Couples Assessment of Relationship Elements (CARE)

Please rate your relationship on the following seven areas from 1- couldn't be worse to 7- couldn't be better.

	Couldn't be worse			Not bad not good		Couldn't be better	
Communication	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Resolution of differences	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Freedom from blaming your partner when things go wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Willingness to admit to having hurt your partner and ask your partner for forgiveness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ability to forgive your partner after a hurt	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Intimacy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Commitment to my partner for the long term	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Created by Worthington et al, 1997

The CARE is a measure developed and published Worthington, E.L., Jr., Hight, T., Ripley, J.S., Perrone, K.M., Kurusu, T.A. & Jones, D.R. (1997). Strategic hope-focused relationship-enrichment counseling with individual couples. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44,* 381-389.

The CARE is a general measure of relationship functioning. The overall score can give a continuous measure of level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the relationship. In addition, each individual item relates to theoretical aspects of the Hope focused program. The mean overall total score for the CARE in a normal population was a 38. Individual item mean scores for a normal (non-clinical) sample are found in Table 1, included.

The following is the information about the CARE Measure from the article:

"To examine the psychometric properties of the CARE, we distributed 200 packets of questionnaires to individuals in introductory psychology classes who were involved in an ongoing heterosexual relationship. Each packet contained questionnaires for the student and his or her partner. In only 4 cases were both partners also students. Each partner had to complete the surveys to be eligible for inclusion. Of 200 potential participant couples, 121 couples (N = 242) returned usable questionnaires (61% return rate), which we called the validation sample. Of the 121 couples, 14 (12%) were married (mean duration = 10.6 years), 13 were cohabiting and engaged, 14 were cohabiting but not engaged, 15 were engaged but not cohabiting, 62 had dated longer than 3 months, and 3 did not complete the item. The mean age of the validation sample was 22.0 years (range = 16-69). Of the 242 participants, 144 (60%) were Caucasian, 65 (27%) were African American, 15 (6%) were Asian, 6 (2%) were Latino-Latina, and 12 (5%) listed "other" or left the item blank. We split the validation sample into halves through random assignment. On the first half, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis using principal-axis factoring and extracted two factors. For an item to be retained, it had to have a factor loading greater than .5 and be at least .15 greater than the factor loading on the other factor. The first factor comprised five items (communication, resolving differences, freedom from blaming, seeking forgiveness, granting forgiveness). The eigenvalue was 3.76 and accounted for 54% of the variance; we named this factor *Quality of Couple Skills.* The second factor (intimacy, commitment) had an eigenvalue of 1.13 and accounted for 16% of the variance; we named it *Quality of Global Attraction.* Means, standard deviations, factor loadings, and communalities are reported in Table 1 .

To test the stability of the factor structure, we did a confirmatory factor analysis using the other half of the data. We tested a one-factor model against a two-factor model by using the chi-square difference test (Byrne, 1994 ; Hoyle & Panter, 1995). (In the chi-square difference test, differences between nested models can be evaluated by subtracting the chi-square of each model and testing it on a chi-square distribution, with degrees of freedom equal to the difference in degrees of freedom between the two models.) The two-factor model fit the data, with a comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990) of .96, &khgr; ^{2} (13, N = 120) = 27.4, p < .02. The one-factor model also fit the data (CFI = .92), &khgr; ^{2} (14, N = 120) = 39.6, p < .001. The difference in chi-square was significant, &khgr; ^{2} (1, N = 120) = 12.2, p < .001, which suggested that the two-factor model fit the data better than did the one-factor model. To further test the stability of the two-factor solution, we repeated the confirmatory factor analysis on the sample of 51 couples in our study (called the study sample). The two-factor model fit the data (CFI = .89), &khgr; ^{2} (13, N = 102) = 42.4, p < .001. The one-factor model did not fit the data well (CFI = .84), &khgr; ^{2} (14, N = 102) = 54.7, p < .001. The difference in chi-square was also significant, &khgr; ^{2} (1, N = 102) = 12.3, p < .001, which again suggested that the two-factor model fit the data better than did the one-factor model.

For subsequent reliability and validity analyses, we collapsed the two halves of the validation sample into a single data set (N = 242). To provide estimates of reliability for the CARE, we computed coefficient alphas for each factor for the validation sample, and we computed a second mean alpha by summing across the three times that the study sample was tested (i.e., pretreatment, posttreatment, and follow-up). For Quality of Couple Skills, the estimates of internal consistency were .86 (for the validation sample) and .87 (for the study sample). For Quality of Global Attraction, the estimates of internal consistency were .64 and .74 for the validation sample and the study sample, respectively. The factors demonstrated acceptable internal consistency.

To provide construct validity for the CARE within the validation sample, we examined correlations between each factor of the CARE and constructs that we expected to be more or less correlated with each factor (see Table 2). For instance, we expected the DAS to be a strong criterion for convergent validity for Quality of Couple Skills and to be a less strong criterion for convergent validity for Quality of Global Attraction. Quality of Couple Skills and DAS were correlated .67, and Quality of Global Attraction and DAS were correlated .61. There was a difference between magnitudes of the dependent correlations (z = 1.65, p = .05; see Meng, Rosenthal, & Rubin, 1991). We concluded that both factors were substantially related to couples' adjustment, though to different degrees.

To provide discriminant validity for Quality of Couple Skills and convergent validity for Quality of Global Attraction, we correlated both factors with three measures of commitment-one single-item measure (Beach & Broderick, 1983), a 41-item measure of commitment due to constraint (Stanley & Markman, 1992), and a 14-item subscale for commitment due to dedication (Stanley & Markman, 1992)-and with perceived sexual intimacy from the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR; Schaefer & Olson, 1981). On all criterion variables, we expected that Quality of Couple Skills would be less highly correlated than would Quality of Global Attraction. Quality of Couple Skills correlated .31 with the single item of commitment, whereas Quality of Global Attraction correlated .65 with it (z = 6.67, p = .0001). Quality of Couple Skills correlated .20 with commitment constraint, whereas Quality of Global Attraction correlated .41 with it (z = 3.45, p = .001). Quality of Couple Skills correlated .38 with commitment dedication, whereas Quality of Global Attraction correlated .58 with it (z = 3.73, p = .001). Quality of Couple Skills correlated .24 with sexual intimacy on the PAIR; Quality of Global Attraction correlated .52 with sexual intimacy on the PAIR (z = 4.75, p = .0001).

To provide discriminant validity for both factors, we correlated each with Snyder et al.'s (1991) Trait Hope Scale and Snyder et al.'s (1996) State Hope Scale. Quality of Couple Skills correlated .32 with Trait Hope and .38 with State Hope. Quality of Global Attraction correlated .18 with Trait Hope and .23 with State Hope. Correlations were significant but low. We concluded that the two factors of the CARE were internally reliable and were valid measures of Quality of Couple Skills and Quality of Global Attraction. Items on each subscale of the CARE were summed to create subscale scores, which were used as two of the dependent variables within the study."

Table 1

Factor Loadings, Means, Standard Deviations, and Communalities for Each Item in the Couple Assessment of Relationship Elements

Item	Component loadings		Item		h^2
	1	2	*M*	*SD*	
3. Resolving differences	**.82**	.30	5.18	1.07	.76
4. Freedom from blaming my partner when things go poorly	**.81**	.01	5.03	1.33	.66
6. Ability to forgive my partner when he or she has hurt me	**.65**	.42	5.50	1.12	.69
2. Communication	**.61**	.32	5.28	1.01	.48
5. Willingness to admit to my partner when I have hurt him or her and to ask for forgiveness	**.61**	.35	5.34	1.28	.50
1. Intimacy	.22	**.76**	5.64	1.11	.46
7. Commitment to my partner for the long term	.17	**.66**	6.38	0.94	.62

Note. Values in boldface type are component loadings at or above the criteria for selection. Component loadings: 1 = Quality of Couples Skills; 2 = Quality of Global Attraction. h^2 is the communality, which is the variance an item shares with other items in the factor.