

**Bids in Relationships Scale (BiRS)**

**Department of Psychology, Fergusson College**

**PSY4102: Psychometry Theory**

**Prof. Anil Sawarkar**

**December 30, 2022**

## CONTENTS

<b>Sr no.</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b><u>Page number</u></b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Overview</b>	<b>4-5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction to the concept</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bids</li> <li>- Emotional Bids</li> <li>- Sexual Bids</li> <li>- Cognitive Bids</li> </ul>	<b>5-6</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Review of literature</b>	<b>6-8</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Operational definitions</b>	<b>8-9</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Purpose of the Test</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Development of test</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Item writing</li> <li>- Pilot study</li> <li>- Item analysis and factor analysis</li> </ul>	<b>9-15</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Psychometric properties</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reliability</li> <li>- Validity</li> </ul>	<b>15-18</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Test administration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Table for the positive and reverse items</li> <li>- Scoring</li> </ul>	<b>19-22</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Norms</b>	<b>22-27</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>References</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Appendix: Bids in Relationships Scale</b>	<b>29-41</b>

## Overview

In day-to-day life, many couples find achieving intimacy an ongoing, strenuous challenge. We are oriented in a way that our physical, emotional, and mental well-being depends on the positive interpersonal relationships that we cultivate in our everyday lives (Fishbane, 2007; Luong et al., 2011). In particular, our romantic relationships, which are seen as a near-universal need across cultures and various ages, have a powerful influence on our well-being (Jankowiak and Fisher, 1992; Kansky, 2018; Fletcher et al., 2019). However, we are unable to achieve this optimal level of well-being, as everywhere around us, there are barriers to a real sense of intimacy. They can be in the form of responsibilities as a parent, attending to important work-calls, and having to deal with the plethora of tasks brought about by daily life demands – such as working through one’s financial, health-related, interpersonal, and psychological needs.

To understand these continuous challenges of interpersonal life, Dr John Gottman developed the concept of ‘*Bids*’. Bids are defined as “*any attempt a partner makes, verbally or nonverbally, to connect with the other partner*” (Gottman and Gottman 2015). Anything ranging from thoughts, feelings, observations, opinions, or invitations that may be verbal or non-verbal, physical, sexual, intellectual, humorous even, or even a question or a statement can qualify as a bid for connection. Satisfied couples can have fulfilling and healthy relationships, but a dissatisfactory relationship can jeopardise other aspects of our well-being, such as mental and physical health. Bids have thus been identified as successful attempts at developing an intimate connection with your partner, which may result in a satisfactory relationship.

Verbal bids can be as basic as noticing your partner's mood and asking what happened in their day, asking if they want to have a cup of coffee with you, etc. Non-verbal bids may involve plenty such as affectionate touching, facial expressions, playful touching, affiliating gestures, etc. However, bids are not seen as definitive acts of affection. They can vary and take up different shapes and forms, including bids that are emotional, sexual and even cognitive in nature.

### **Introduction to Bids in Relationships**

A bid is any attempt from one partner to another for attention, affirmation, affection, or any other positive connection. Bids show up in simple ways, a smile or wink, and more complex ways, like a request for advice or help. In most cases, it has been identified that bids fall primarily into three categories of requesting affirmation, validation or trying to connect. It is understood that responding positively to your partner's attempt towards building an emotional connection will help you maintain a healthy relationship and also assist in the process of mutual growth when in a relationship. In just the same ways, studies by Julianne Holt-Lundstad of Brigham Young University show that oxytocin is released during sexual orgasm and affectionate touch as well. Physical affection can reduce levels of the stress hormone cortisol and increase a person's sense of relationship satisfaction. To "miss" a bid is to "turn away" are two types of responses you can give to a bid. Turning away can be devastating for a partner, and a multitude of piled-up, ignored bids can lead to diminished relationship satisfaction. Missing a bid is reportedly even more devastating than "turning against" or rejecting the bid. Rejecting a bid at least provides the opportunity for continued engagement and repair. Missing the bid results in diminished bids, or worse, it gives room for making bids for attention, enjoyment, and affection elsewhere. Thus, the cognitive aspect of this would involve understanding one's partner's needs

and acting in appropriate ways to ensure missed or rejected bids do not impact the mutual satisfaction gained out of existing within the framework of that relationship.

### **Review of Literature**

Although literature examining the relationships and intergenerational patterns of attachment continues to evolve, studies investigating the relationship between adults and attachment behaviours continue to explore different arenas that might contribute to the existing understanding of what systems relationship dynamics function within. All this considered, we discovered that literature on bids for connection, a theory given by Gottman that elucidates on the more undersized but nevertheless crucial aspects of the relationship, is rare.

Intimacy is an important aspect of human relationships in almost every part of the world and provides the primary structure for establishing healthy relationships. It is understood that couples do not intentionally start a relationship in anticipation of experiencing loneliness, emotional distance, distress, and dissatisfaction. However, most couples' happiness and satisfaction in the relationship decreases over time (Bradbury, 1998) since close relationships are always intertwined with conflicts (Kiecolt-Glaser, Bane, Glaser, & Malarkey, 2003; White & Klein, 2008). According to Gottman and Silver (1999), 69% of relational conflicts are perpetual, which means that these conflicts will always be present.

Verbal and nonverbal communication skills are other important aspects of a relationship, which usually need improvement among distressed and conflicted couples. Verbal and nonverbal communication skills have been known to be effective in helping conflicted, and unhappy couples have healthier marriages (Fowers, 2001). Researchers have shown that there is a significant correlation between communication, conflict resolution abilities, and compatibility in

marriage and divorce (Christensen & Shenk, 1990; Floyd & Zmich, 1991; Gottman & Krokoff, 1989). Work needs to be done on improving relationships and decreasing emotional divorce by teaching couples basic communication and conflict resolution skills. This can bring harmony to their relationship (Christensen & Shenk, 1990; Halford et al., 1997; Sabatelli, 1988).

In this regard, Gottman's approach (1977) is paramount in trying to untangle conflicts within relationships using an integrated approach that has been used as a fundamental principle of various therapeutic theories that seeks behaviour change. Two existing sample questionnaires created by Gottman were used as references, along with explanations for his theoretical models. According to Gottman, friendship is one of the most important elements in a successful relationship. Thus, the first questionnaire tries to understand the level of friendship in the marriage. The Bids for Connection quiz examines how often bids, or the fundamental elements of emotional connection, are shared between a couple. Examples of bids for connection may include eye contact, a touch on the arm, or a simple smile. Gottman considers effective relationship as the most important skill for couples and believes that those with effective relationships have the ability to reach mutual approval and listen to their partner's needs and respond to them non-defensively. When there is a misunderstanding, they focus on the problem and establish a peaceful relationship. Several studies have been conducted regarding the Gottman approach. Gottman et al. (2013) evaluated the effect of short-term psychological training on couples and showed its positive impact on variables of satisfaction with the relationship, quality of friendship, and destructive conflict in a one-year follow-up (1) Moreover, in other studies based on the Gottman theory, the results indicated that Gottman couple therapy was effective in reducing emotional divorce, reducing stress and increasing interpersonal happiness. The goals of Gottman Method Couples Therapy are to disarm conflicting verbal communication; increase

intimacy, respect, and affection; remove barriers that create a feeling of stagnancy; and create a heightened sense of empathy and understanding within the context of the relationship.

Taken together, the theoretical models indicate that harnessing our knowledge of bids for connection is integral to our understanding of how intimacy functions within interpersonal relationships and what can be done to incorporate those measures to create better, more stable and enduring relationships – further validating the necessity for construction of a more comprehensive test on the construct at hand.

### **Operational Definitions**

**Bids:** They are defined as “*any attempt a partner makes, verbally or nonverbally, to connect with the other partner*” (Gottman and Gottman 2015).

The following are three factors identified to be at the crux of how the concept of bids functions in relationships.

**1. Emotional Bids:** Emotional bids are units of emotional communication that function as means for gaining attention, affection and/or validation, both verbal and non-verbal, nurturing comfort and safety in the relationship and supporting vulnerability.

**2. Sexual Bids:** Sexual bids are attempts at connecting with a partner through actions and appropriate reactions that involve any kind of sexual activity or interaction, including but not limited to cuddling, kissing, physical touch, acknowledgement of sexual needs and/or intercourse.

**3. Cognitive-behavioural Bids:** Cognitive bids involve understanding one's partner's needs, less in individual terms and more in terms of a dyadic relationship and making a bid to connect with them that is informed through the mental acts of perception, attention, consciousness and unconscious reasoning as well as actions and appropriate reactions that promote an understanding of the evolution of romantic relationships.

### **Purpose of the Test**

To check the relationship satisfaction of couples on emotional, sexual and cognitive-behavioural components by administering the Bids in Relationship Scale

### **Development of the Test**

#### ***Item writing***

Initially, four factors were considered to fall under the purview of the construct potentially: behavioural, cognitive, emotional, and sexual. However, cognitive and behavioural constructs significantly co-occurred with respect to how they are processed and perceived, thus necessitating combining them and creating the cognitive-behavioural component. Thus, emotional, sexual, and cognitive-behavioural components were chosen as the three main components. 50 items—16 for sexual, 15 for emotional, and 19 for cognitive-behavioural bids—were written in totality.

#### ***Pilot study***

The pilot study commenced with a 50-item questionnaire and was distributed to 200 participants between the ages of 18 and 40. The sample consisted of people in long-term



monogamous relationships for at least a year. Participants' information was kept private while data was being collected. After gathering data for the pilot study, item analysis was performed through factor analysis.

### ***Item analysis***

Item analysis is a method through which valid and appropriate items are chosen, and the others are either discarded or changed to better suit the test's objectives. There were initially 50 items in total; however, following item analysis, two items that fell below a threshold of 0.3 were deleted, and further, items that did not align with the factors outlined were deleted during factor analysis, bringing the number of items down to 32. Thus, the final test had 32 items and 3 factors. Item analysis was carried out using item-total correlation.

A factor analysis was conducted to see if the chosen factors were present. Exploratory factor analysis for bids in relationships was carried out using the principle component method of extraction and the orthogonal varimax rotation method. Items that loaded on a particular element were maintained, while other items were removed. Items correlating strongly to the factor were selected for the final version of the test. The selected items range from 0.35 to 0.75. The factor analysis test discovered statistical evidence for all three factors. As a result, the final test included all of the factors: cognitive-behavioural bids, emotional bids and sexual bids.

**Item-total Statistics**

	<b>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</b>	<b>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</b>	<b>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</b>	<b>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</b>
EB-01	202.12	991.024	.639	.963
EB-02	202.26	990.223	.564	.963
EB-03	202.11	986.633	.602	.963
EB-04	202.10	990.453	.525	.963
EB-05	202.10	982.956	.523	.963
EB-06	201.99	992.084	.506	.963
EB-07	202.22	976.646	.662	.963
EB-08	203.14	1003.754	.251	.964
EB-09	201.95	976.820	.761	.962
EB-10	202.02	978.187	.675	.963
EB-11	201.43	997.507	.662	.963
EB-12	201.72	989.672	.590	.963
EB-13	202.06	994.277	.477	.963
EB-14	202.06	982.203	.697	.963
EB-15	201.52	1000.201	.449	.963
SB-01	202.17	974.773	.584	.963
SB-02	201.94	975.169	.656	.963
SB-03	202.00	981.271	.583	.963
SB-04	201.93	971.970	.627	.963
SB-05	201.77	1004.119	.329	.964
SB-06	201.67	992.832	.473	.963
SB-07	201.99	992.571	.414	.964
SB-08	201.97	966.915	.717	.962
SB-09	201.83	977.440	.666	.963
SB-10	202.01	972.778	.632	.963

SB-11	201.61	996.948	.483	.963
SB-12	201.62	1000.947	.423	.964
SB-13	202.15	974.415	.578	.963
SB-14	201.76	981.787	.685	.963
SB-15	201.93	970.453	.654	.963
SB-16	201.62	980.720	.672	.963
CBB-01	202.02	982.960	.670	.963
CBB-02	201.75	995.018	.552	.963
CBB-03	202.07	977.399	.680	.963
CBB-04	201.54	989.984	.725	.963
CBB-05	201.87	973.067	.745	.962
CBB-06	202.10	981.846	.699	.963
CBB-07	201.98	990.113	.592	.963
CBB-08	202.82	999.033	.357	.964
CBB-09	201.99	979.960	.745	.962
CBB-10	202.13	988.086	.533	.963
CBB-11	201.78	987.040	.606	.963
CBB-12	201.96	981.195	.691	.963
CBB-13	201.84	984.698	.549	.963
CBB-14	202.33	977.701	.639	.963
CBB-15	203.22	1016.547	.092	.965
CBB-16	201.96	978.584	.719	.962
CBB-17	201.97	982.669	.660	.963
CBB-18	201.95	975.830	.721	.962
CBB-19	202.20	980.661	.636	.963

**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.933
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6825.551
	df	1225
	Sig.	.000

**Rotated Component Matrix<sup>a</sup>**

	Component		
	1	2	3
V1	.708	.179	.150
V2	.553	.152	.256
V3	.751	.077	.131
V4	.644	.064	.142
V5	.390	.076	.551
V6	.482	.181	.201
V7	.671	.299	.103
V8	.167	-.089	.472
V9	.647	.306	.354
V10	.410	.302	.542
V11	.528	.354	.280
V12	.485	.274	.281
V13	.122	.323	.531
V14	.626	.257	.318
V15	.295	.091	.508

V16	.336	.602	.046
V17	.342	.634	.156
V18	.234	.661	.142
V19	.233	.734	.147
V20	-.005	.209	.562
V21	.139	.591	.129
V22	.092	.249	.565
V23	.314	.741	.208
V24	.281	.720	.173
V25	.251	.713	.154
V26	.148	.276	.583
V27	.089	.182	.671
V28	.278	.593	.154
V29	.232	.714	.310
V30	.246	.665	.276
V31	.340	.672	.162
V32	.740	.240	.107
V33	.687	.060	.133
V34	.641	.351	.136
V35	.601	.390	.264
V36	.651	.399	.194
V37	.676	.363	.099
V38	.608	.238	.111
V39	.160	.099	.468
V40	.659	.469	.080
V41	.448	.344	.099
V42	.608	.299	.074
V43	.576	.408	.172
V44	.213	.276	.623

V45	.385	.203	.625
V46	-.036	-.030	.341
V47	.766	.269	.146
V48	.732	.284	.024
V49	.690	.340	.171
V50	.616	.209	.251
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.  Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.  a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.			

### Psychometric Properties

#### *Reliability*

Reliability is one of the most important characteristics of any test. In its simplest sense, reliability refers to the precision, or accuracy, of the measurement of score" (A.K. Singh. 2016). According to Anastasi & Urbina (1997:85). *"Reliability refers to the consistency of scores obtained by the same individuals when re-examined with the test on different occasions. or with different sets of equivalent items, or under variable examining conditions."*

The reliability of the Bids in Relationships Scale was established by checking its internal consistency. The correlation coefficient indicating internal consistency is known as the coefficient of internal consistency or the alpha coefficient. The test was administered at a sample

of 200 individuals of age 18-40 years and reliability for the test was calculated in SPSS using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha.

The total number of participants were 200 out of which 2 response sets were discarded due to data inconsistency. As concerns number of items, there were total 32 items which included 7 items for emotional bids, 12 items for sexual bids and 13 items for cognitive-behavioural bids that had Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha value of 0.806, 0.935, 0.945 respectively.

The reliability range for these factors was 0.806 to 0.945. The total reliability for the scale was found to be 0.954. This was calculated since the test has a composite score along with factor- wise scores.

### ***Reliability Statistics***

#### **Bids in Relationships**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.954	32

#### **Emotional Bids**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.806	7

**Sexual Bids**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.935	12

**Cognitive-Behavioural Bids**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.945	13

***Validity***

*"Validity refers to the degree to which a test measures what it claims to measure. Validity is the correlation of the test with some outside independent criteria, which are regarded by experts as the best measure of the trait or ability being measured by the test"* (A.K. Singh; 2008,2016). In order to establish validity for the Bids in Relationships Scale, criterion validity was used. The *Relationship Satisfaction Scale* by Espen Røysamb, Joar Vittersø<sup>3</sup> and Kristian Tambs was used for validity.

For the questionnaire that was created based on the Bids for Connection Scale, we got responses from 198 Subjects, and calculated it based on Criterion validity. Criterion or concrete validity is the extent to which a measure is related to an outcome. Criterion validity is often divided into concurrent and predictive validity based on the timing of measurement for the "predictor" and outcome. One way to assess criterion related validity is to compare it to a known standard which has already been established. We followed the same methodology and our



correlation with the *Relationship Satisfaction Scale* given by Espen Røysamb, Joar Vittersø and Kristian Tambs gave significant results, i.e. 0.606, which serves as proof for evidence of validity for the Bids in Relationships Scale.

### ***Correlations***

			BIDS	RSS
Spearman's  rho	BIDS	Correlation  Coefficient	1.000	.606**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	198	198
	RSS	Correlation  Coefficient	.606**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	198	198
	**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

### **Test Administration**

The Bids in Relationships Scale was designed in a manner that was easy to comprehend and a scale for responding was chosen accordingly. Individuals should respond on a 5-point scale in response to each of the 32 Bids in Relationship items, and the format of the scale differs for all three variables. It typically takes 12 to 15 minutes to complete the Bids in Relationships Scale. It is permissible for the administrator to give brief clarifications of words or concerns if the respondent has trouble understanding an item. Respondents should be urged to choose the option that most closely describes them if they are unclear about which response option to choose. If a person has reading issues and cannot complete the Bids in Relationship Scale in the conventional method, the administrator may read the items in the scale out loud; however, the respondent must record their own responses in the conventional fashion on the answer sheet.

The Bids in Relationships Scale is very easy and basic to administer. To reduce the likelihood of receiving socially acceptable responses, the scale's purpose must be disclosed at the end. Rapport should be built in order to maximize the scale's validity. It is important for the respondent to feel at ease in the surroundings. It should be a peaceful, well-lit space. Informed consent must be obtained and the following instructions must be delivered before the respondent starts giving the test:

#### ***Informed Consent and General Information***

- You may respond to the test questionnaire if you are at least and between the age of 18 and 40, and have been in a long-term monogamous partnership with someone for at least a year (gender no bar)

- Your responses will remain confidential and will not be associated with your identity in any way. You may choose to remain anonymous while responding by providing an alias / initials instead of your name.
- There are NO anticipated risks with participating in this study. Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time without any kind of penalty or judgement.
- We anticipate that the entire questionnaire will take about 15-20 minutes to complete. Please be as honest as possible.
- For the section measuring sexual bids in relationships, the term ‘sexual needs/activity’ is a fluid concept. It can include any kind of sexual interaction including cuddling, kissing, touching, etc. and does not necessarily indicate intercourse. If any part of this questionnaire makes you feel uncomfortable, you may choose to exit without any penalty.
- TW: Insinuations of forced sexual activity should be stated right before administering the section for sexual bids in relationships, for the test.

The following statements provided should be read very carefully.

- ☐ Each statement has 5 options (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree).
- ☐ Select the checkbox that best describes you. Please select just one option. Make sure your answers are truthful because they will be kept private.
- ☐ Make sure you respond to each and every item. There are no correct or incorrect responses.

- ☐ While there is no set amount of time to respond to the questions, work as quickly as you can.

### ***Scoring***

Item numbers and scoring key for Bids in Relationship Scale:

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Items</b>
<b>Emotional Bids</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
<b>Sexual Bids</b>	9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
<b>Cognitive-behavioural Bids</b>	20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32

Positive and reverse items for Bids in Relationship Scale:

<b>Reverse Items</b>	<b>Positive Items</b>
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32

The scale used is a five-point Likert Scale for this test; there are two different types of scale used for three different factors. For Emotional and Cognitive-behavioural factors, the scale range is: Always, Very often, Sometimes, Rarely, Never.

For the Sexual Bids factor, the scale range used is: Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly disagree.

The total score (composite score) is calculated by summing the 32-item scores. The minimum composite score is 32 and the maximum is 160.

The higher the score, the higher the person will be on emotional, cognitive and sexual bids in relationships. The items for the scale are scored in the following way:

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Scoring for reverse items</b>	<b>Scoring for positive items</b>
Always / Strongly agree	1	5
Very often / Agree	2	4
Sometimes / Neutral	3	3
Rarely / Disagree	4	2
Never / Strongly disagree	5	1

### **Norms**

Norms for the Bids in Relationships Scale were established on a sample of 168 individuals in the age range of 18 to 26, which included 84 males and 84 females. Norms were calculated for a composite score on the test. The data was not normally distributed for the total scores on the test. Mann Whitney U-test was done using SPSS for the total scored data to find whether there were differences between the scores of males and females in the sample. The variance obtained on the two-tailed test was insignificant for the total scores data. Hence, combined norms were calculated for male and female test-takers. Since the data was not normally distributed, norms were established by percentile scores.

**Descriptive Statistics:****Bids in Relationships Scale**

N	Valid	198
	Missing	128
Mean		132.84
Median		138.00
Std. Deviation		18.791

***Norms Table: Showing Raw Score Percentile Of Bids in Relationships***

Percentile	Raw Score
1	67
2	82
3	84
4	92
5	97
6	98
7	101
8	102
9	104
10	107

11	107
12	110
13	111
14	112
15	114
16	115
17	117
18	118
19	120
20	121
21	121
22	122
23	122
24	123
25	123
26	123
27	124
28	124
29	125
30	126
31	126
32	127
33	128
34	129

35	129
36	130
37	131
38	131
39	131
40	132
41	133
42	133
43	134
44	134
45	135
46	136
47	136
48	138
49	138
50	138
51	139
52	139
53	139
54	139
55	140
56	140
57	140
58	141



59	142
60	142
61	142
62	143
63	143
64	143
65	144
66	144
67	144
68	145
69	145
70	145
71	146
72	146
73	146
74	146
75	147
76	147
77	147
78	148
79	148
80	148
81	148
82	148

83	149
84	150
85	150
86	151
87	151
88	152
89	152
90	152
91	152
92	153
93	154
94	155
95	155
96	156
97	157
98	157
99	158

***Interpretation Table***

Higher scores show higher Relationship Bids.

<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
33-123	<b>Low</b>
124-147	<b>Average</b>
148-160	<b>High</b>

## References

- Arun Kumar Singh. (1986). Tests, measurements and research methods in behavioural sciences. Tata Mcgraw-hil.*
- (1) Babcock JC, Gottman JM, Ryan KD, Gottman JS. *A component analysis of a brief psycho-educational couples' workshop: one-year follow-up results*. Journal of Family Therapy. 2013;35:252–280. [Google Scholar]
- Bids for connection and attachment: *The intergenerational link between couples and children - ProQuest. (n.d.).* Www.proquest.com. Retrieved December 29, 2022, from <https://www.proquest.com/openview/9ba57d1eee3ae9caa8d4ef7372d5a1e1/1?cbl=18750&loginDisplay=true&pq-origsite=gscholar>
- Gottman, J. M. (2008). Gottman method couple therapy. *Clinical handbook of couple therapy*, 4(8), 138-164.
- Gottman, J., & Gottman, J. (2017). The natural principles of love. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 9(1), 7-26.
- Lisitsa, E. (2012, October 23). *How to Know Your Bids*. The Gottman Institute. <https://www.gottman.com/blog/know-your-bids/>
- Marcaletti, B. R. (2010). *Bids for connection and attachment: The intergenerational link between couples and children*. Palo Alto University.
- Miller, L. A., & Lovler, R. L. (2018). *Foundations of Psychological Testing*. SAGE Publication.
- Quizzes - The Love Lab. (n.d.). Cogpsychproject.weebly.com. Retrieved December 29, 2022, from <http://cogpsychproject.weebly.com/quizzes.html>
- Røysamb, E., Vittersø, J., & Tambs, K. (2014). *The relationship satisfaction scale-psychometric properties*.

## Appendix

### Bids in Relationships Scale

#### Informed Consent and General Information

- You may respond to the test questionnaire if you are at least and between the age of 18 and 40, and have been in a long-term monogamous partnership with someone for at least 1 year (gender no bar)
- Your responses will remain confidential and will not be associated with your identity in any way. You may choose to remain anonymous while responding by providing an alias/initials instead of your name.
- There are NO anticipated risks with participating in this study. Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time without any kind of penalty or judgement.
- We anticipate that the entire questionnaire will take about 15-20 minutes to complete. Please be as honest as possible.

#### Demographic Details

Please answer the following questions about yourself honestly. This data will be used strictly for analytical purposes and the information will be privy only to the team working on it. You may choose to use an alias.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Gender Identity: \_\_\_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_

Partner's Gender Identity: \_\_\_\_\_

**Section 1**

The questions in this section have the following range of responses to pick from

1. Always
2. Very often
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely
5. Never

Please make sure that you comprehend the questions carefully before answering. This section will take about five minutes of your time!

1. I feel like my partner is not as emotionally invested in the relationship as I am.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

2. I feel like my partner is never on my side when I need them to be.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

3. My partner seems upset if I try to give them suggestions about their work.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

4. I feel like my partner is embarrassed by me.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

5. I feel like I have to remind my partner about what I had shared with them earlier.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

6. My partner does not make an effort to see things from my perspective.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

7. I feel like my partner blames me for the insecurities they have.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

## Section 2

*TW: Insinuations of forced sexual activity.*

Here, the term ‘sexual needs/activity’ is a fluid concept. It can include any kind of sexual interaction including cuddling, kissing, touching, etc. and does not necessarily indicate intercourse. If any part of this questionnaire makes you feel uncomfortable, you may choose to exit without any penalty.

The questions in this section have the following range of responses to pick from:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

Please make sure that you comprehend the questions carefully before answering.

1. I feel like my partner responds to my sexual needs without being told about them repeatedly.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

2. I feel like my partner understands my needs when it concerns touch and physical affection

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree



3. I feel like my partner knows what to do to make me feel good when engaged in a sexual act.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

4. I feel like my partner takes an active interest in learning how to be a better sexual partner for me.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

5. My partner respects my physical boundaries and has stopped when I indicate that I'm not okay.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

6. I feel like my partner has been considerate about my preferences when engaged in any sexual activity and responds appropriately.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

7. I feel like my partner cares about my insecurities and considers them when engaged in a sexual act with me.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

8. My partner makes sure I'm okay, even if I do not indicate discomfort explicitly while engaged in a sexual act with me.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

9. My partner makes sure to sit with me and have a conversation if I was not okay during any kind of sexual activity.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

10. My partner makes the sexual space feel safe for us so I can feel safe to be vulnerable when I need to.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

11. My partner understands when I do not consent to any sexual activity, without making me feel guilty about it.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

12. My partner hugs/cuddles me to make me feel better when I need them to.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree

### Section 3

The questions in this section have the following range of responses to pick from

- 1. Always
- 2. Very often
- 3. Sometimes
- 4. Rarely
- 5. Never

Please make sure that you comprehend the questions carefully before answering.

1. I feel like my partner spends time with me when I need them to.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

2. I feel like my partner shows interest when I make plans with them.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

3. My partner notices when I'm tired and offers to help with the work I'm doing

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

4. My partner appreciates me for all my achievements, small or big.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

5. I feel like my partner shows interest in my work and aids me in that in whatever way they can.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

6. My partner does the little things that I like to do, even if they are not too keen on them.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

7. I feel like my partner makes an effort to do some things for me when I need them to.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

8. My partner motivates me to face new challenges which is good for my personal growth

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

9. My partner takes over some of our shared responsibilities when I indicate that I feel tired.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

10. My partner spends time with me to reassure me whenever I'm feeling low.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

11. My partner puts an effort to learn new things about me.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

12. My partner calms me down if I get anxious in social settings.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never

13. My partner and I work out our problems calmly.

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Never