strongly influenced by definite social obligations that go along with the kind of relationship we have. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
48. TP is the kind of person I would miss very much if anything happened to interfere with our acquaintanceship. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
49. TP lives with so much stress and personal pressure that I find it easy to react with acceptance and understanding when (s)he does or says things that could otherwise create problems in our relationship. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
50. It is perfectly okay with me when TP forms close, friendly relationships with other people. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
51. I find it easy to get involved in activities I think will be interesting or worthwhile, even if TP does not share my enthusiasm. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
52. Through no fault of our own, TP and I have to work hard for keep our relationship from falling apart. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
53. Any difficulties that come up in my relationship with TP are due to little "everyday" problems that are easy to resolve. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
54. Some of the most troublesome things about my relationship with TP are also the most stimulating, because they challenge me and keep me "on my toes." 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
55. Because TP is so set in some of her/his negative and unwholesome ways, there will always be serious trouble spots in our relationship. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
56. If something happened so that my relationship with TP were no longer satisfying, I would keep on with it anyway for legal, moral, or ethical reasons. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
57. When we get together to work on a task or project, TP can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
58. TP seems to really enjoy helping me out and doing favors for me. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
59. TP understands the personal goals and ideals that are most important to me and encourages me to pursue them. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

6 = Always. Invariably; Without Exception
5 = Almost Always
4 = Usually
3 = About Half the Time
2 = Seldom
1 = Almost Never
0 = Never

-or-

6 = Definitely; No Doubt About It
5 = Extremely Likely; Almost No Doubt About It
4 = Probably
3 = Perhaps
2 = Probably Not
1 = Extremely Unlikely
0 = Definitely Not

- 60. Although TP is not necessarily aware of it, I do and say the kinds of things that keep me pretty much in control of what goes on between us. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 61. Because I regard my relationship with TP to be a "one and only" arrangement, I would be very disappointed if I found out that TP had developed the same basic type of relationship with anyone else. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 62. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to TP about topics that (s)he considers controversial or touchy. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 63. TP has a way of making me feel like a really worthwhile person, even when I do not seem to be very competent or skillful at my more important activities. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 64. The kinds of things I do and say in my relationship with TP help keep her/him from going back to an unwholesome and ineffective way of life. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 65. If I were to list the most important aspects of my relationship with TP, positive emotional experiences are among the things I would include. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 66. When TP does things that lead to problems for her/himself, it is because I have failed to be the kind of partner (s)he wants and needs. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 67. TP is quick to point out anything (s)he sees as a flaw in my character. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 68. It is easy to think of favorable things to say about TP. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 69. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 70. When TP seems to be more in charge of what goes on between us than I am, it bothers me quite a bit. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 71. TP is the kind of person who would stick with me even if our relationship ran into serious difficulty. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 72. I could never see myself as a completely worthwhile person as long as P saw anything about me to dislike or criticize. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 73. I make an effort to say and do things I know will influence TP to change her/his attitudes and life style for the better. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 74. If something happened to bring my relationship with TP to an end, my life would lose most of its meaning and purpose. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
- 75. If I thought about it really objectively, I would conclude that society has quite a few rules about the kind of relationship I have with TP. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

6 = Always. Invariably; Without Exception
5 = Almost Always
4 = Usually
3 = About Half the Time
2 = Seldom
1 = Almost Never
0 = Never

-or-

6 = Definitely; No Doubt About It
5 = Extremely Likely; Almost No Doubt About It
4 = Probably
3 = Perhaps
2 = Probably Not
1 = Extremely Unlikely
0 = Definitely Not

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 76. "False sincerity" and "phoniness" are the kinds of terms that occur to me when I think honestly about my impressions of TP. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 77. When TP behaves in ways that make things difficult for those around her/him, it is because of unfortunate circumstances in her/his life for which (s)he cannot be blamed. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 78. If TP were to get involved in a satisfying friendly relationship with someone else, I would be fearful that it might take something important away from the relationship (s)he has with me. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 79. I have a hard time getting involved in things TP does not think are very important. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 80. Because our different roles and responsibilities create competition and conflict between us, TP and I experience quite a bit of strain in our relationship. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 81. Even though TP has her/his share of human failings, we have what most people would consider a trouble-free relationship. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 82. If TP were to behave in ways that were too steady and reliable, our relationship would lose some of its fascination and excitement. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 83. I look forward to a bright and rewarding future in my relationship with TP. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 84. I consider my relationship with TP so permanent that if (s)he had to move to a distant city for some reason, I would move to the same city to keep the relationship going. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 85. TP takes our relationship too much for granted. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |

ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM (ADF-C5)

This form lists 85 statements about your possible reactions to a designated partner, whom we will call the Target Person (TP). Please indicate your response to each statement on the special ADF-C5 Answer Sheet.

Statements

1. TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.
2. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on TP to help with chores and errands to make things as convenient for me as possible.
3. TP makes it easy for me to express my most important qualities in my everyday life.
4. When it is necessary, I quietly set things up to get TP to agree with me without letting her/him know I am influencing her/him.
5. Because my relationship with TP is not the kind people ordinarily get jealous about, I would consider it perfectly all right if TP were to have the same basic type of relationship with another person or persons.
6. TP's ways of dealing with people make her/him rather difficult to get along with.
7. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on TP to notice it and appreciate my ability.
8. TP needs the kind of relationship (s)he has with me to keep her/his life from "going down the drain."
9. When I get together with TP, my emotional reactions are strong enough that I am definitely aware of them.
10. Whether TP leads a wholesome or productive life depends upon my being careful to be the kind of partner (s)he wants and needs.
11. I can converse comfortably and freely with TP without worrying about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate, or just plain silly.
12. If I were asked to list a few people that I thought represented the very best in "human nature," TP is one of the persons I would name.
13. If I hadn't heard from TP for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact her/him just for the sake of keeping in touch.
14. I feel very uneasy when I have too little influence over the things that go on in my relationship with TP.
15. The kinds of things TP does and says make me confident that (s)he will never abandon our relationship and leave me to face life without her/him.
16. If I thought TP had a low opinion of me, I would feel like an utter failure.
17. I try to do and say the kinds of things that will encourage TP to give up her/his bad habits and traits, and develop good ones.
18. If my relationship with TP were to break up for some reason, it would create personal problems for me that I would never completely recover from.
19. If I thought realistically about it, I would conclude that at least half the things TP and I do together are necessary because of people's expectations and other social pressures that have nothing to do with the really personal aspects of our relationship.
20. TP expresses so many personal qualities I like that I think of her/him as being "one of a kind," a truly unique person.
21. TP has the discouraging kind of life history that makes her/his faults easy to understand and put up with.
22. I become resentful when TP gets involved in really good relationships with people other than me.
23. It is difficult for me to stay interested in activities unless TP is interested in them also.
24. Because of circumstances neither TP nor I can do anything about, there is quite a bit of tension and strain in our relationship.

25. Some of TP's actions and attitudes create situations so difficult that they are almost impossible for me to deal with.
26. When TP behaves in thoughtless or irresponsible ways that could lead to problems, I find a certain amount of challenge and excitement in trying to keep things under control.
27. The kinds of things TP has been doing and saying lately convince me that (s)he is determined to make our relationship better for both of us.
28. If my relationship with TP became too dissatisfying to be worth the trouble, I could call it off or ease out of it with little difficulty.
29. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP introduces viewpoints that help me see things in a new light.
30. TP is willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects, even if (s)he is not directly involved.
31. TP treats me in ways that encourage me to be my "true self."
32. When I want to influence the way TP treats me or behaves in our relationship, I am especially careful to do things I know (s)he wants me to do.
33. Considering the kind of relationship we have, there are certain kinds of things TP and I do together that I would consider inappropriate for either of us to do with anyone else.
34. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with TP from "falling apart."
35. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy and congratulatory about it.
36. My relationship with TP has helped save her/him from some very self-defeating attitudes and characteristics.
37. When TP and I get together, we spend a certain amount of time talking about the good feelings and emotions that are associated with our relationship.
38. I need to be careful about what I do or say, because my own mistakes and shortcomings can easily create problems or unhappiness for TP.
39. TP is the kind of person who likes to "put me down" or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or omments.
40. TP has the kind of personal qualities that would make almost anyone admire her/him if they got to know her/him well.
41. If TP and I could arrange our schedules so we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP.
42. When I think that TP is having too much influence over the things that take place in our relationship, it makes me feel very uneasy.
43. I am bothered by the possibility that TP may some day just "walk away" from our relationship.
44. When TP disapproves of things I do or say, I have a hard time feeling good about myself.
45. My most important role in my relationship with TP is helping her/him become a better person.
46. If my relationship with TP were in serious trouble for any reason whatsoever, I would do anything in my power to keep it from breaking up.
47. The kinds of things that TP and I do together are strongly influenced by definite social obligations that go along with the kind of relationship we have.
48. TP is the kind of person I would miss very much if anything happened to interfere with our acquaintanceship.
49. TP lives with so much stress and personal pressure that I find it easy to react with acceptance and understanding when (s)he does or says things that could otherwise create problems in our relationship.
50. It is perfectly okay with me when TP forms close, friendly relationships with other people.

51. I find it easy to get involved in activities I think will be interesting or worthwhile, even if TP does not share my enthusiasm.
52. Through no fault of our own, TP and I have to work hard to keep our relationship from falling apart.
53. Any difficulties that come up in my relationship with TP are due to little "everyday" problems that are easy to resolve.
54. Some of the most troublesome things about my relationship with TP are also the most stimulating, because they challenge me and keep me "on my toes."
55. Because TP is so set in some of her/his negative and unwholesome ways, there will always be serious trouble spots in our relationship.
56. If something happened so that my relationship with TP were no longer satisfying, I would keep on with it anyway for legal, moral, or ethical reasons.
57. When we get together to work on a task or project, TP can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems.
58. TP seems to really enjoy helping me out and doing favors for me.
59. TP understands the personal goals and ideals that are most important to me and encourages me to pursue them.
60. Although TP is not necessarily aware of it, I do and say the kinds of things that keep me pretty much in control of what goes on between us.
61. Because I regard my relationship with TP to be a "one and only" arrangement, I would be very disappointed if I found out that TP had developed the same basic type of relationship with anyone else.
62. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to TP about topics that (s)he considers controversial or touchy.
63. TP has a way of making me feel like a really worthwhile person, even when I do not seem to be very competent or skillful at my more important activities.
64. The kinds of things I do and say in my relationship with TP help keep her/him from going back to an unwholesome and ineffective way of life.
65. If I were to list the most important aspects of my relationship with TP, positive emotional experiences are among the things I would include.
66. When TP does things that lead to problems for her/himself, it is because I have failed to be the kind of partner (s)he wants and needs.
67. TP is quick to point out anything (s)he sees as a flaw in my character.
68. It is easy to think of favorable things to say about TP.
69. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together.
70. When TP seems to be more in charge of what goes on between us than I am, it bothers me quite a bit.
71. TP is the kind of person who would stick with me even if our relationship ran into serious difficulty.
72. I could never see myself as a completely worthwhile person as long as TP saw anything about me to dislike or criticize.
73. I make an effort to say and do things I know will influence TP to change her/his attitudes and life style for the better.
74. If something happened to bring my relationship with TP to an end, my life would lose most of its meaning and purpose.
75. If I thought about it really objectively, I would conclude that society has quite a few rules about the kind of relationship I have with TP.

76. "False sincerity" and "phoniness" are the kinds of terms that occur to me when I think honestly about my impressions of TP.
77. When TP behaves in ways that make things difficult for those around her/him, it is because of unfortunate circumstances in her/his life for which (s)he cannot be blamed.
78. If TP were to get involved in a satisfying friendly relationship with someone else, I would be fearful that it might take something important away from the relationship (s)he has with me.
79. I have a hard time getting involved in things TP does not think are very important.
80. Because our different roles and responsibilities create competition and conflict between us, TP and I experience quite a bit of strain in our relationship.
81. Even though TP has her/his share of human failings, we have what most people would consider a trouble-free relationship.
82. If TP were to behave in ways that were too steady and reliable, our relationship would lose some of its fascination and excitement.
83. I look forward to a bright and rewarding future in my relationship with TP.
84. I consider my relationship with TP so permanent that if (s)he had to move to a distant city for some reason, I would move to the same city to keep the relationship going.
85. TP takes our relationship too much for granted.

ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM (ADF-C5)

Answer Sheet

Your Name or ID _____

Please record below your response to each of the ADF-C5 statements about your Target Person (TP). Decide which of the scale numbers best describes your reaction and record your choice by circling that number.

You will notice that some of the statements are best answered in terms of "how often" and some are best answered in terms of "how likely." This will not be confusing. Simply read the following codes carefully and use them as guides in circling your choices.

- | | | |
|--|-------------|---|
| 6 = Always. Invariably; Without Exception | -or- | 6 = Definitely; No Doubt About It |
| 5 = Almost Always | | 5 = Extremely Unlikely; Almost No Doubt About It |
| 4 = Usually | | 4 = Probably |
| 3 = About Half the Time | | 3 = Perhaps |
| 2 = Seldom | | 2 = Probably Not |
| 1 = Almost Never | | 1 = Extremely Unlikely |
| 0 = Never | | 0 = Definitely Not |

NOTE: Please try to respond to all items. However, if you feel that a statement does not apply to your relationship with your TP in any way, draw a line through the corresponding scale numbers and go on to the next item.

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Statement #1. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #31. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #61. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #2. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #32. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #62. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #3. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #33. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #63. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #4. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #34. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #64. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #5. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #35. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #65. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #6. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #36. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #66. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #7. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #37. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #67. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #8. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #38. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #68. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #9. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #39. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #69. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #10. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #40. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #70. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
|
 | | |
| #11. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #41. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #71. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #12. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #42. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #72. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #13. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #43. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #73. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #14. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #44. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #74. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #15. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #45. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #75. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #16. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #46. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #76. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #17. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #47. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #77. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #18. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #48. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #78. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #19. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #49. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #79. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #20. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #50. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #80. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
|
 | | |
| #21. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #51. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #81. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #22. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #52. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #82. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #23. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #53. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #83. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #24. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #54. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #84. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #25. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #55. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #85. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| #26. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #56. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | |
| #27. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #57. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | |
| #28. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #58. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | |
| #29. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #59. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | |
| #30. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | #60. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 | |

ADF-C5 Scoresheet
(Items Marked "R" are scored in reverse)

1	29	57	_____	SV (Var1)	Subject ID _____
2	30	58	_____	UV (Var2)	F___ M___ Age ___
3	31	59	_____	SAV (Var3)	Occup/Prof _____
4	32	60	_____	CON _{Beh} (Var4)	Race/Ethnicity _____
5R	33	61	_____	EXCL (Var5)	Relationship to TP _____
6	34	62	_____	MD-P (Var6)	TP's Sex _____ Age _____
7	35	63	_____	ESV (Var7)	Length of Relat _____
8	36	64	_____	RESC (Var8)	Occup/Prof _____
9	37	65	_____	EMEX (Var9)	Race/Ethnicity _____
10	38	66	_____	XRESP (Var10)	<u>NOTES</u>
11	39R	67R	_____	SECV (Var11)	
12	40	68	_____	GF (Var12)	
13	41	69	_____	VID (Var13)	
14	42	70	_____	CON _{Anx} (Var14)	
15R	43	71R	_____	FEARABAN (Var15)	
16	44	72	_____	WORDEP (Var16)	
17	45	73	_____	CHNG (Var17)	
18	46	74	_____	XPERM (Var18)	
19	47	75	_____	SOCREG (Var19)	
20	48	76R	_____	PQP (Var20)	
21	49	77	_____	DEN _{ExBlm} (Var21)	
22	50R	78	_____	JEAL (Var22)	
23	51R	79	_____	ACTDEP (Var23)	
24	52	80	_____	MD-S (Var24)	
25R	53	81	_____	MINDIF (Var25)	
26	54	82	_____	XCIT (Var26)	
27	55R	83	_____	POSEX (Var27)	
28R	56	84	_____	PERM (Var28)	

Guide for Converting Women's ADF-C5 Responses to z-score Equivalents

To calculate z scores, apply figures in columns A and B according to the general equation, $X_{Std} = (A)X_{Raw} - B$.

EXAMPLE: Assume a raw score of 11 on Security Value. The z-score equivalent would be $X_{Std} = (.26)11 - 3.5$, or -.4 (rounded from -.38)

<u>Variables</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>
FACTOR 1 - PRR	.28	4.1
Voluntary Interdependence	.34	5.2
Person-qua-Person	.35	5.5
Emotional Expression .	.28	3.5.
Utility Value	.26	3.5
Stimulation Value	.30	3.6
Ego Support Value	.29	4.0
Self-affirmation Value	.28	3.9
Security Value	.26	3.5
Minimization of Difficulty	.25	3.0
Positive Expectations	.25	3.2
General Favorability	.31	4.3
Maintenance Diff - Personal	.26	1.5
Maintenance Diff - Situational	.25	1.3
Fear of Abandonment	.28	1.1
FACTOR 2 -DOPCT	.27	3.6
Control-Behavior	.29	2.1
Control-Anxiety	.28	1.9
Exaggerated Responsibility	.28	1.4
Rescue Orientation	.25	1.7
Change Orientation	.26	2.3
Excitement/Challenge	.29	1.7
Externalization of Blame	.26	1.7
Social Regulation	.27	1.2
FACTOR 3 - Com/Inv	.27	3.2
Activity Dependency	.28	1.5
"Normal" Permanence	.27	3.3
Exaggerated Permanence	.25	2.6
Exclusiveness .	.24	3.7
Worth Dependency	.28	2.1
Jealousy	.26	1.7

Acquaintance Description Form-C5 Standard Score Plotting Sheet - Male Respondent

Respondent's Name or ID _____ Relationship to TP _____

		Standard Score Plot								
		Raw Score	Std Score	Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High		
				-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<i>Positive, Rewarding Relationship</i>										
	PRR Factor Score	_____	_____
	<u>PRR Scale Scores</u>									
	Voluntary Interdependence	_____	_____
	Person-qua-Person	_____	_____
	Emotional Expression	_____	_____
	Utility Value	_____	_____
	Stimulation Value	_____	_____
	Ego Support Value	_____	_____
	Self-affirmation Value	_____	_____
	Security Value	_____	_____
	Minimization of Difficulty	_____	_____
	Positive Expectations	_____	_____
	General Favorability	_____	_____
				Very High	High	Average	Low	Very Low		
				3	2	1	0	-1	-2	-3
	*Maintenance Diff - Personal	_____	_____
	*Maintenance Diff - Situational	_____	_____
	*Fear of Abandonment	_____	_____
				Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High		
				-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<i>Defensive, Overprotective Caretaking</i>										
	DOPCT Factor Score	_____	_____
	<u>DOPCT Scale Scores</u>									
	Control-Behavior	_____	_____
	Control-Anxiety	_____	_____
	Exaggerated Responsibility	_____	_____
	Rescue Orientation	_____	_____
	Change Orientation	_____	_____
	Excitement/Challenge	_____	_____
	Externalization of Blame	_____	_____
	Activity Dependency	_____	_____
	Jealousy	_____	_____
<i>Commitment/Involvement</i>										
	<u>Com/Inv Scale Scores</u>									
	Voluntary Interdependence	_____	_____
	“Normal” Permanence	_____	_____
	Exaggerated Permanence	_____	_____
	Exclusiveness	_____	_____
	Worth Dependency	_____	_____
<i>Miscellaneous (No Factor Loadings >.45)</i>										
	Social Regulation	_____	_____

*Reverse plotting for these scales reflects negative factor loadings.

Guide for Converting Men's ADF-C5 Responses to z-score Equivalents

To calculate z scores, apply figures in columns A and B according to the general equation, $X_{Std} = (A)X_{Raw} - B$.

EXAMPLE: Assume a raw score of 12 on Stimulation Value. The z-score equivalent, would be $X_{Std} = (.36)12 - 4.3$, or .3 (rounded from .26)

<u>Variables</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>
FACTOR 1 - PRR	.33	5.2
Voluntary Interdependence	.37	5.5
Person-qua-Person	.36	5.6
Emotional Expression .	.31	2.0
Utility Value	.35	5.0
Stimulation Value	.36	4.3
Ego Support Value	.35	4.9
Self-affirmation Value	.34	4.7
Security Value	.31	4.0
Minimiztion of Difficulty	.29	3.6
Positive Expectations	.28	3.7
General Favorability	.36	5.2
Maintenance Diff - Personal	.28	1.7
Maintenance Diff - Situational	.27	1.4
Fear of Abandonment	.28	1.1
FACTOR 2 -DOPCT	.28	3.8
Control-Behavior	.32	2.4
Control-Anxiety	.28	1.9
Exaggerated Responsibility	.29	1.9
Rescue Orientation	.28	2.0
Change Orientation	.27	2.5
Excitement/Challenge	.29	2.0
Externalzation of Blame	.27	1.9
Activity Dependency	.28	1.7
Jealousy	.26	1.6
FACTOR 3 - Com/Inv	.25	2.9
"Normal" Permanence	.24	3.0
Exaggerated Permanence	.24	2.7
Exclusiveness	.23	3.3
Worth Dependency	.28	2.2
Social Regulation	.28	2.1
