2015

Do You Pursue Your Heart or Your Art?: Creativity, Personality, and Love

Kelly Campbell
California State University - San Bernardino, kelly@csusb.edu

James Kaufman

Do You Pursue Your Heart or Your Art?: Creativity, Personality, and Love

Kelly Campbell
California State University, San Bernardino

James Kaufman
University of Connecticut

Author Note

Kelly Campbell, Department of Psychology, California State University, San Bernardino

James Kaufman, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Connecticut

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Kelly Campbell, Department of Psychology, California State University, San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA, 92407. Email: Kelly@csusb.edu; Phone: 909-537-7687.

Abstract

We examined the associations between love, personality, and creativity for people in relationships of varying durations. Participants (N =1,529) from regions across the U.S. completed an online survey. Consistent with prior work, we found that relationship length was negatively associated with passion, positively associated with commitment, and did not exhibit a significant association with intimacy. For personality, agreeableness was positively associated with passion, intimacy, and commitment, and conscientiousness was positively associated with intimacy and commitment. Additionally, openness was significantly associated with passion and intimacy for men, and emotional stability was significantly associated with intimacy for women. Of note, artistic creative behaviors were negatively associated with all three love components whereas everyday creative behaviors and self-assessed creativity were positively associated with each love component.

Keywords: creativity, love, personality, couple relationships, relationship duration

Do You Pursue Your Heart or Your Art?: Creativity, Personality, and Love

The more I think about it, the more I realize there is nothing more artistic than to love others.
- Vincent van Gogh

What makes a relationship last? Many people select partners based on passion, which tends to decline with time (Ahmetoglu, Swami, & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2010). According to Sternberg's (1986, 1998; Sternberg & Weis, 2006) triangular theory, commitment and intimacy are equally key components, particularly for long-lasting love. Passion, however, is the most exciting of the three love components. Yet the people who inspire passion in us may not also spark intimate feelings or commitment. Although passion generally declines with time, some couples keep it alive throughout their lives (Acevedo, Aron, Fisher, & Brown, 2012; O'Leary, Acevedo, Aron, Huddy, & Mashek, 2011). Aron and colleagues (2005) found that partners who engage in novel, stimulating activities are better able to maintain their passionate love over the long-term, which suggests that creativity may be a key factor distinguishing couples that maintain long-term love from those who do not.

In one of the only studies to explore this explicit connection, Förster, Epstude, and Özelsel (2009) examined the association between creativity and love. They based their study on the premise that humans have distinct systems for 1) passion/sex and 2) love/long-term attachment (e.g., Fisher, 2006), and postulated that sexual activity involves focusing on the present moment, which is concrete, and should therefore encourage analytic thinking. By contrast, love/attachment involves a long-term orientation and abstract thought, which should enhance creativity. They prompted participants to both consciously and subliminally think of casual sex without love (i.e., a one night stand) or love without sex (i.e., a romantic walk on the beach) and then examined their analytic (GRE problem solving) and creative (insight problem solving) abilities. Their hypotheses were supported in that prompting individuals to think about

sex was associated with local processing and enhanced analytic thinking, whereas prompting participants to think about love was associated with global processing and enhanced creativity. This study suggests that love characterized by high intimacy and commitment is associated with creativity.

Curiously, the personality trait most commonly associated with creativity, openness, is not strongly associated with love (Wiggins, 1996). Why might this discrepancy exist? One possibility is due to the *types* of creativity that have been assessed in previous research. Although Förster et al. (2009) used insight problem-solving to assess creativity (Helie & Sun, 2010), this method is but one of many different approaches to the complex construct (Kaufman, 2009). Creativity is often considered to be a domain-specific ability, so that people who might be creative in visual art may not necessarily also be creative in their everyday life (e.g., Baer & Kaufman, 2005; Kaufman & Baer, 2004). The same personality trait may differentially impact creativity across domains; conscientiousness, for example, is often positively related to scientific creativity and negatively related to artistic creativity (Feist, 1998). It is possible that some types of creativity help relationships thrive, whereas other types may be neutral or even detrimental.

An area yet to be explored on this topic is whether distinct types of creativity differentially impact love. One way to examine creativity across domains is to focus on reports of creative behaviors and self-perceptions of ability; such measures have shown solid reliability and validity (see Silvia, Wigert, Reiter-Palmon, & Kaufman, 2012 for an in depth examination of this issue). These measures have not been examined in the previous research on love. In addition, such approaches allow the exploration of different types of creative behaviors. Some measures of creative domains are very specific, exploring creativity in fields such as medicine (Kaufman, 2006), writing lyrics (Kaufman, 2012), or architecture (Carson, Peterson, & Higgins, 2005); one

danger is that people without creative expertise in these areas may simply guess. A perspective geared more for laypeople separates artistic creative behaviors and everyday creativity (Ivcevic, 2007). Self-assessed creativity (how creative you believe yourself to be) is an additional construct often used in novice populations (Beghetto, 2006; Beghetto, Kaufman, & Baxter, 2011).

Sternberg's Triangular Theory of Love

The most popular conceptual model of love is Sternberg's (1986, 1998) triangular theory. He explains love via three components: passion, intimacy, and commitment. Passion pertains to physical attraction and sexual arousal, which provides the motivation to become romantically involved with a partner. It is the least controllable of the three components and the most vulnerable to decline in long-term relationships. Intimacy is an emotional bond characterized by warmth, understanding, communication, and sharing. This bond tends to develop as a relationship progresses, but may also exist in newly formed unions (Sternberg, 1986). Commitment pertains to a conscious decision to remain in a relationship and love a partner, even through difficult times. It is often the final component to emerge within a relationship, although in arranged marriages, it may be the first. Each component varies in degree from weak to strong, and may change depending on the particular relationship, as well as across time within a single relationship (Sternberg, 1986; 1998; 2008). As much as we know about how Sternberg's three components interact over a relationship's course, we know surprisingly little about the specific determinants of each type. How do personality and creativity, for example, play into Sternberg's trio? Based on past research, there is reason to suspect a connection.

Personality and Love

Personality has been conceptualized within the love research as a set of enduring, heritable characteristics (Donnellan, Larsen-Rife, & Conger, 2005). The predominant model of personality, the Five Factor Model, describes personality according to the "Big Five" traits of agreeableness, conscientiousness, extroversion, openness, and emotional stability (Goldberg, 1990; McCrae & Terracciano, 2005). Each of these traits has two poles and people can score at either end of a pole, or anywhere in between. Although the labels reflect the "positive" sides of the traits, personality is a complex construct; conscientious people may also be too focused on details, for example, and agreeable people may be pushovers (Kyllonen, Walters, & Kaufman, 2005).

Agreeable people can be described as helpful, sympathetic, trustworthy, altruistic, and modest. Conscientious individuals tend to be hardworking, organized, self-disciplined, competent, and striving for achievement. Extroverted (as opposed to introverted) people are gregarious, warm, assertive, active, and inclined toward positive emotions. Openness refers to an individual's intellectual style. Open people tend to be creative, proactive, interested in new ideas, and generally experience a wide range of emotions. In other words, they are aware of their emotions and less likely to suppress feelings. Emotionally stable (as opposed to neurotic) people tend to not experience negative emotions often. They are less likely to be stressed, worried, anxious, hostile, and depressed (Ahmetoglu & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2013; McCrae & Costa, 1997). These five factors predict relationship outcomes because they influence the manner in which individuals interact with their partners.

Of the Big Five personality traits, people who are agreeable, conscientious, and extroverted tend to have the most satisfying relationships (Wiggins, 1996). Emotional stability is

also predictive of couple outcomes in that unstable or neurotic individuals tend to have dissatisfying relationships that are prone to dissolution (Davila, Karney, Hall, & Bradbury, 2003; Heaven, Smith, Prabhakar, Abraham, & Mete, 2006; Karney & Bradbury, 1997). Researchers who examined the specific association between love and personality found conscientiousness to be associated with Sternberg's intimacy component, and for men, the commitment component (Engel, Olson, & Patrick, 2002). Possibly, conscientious people's tendency to be hardworking and success-oriented is transferred into their relationships, thereby strengthening intimacy and commitment. Although the association between openness and relationship outcomes is not well supported, Donnellan, Conger, and Bryant (2004) found that high openness decreased the likelihood of couple conflict, and wives with high levels of this trait were more likely to be sexually satisfied in their marriage.

The association between personality and love has also been examined using Hendrick and Hendrick's (1986) love styles (White, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2004). This model, originally developed by Lee (1973, 1988), describes six styles of loving. Eros refers to an erotic, sensual style that overlaps to some extent with Sternberg's passionate component. This style associates positively with agreeableness, extroversion, and emotional stability (White et al., 2004). Ludus lovers tend to date numerous partners and view love as a game. Their personalities are low on agreeableness and emotional stability, and high on openness. Those with a storge style have companionate or friendship styles of loving. Their personalities are characterized by conscientiousness and emotional stability. Pragma refers to a practical style that is based on rational rather than emotional qualities. These lovers tend to be low on openness. Mania also overlaps with Sternberg's passionate component and refers to an obsessive and possessive style of loving. Manic lovers exhibit low emotional stability. Finally, agape lovers are those with an

altruistic, faithful, and unconditional love style. They tend to have conscientious and emotionally stable personalities (White et al., 2004).

More recently, Ahmetoglu, Swami, and Chamorro-Premuzic (2010) used a large sample (N =16,030) to investigate the association between personality, love, and relationship length. In their study, conscientiousness was positively associated with Sternberg's intimacy and commitment, and agreeableness was associated with all three love components. In terms of relationship length, passion declined with length of time together, whereas commitment became stronger. These findings have been supported in previous research (Sprecher & Regan, 1998; Sternberg, 1998). Unfortunately, Ahmetoglu and colleagues used a condensed version of the Big Five assessment, which resulted in low reliability for their openness subscale and prevented an examination of this trait with love. Research is therefore needed in order to elucidate the association between openness and love, particularly because some researchers (Aron, Fisher, Mashek, Strong, Li, & Brown, 2005) find that innovative activities help stimulate and maintain passion.

Current Study

We used Sternberg's triangular theory (1986, 1998) and the existing literature on love, personality, and creativity to develop our study hypotheses. Specifically, we sought to examine how love would relate to distinct types of creativity including artistic behaviors, everyday behaviors, and self-assessed creativity. Prior research has found that relationship length predicts love in that passion generally declines with time, whereas commitment is strengthened (Ahmetoglu, et al., 2010; Sprecher & Regan, 1998; Sternberg, 1998). Therefore, we examined the association between love and creativity for people in relationships of varying durations. Our findings methodologically extend prior work by moving beyond hypothetical or imagined

scenarios (e.g., Förster, Epstude, & Özelsel, 2009) to examine these associations for people who are currently in couple relationships. Based on theory and prior empirical work, we propose the following two hypotheses and exploratory research question:

H1) Relationship length will be negatively associated with passion, positively associated with commitment, and not significantly associated with intimacy.

H2) Agreeableness and conscientiousness will be positively associated with passion, intimacy, and commitment.

RQ) How are artistic creative behaviors, everyday creative behaviors, and self-assessed creativity related to passion, intimacy, and commitment?

Method

Participants

Participants were 1,529 individuals (1,325 women, 204 men) with a mean age of 25.27 years (SD = 8.45 yrs). A majority of the sample were university students (n = 1097). The sample was ethnically diverse with 42% self-identifying as European American/White, 35.5% as Hispanic American, 9.5% as African American/Black, 9.5% as Asian American, 1% as Native American, and 2.5% as biracial or other ethnicity. A majority were heterosexual (92%) and residing in the Western part of the U.S. (68%). In terms of relationship status, 42% percent reported being in an exclusively dating relationship, 18% were cohabiting, 18% were married, 11% were engaged, and 11% were casually dating. The mean relationship duration was 3.62 years (SD = 5.17 yrs).

Procedure

University students were recruited through SONA Systems, which is a web-based participant management system. Non-students were recruited through study announcements on

Craig's List, Yahoo Groups, and study share web sites. Upon viewing a description of the study, participants clicked a link directing them to the online consent form and survey. After completing the survey, university students received extra credit class points and non-students had an option of entering a drawing for a creativity book signed by the author. The survey took approximately 30 minutes to complete.

Measures

Love. Participants completed the 45-item Triangular Love Scale (TLS; Sternberg, 1997). The scale contains three 15-item subscales and each subscale reflects a distinct component of love: passion (e.g., My relationship with ___ is passionate), intimacy (e.g., I feel that ___ really understands me), and commitment (e.g., I am committed to maintaining my relationship with ___). Participants use a 9-point Likert scale with response options ranging from 0 (not at all) to 8 (extremely) to indicate their agreement with each statement. The tabulated range for each subscale is from 0-120. The means and standard deviations for the subscales are presented in Table 1. We used mean scores for passion, intimacy, and commitment in our hypotheses testing. The scale has demonstrated good validity and reliability in previous studies (Graham & Christiansen, 2009; Sternberg, 1997). Cronbach's alpha coefficients in the present study were .96 for passion, .96 for intimacy, and .98 for commitment.

Personality. The five-factor model of personality was measured using the 50-item version of the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Goldberg, 1999; Goldberg, et al., 2006; International Personality Item Pool, 2001). The IPIP comprises 10 Likert-type items (rated on a 1-5 scale) to measure each of five personality factors: Agreeableness (e.g., I take time out for others), conscientiousness (e.g., I am always prepared), extroversion (e.g., I am the life of the party), openness (e.g., I have a vivid imagination), and emotional stability (e.g., I am relaxed

most of the time). The scale has demonstrated good validity and reliability in previous studies (Gow, Whiteman, Pattie, & Deary, 2005; Mlačić & Goldberg, 2007). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .80 for agreeableness, .79 for conscientiousness, .87 for extroversion, .79 for openness, and .86 for emotional stability.

Creative behaviors. Participants reported on their artistic and everyday creative behaviors using items taken from Ivcevic (2007). Individuals read 42 statements and indicated whether they had ever performed each behavior by selecting either "yes" or "no." A typical artistic item is "Played music in public", whereas a typical everyday creativity item is "Told a joke." We used a maximum likelihood factor analysis with varimax rotation to confirm that the two scales were, indeed, separate. A two-factor solution mirroring the basic artistic-everyday creativity distinction was found. Items that loaded less than .35 or that loaded on both factors with .10 were eliminated, leaving 34 items (18 artistic creativity items and 16 everyday creativity items). This factor solution accounted for 21.6% of the total variance and was significant at $p < .001$. The factor loadings are presented in Table 2. Total scores for each of these factors were used as assessments of creative behaviors. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .83 for artistic creativity and .80 for everyday creativity. Ivcevic's approach (2007; Ivcevic & Mayer, 2007) has shown support for this type of dichotomy.

Self-assessment of creativity (SAC). The SAC is a six-item, global self-assessment of creativity. Participants are asked to rate themselves on questions such as, "I consider myself to be very creative" and "I am good at coming up with new and different ideas." These items were modified from a study by Kaufman and Baer (2004), which used personality-style items from the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Goldberg, 1999). The mean and standard deviation for this measure is shown in Table 1. Past studies have shown that the SAC measure is correlated

with both other self-report creativity measures (Wigert, Reiter-Palmon, Kaufman, & Silvia, 2012) and actual creative performance (Kaufman, Pumaccahua, & Holt, 2013; Wigert et al., 2012). Cronbach's alpha coefficient in the present study was .82.

Demographic characteristics. Participants were asked to identify their gender, age, ethnic background, sexual orientation, region of current residence within the U.S. (e.g., North, West, South, East), relationship status (e.g., exclusively dating, cohabiting, married), and length of time with their current partner.

Results

Individual Differences in Love and Creativity Variables

Prior to hypothesis testing, we examined whether demographic variations existed in the love and creativity variables. For all analyses, categorical variables such as gender and ethnicity were dummy coded into 0's and 1's. We used six multiple regression analyses to test whether gender (men = 0, women = 1), age, ethnicity, student status, and relationship status were associated with each love component (passion, intimacy, commitment) and creativity type (artistic, everyday, self-assessed). For passion, we found that age ($\beta = -.235$, $p < .001$) and relationship status ($\beta = .130$, $p < .05$) were significant predictors (Adjusted $R^2 = .05$, $p < .001$). For intimacy, gender ($\beta = .098$, $p < .001$), age ($\beta = -.153$, $p < .001$) and relationship status ($\beta = .149$, $p < .05$) were significant predictors (Adjusted $R^2 = .04$, $p < .001$). For commitment, gender ($\beta = .066$, $p < .001$), age ($\beta = -.148$, $p < .001$), and relationship status ($\beta = .254$, $p < .001$) were significant predictors (Adjusted $R^2 = .07$, $p < .001$). For creativity, gender ($\beta = .149$, $p < .001$) and being European American/white ($\beta = .119$, $p < .05$) were associated with everyday creativity (Adjusted $R^2 = .04$, $p < .001$) whereas being African American/black ($\beta = .090$, $p < .001$) and Asian American ($\beta = .078$, $p < .05$) were associated with artistic creativity (Adjusted $R^2 = .01$, p

< .001). In terms of self-assessed creativity, gender ($\beta = -.046$, $p < .05$), age ($\beta = .054$, $p < .05$), being Hispanic American ($\beta = -.142$, $p < .001$), and relationship status ($\beta = .083$, $p < .001$) were significant predictors in the model (Adjusted $R^2 = .02$, $p < .001$).

Next, we used three ANOVAs to examine relationship status differences (dating, cohabiting, engaged, married) for each love component (passion, intimacy, commitment). For passion, the analysis was statistically significant, F (3, 1308) = 8.74, p = .000. Tukey's post hoc comparisons indicated that the engaged group (M = 6.91, SD = 1.21) had significantly more passion than those who were dating (M = 6.19, SD = 1.63) cohabiting (M = 6.19, SD = 1.61) and married (M = 6.18, SD = 1.93). The comparisons among the other groups were not significant. For intimacy, the analysis was significant: F (3, 1314) = 8.53, p = .000. Tukey's post hoc comparisons indicated that the engaged group (M = 7.39, SD = 1.02) had significantly more intimacy than those who were dating (M = 6.41, SD = 1.68) and married (M = 7.14, SD = 1.55). The comparisons among the other groups were not significant. For commitment, the analysis was significant: F (3, 1314) = 25.48, p = .000. Tukey's post hoc comparisons indicated that the dating group (M = 6.42, SD = 1.68) had significantly less commitment than those who were cohabiting (M = 6.85, SD = 1.51), engaged (M = 7.39, SD = 1.02), and married (M = 7.14, SD = 1.55). The comparisons among the other groups were not significant.

Relationship Length and Love

Based on prior work, we expected relationship length to be negatively associated with passion, and positively associated with commitment (e.g., Ahmetoglu et al., 2010). We did not expect there to be a significant association between relationship length and intimacy. We examined this prediction using three multiple regression analyses in which each of the love components was entered as a dependent variable, and relationship length was used at an

independent variable, while controlling for the other two love components. Our findings were consistent with expectations. Relationship length was negatively associated with passion (β = -.141, $p < .001$; Adjusted $R^2 = .73$, $p < .001$) and positively associated with commitment (β = .135, $p < .001$, Adjusted $R^2 = .76$, $p < .001$). The association between relationship length and intimacy was not significant (β = -.012, $p = .46$; Adjusted $R^2 = .72$, $p < .001$).

Love, Personality, and Creativity

Prior to hypothesis testing, we examined demographic variations in our outcome variables (reported in individual differences section above) and found that gender was significantly associated with each variable except for passion and artistic creativity. Therefore, we examined hypothesis two as well as our research question with the entire sample and then for men and women separately. We used three forward stepwise linear regression analyses with each love component as a dependent variable and the "Big Five" personality traits, and creativity types as independent variables. Each regression model was significant and is summarized below and in Tables 4-6.

The regression model with passion as the dependent variable ($R^2 = .046$, adjusted $R^2 = .043$; $p < .001$) indicated that as predicted, agreeableness (ß = .099, $p < .001$) was positively associated with passion (conscientiousness narrowly missed significance; ß = .058, $p = .067$). Additionally, everyday (ß = .099, $p < .001$) and self-assessed creativity (ß = .096, $p < .001$) were positively associated with passion, whereas artistic creativity (ß = -.086, $p < .001$) was negatively associated with passion. For women, agreeableness (ß = .085, $p < .001$), artistic creativity (ß = -.072, $p < .05$), everyday creativity (ß = .082, $p < .05$), and self-assessed creativity (ß = .092, $p < .001$) were associated with passion ($R^2 = .035$, adjusted $R^2 = .031$; $p < .001$). For men, openness (ß = .238, $p < .05$) was associated with passion ($R^2 = .057$, adjusted $R^2 = .049$; p

< .001). These complete results are shown in Table 4.

The regression model with intimacy as the dependent variable (R^2 = .115, adjusted R^2 = .111; $p < .001$) indicated that as expected, agreeableness (ß = .188, $p < .001$) and conscientiousness (ß = .077, $p < .01$) were positively associated with intimacy. All three creativity types were significantly associated with intimacy (everyday, ß = .086, $p < .01$; self-assessed, ß = .125, $p < .001$), although artistic creativity (ß = -.165, $p < .001$) demonstrated a negative association. For women, agreeableness (ß = .133, $p < .001$), conscientiousness (ß = .072, $p < .05$), emotional stability (ß = .094, $p < .001$), artistic creativity (ß = -.168, $p < .001$), and self-assessed creativity (ß = .110, $p < .001$) were significantly associated with intimacy (R^2 = .098, adjusted R^2 = .092; $p < .001$). For men, agreeableness (ß = .298, $p < .001$) and openness (ß = .240, $p < .001$) were significantly associated with intimacy (R^2 = .201, adjusted R^2 = .188; $p < .001$). These complete results are shown in Table 5.

The regression model with commitment as a dependent variable (R^2 = .067, adjusted R^2 = .063; $p < .001$) indicated that as expected, agreeableness (ß = .115, $p < .001$) and conscientiousness (ß = .068, $p < .05$) were positively associated with commitment. All three creativity types were significantly associated with commitment (everyday, ß = .114, $p < .001$; self-assessed, ß = .083, $p < .01$), although as with the previous regression models, artistic creativity (ß = -.109, $p < .001$) associated negatively. For women, agreeableness (ß = .076, $p < .05$), conscientiousness (ß = .065, $p < .05$), everyday creativity (ß = .110, $p < .001$), and artistic creativity (ß = -.098, $p < .001$) were significantly associated with commitment (R^2 = .048, adjusted R^2 = .043; $p < .001$). For men, agreeableness (ß = .295, $p < .001$) and self-assessed creativity (ß = .171, $p < .05$) were significantly associated with commitment (R^2 = .140, adjusted R^2 = .127; $p < .001$). These complete results are shown in Table 6.

Discussion

Prior to hypothesis testing, we examined whether love and creativity varied based on the demographic and relationship characteristics of gender, age, ethnicity, student status and relationship status (i.e., dating, cohabiting, engaged, married). Gender was a significant predictor in our regression analyses for intimacy, commitment, everyday creativity, and self-assessed creativity. Therefore, we tested hypothesis two and our research question for the entire sample as well as for women and men separately. In addition to gender differences, we also found ethnic variations for each creativity type. European/white participants reported greater everyday creativity than other groups whereas African and Asian Americans reported higher artistic creativity. Hispanic American participants additionally reported higher self-assessed creativity than other groups, although this effect was modest.

These types of individual variations are consistent with past work. Although there tend to be few actual differences in creativity by gender (Baer & Kaufman, 2008), men are more likely to give higher self-estimates of their creative abilities (Furnham, Batey, Anand, & Manfield, 2008; Furnham et al, 2006; Kaufman, 2006, 2012). In our sample, men scored higher on self-assessed creativity. Similarly, there appears to be few gender differences regarding love (Canary & Emmers-Sommer, 1997), except that men report more passion early in their relationships (Kenrick, Sadalla, Groth, & Trost, 1990). In our sample, women reported greater intimacy and commitment than men. The different patterns of self-reported creative strengths by ethnicity are also consistent with past results (e.g., Kaufman, 2006). Indeed, the difference in how ethnicities self-evaluate their creativity compared to their intellectual abilities (Ivcevic & Kaufman, 2013) has led some to propose that creativity might be one way of warding off potential issues of stereotype threat (Kaufman, 2010).

In our preliminary analyses, we also examined whether the love components of passion, intimacy, and commitment varied based on relationship status. We found that engaged participants reported significantly more passion and intimacy than those who were dating and married, as well as more passion than those who were cohabiting. Additionally, participants who were dating reported lower commitment than participants with other relationship statuses. These findings are consistent with prior research indicating that engaged individuals have higher levels of passion and intimacy compared to those who are dating, cohabiting, and married (Sprecher & Regan, 1998). Engaged people tend to wear "rose colored glasses" with respect to their partner and relationship; it is therefore to be expected that they would report higher levels of passion and intimacy in this stage. Our commitment findings are also consistent with previous work indicating that compared to people in other relationship stages (cohabiting, engaged, married), those in dating relationships report lower levels of commitment (Lemieux & Hale, 2002).

Our hypothesis testing indicated that love was related to creativity and personality in both expected and unexpected ways. First, we replicated prior work regarding relationship length and love. Specifically, we found that relationship length was negatively associated with passion, positively associated with commitment, and did not exhibit a significant association with intimacy. Previous empirical work suggests that passion is commonly present in the earliest phases of a romantic relationship (Aron et al., 2005; Regan, Kocan, & Whitlock, 1998). However, it is difficult to sustain high passion over the long-term and relationships are most likely to endure when they develop commitment or a long-term attachment (Acevedo et al., 2012; Sternberg, 2008). In support of our predictions and consistent with prior work, we found that relationship length and commitment exhibited a positive association. We did not expect a significant association between relationship length and intimacy because although this

component is likely to develop as a relationship progresses, individuals in new relationships may also exhibit high levels of intimacy (Regan et al., 1998; Sternberg, 1986). This prediction was supported in our study.

Second, as regarding personality, we predicted that agreeableness and conscientiousness would be positively associated with passion, intimacy, and commitment. Prior research indicated that these traits are predictive of relationship quality and stability (e.g., Wiggins, 1996), as well as love specifically (Ahmetoglu et al., 2010; Engel et al., 2002; White et al., 2004). Our findings were as expected, except that conscientiousness just missed being significantly associated with passion. Regarding gender, agreeableness and conscientiousness associated with all three love components for women, whereas openness was a significant predictor for men's passion and intimacy. Donnellan and colleagues (2004) found that women who were high on openness were sexually satisfied in marriage; our findings support the notion that openness may function similarly for men. Individuals with open personalities are likely to explore new activities, which fits with Aron et al.'s (2005) assertion that such activities help partners sustain passion. Women's intimacy was also predicted by emotional stability, which is consistent with extensive research that has demonstrated an association between emotional stability and relational outcomes (Davila et al., 2003; Heaven et al., 2006; Karney & Bradbury, 1997), as well as intimacy specifically (White et al., 2004).

Next, we examined the association between creativity and love with an interest in whether distinct types of creativity (artistic, everyday, self-assessed) would differentially associate with love. Researchers have previously failed to distinguish between creativity types in their examination of couple relationships. Based on Aron et al.'s (2005) findings that passion is sustained when partners engage in new experiences, we questioned whether everyday creativity

may positively associate with passion. Alternatively, Förster and colleagues (2009) found that long-term commitment, rather than sexual passion stimulated creativity. Given these divergent findings, we decided to take an exploratory approach. We found that everyday and self-assessed creativity were positively associated with passion, intimacy, and commitment, and strikingly, artistic creativity was negatively associated with all three love components. The positive associations between everyday and self-assessed creativity and love indicate that in general, creativity enhances romantic relationships. Certainly, much of the research on everyday creativity (sometimes called mini-c or little-c; Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009) has found it to be associated with positive life outcomes, such as better physical health (Stuckey & Nobel, 2010), better moods (Amabile, Barsade, Mueller, & Staw, 2005), happiness (Silvia, et al, 2014) and less personal stress (Nicol & Long, 1996). This evidence, combined with Aron et al.'s (2005) findings that innovative activities help maintain passion, suggest that everyday creativity is an important component of a satisfying partnership.

Our measure of self-assessed creativity enabled participants to provide a global appraisal of creativity, which may have included both everyday and artistic components. However, the items contained in the measure reflect characteristics that are also likely enhance relationships, such as, "I am good at coming up with new and different ideas." For men, self-assessed creativity was the only type that associated with love—specifically, commitment. Perhaps global evaluations were influenced by creativity exhibited within the relationship. Future work is needed to disentangle the direction of associations found within our study and to further explore the gender differences.

Why might artistic creativity be negatively predictive of love? One reason might be that being creative in the arts gives people meaning and purpose in life (consistent with the concept

of Flow as proposed by Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, 1996). Having such needs met by activities that are often intensely personal and solitary may not be conducive to forming the bonds of intimacy and commitment with a romantic partner. Similarly, people who are intrinsically motivated to be creative in the arts may choose to spend time on these pursuits rather than with a partner. Obviously, artistic creative behaviors can be shared, but social activities tend to be more associated with everyday creativity (e.g., Kaufman, 2012; Mouchiroud & Lubart, 2002).

Another possibility may revolve around the nature of people who pursue creativity in the arts. Some studies have found that creative people in the arts are more likely to be mentally ill compared to creative people in other domains (e.g., Nettle, 2006; Rawlings & Locarnini, 2008). Creativity in writing and the visual arts has been associated with mental illness in historiometric studies (Kaufman, 2001; Ludwig, 1995; Post, 1994, although see Schlesinger, 2009), census-based studies (Kyaga et al., 2012), and empirical studies on everyday populations (Vellante et al., 2011). Everyday creativity is generally not associated with mental illness (e.g., Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009; Silvia & Kaufman, 2010). It is possible that those who engage in creative artistic behaviors are more prone to mental disorders that may also threaten romantic relationships; this theory is consistent with the positive predictive power of emotional stability and agreeableness in our study and prior work. It is important to note, however, that many of these studies were conducted on eminent or professional artists, whereas our sample consisted of an average population.

One specific limitation is that fairly small percentages of the variance in the love measures were explained by personality and creativity. We therefore should not overstate the benefits of everyday creative behaviors, self-assessed creativity, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, and emotional stability (e.g., Forgeard, 2013). Given the

established negative stereotypes that many people have about creativity (Mueller, Goncalo, & Kamdar, 2011; Mueller, Melwani, & Goncalo, 2012; Westby & Dawson, 1995), we should be even more tempered in ascribing possible negative connotations to creative artistic pursuits.

Limitations and Future Directions

As with any research, it is important to note the limitations of our study. First, the design was correlational, which does not enable us to draw conclusions about cause and effect. We speculate that the association between creativity and love is bidirectional. In other words, people who enact creative behaviors are more likely to secure romantic partners because creativity is a desirable trait, and creativity within a relationship leads to greater passion, intimacy, and commitment. On the other hand, greater love within a relationship may also stimulate creativity, particularly with respect to everyday behaviors. The direction of these associations will need to be examined in future work.

Our sample consisted of mostly women and European/white and Hispanic Americans. As we found, there were some differences based on demographic variables. Given this prior work, we examined our hypotheses for men and women separately and found gender differences. Future researchers will benefit from continuing to examine gender differences in their studies.

There are generally few consistent individual differences in creative ability (Kaufman, Baer, & Gentile, 2004; Kaufman, Niu, Sexton, & Cole, 2010) or self-perception (Kaufman, 2006) by ethnicity. Similarly, few ethnic differences have been reported with respect to love, except that Asian individuals tend to have a more collective (versus individual) life orientation, which may impact how they conceptualize their relationships (e.g., Doherty, Hatfield, Thompson, & Choo, 1994; Riela, Rodriguez, Aron, Xu, & Acevedo, 2013). Although European American participants are often over-represented in social science research, the large number of

Hispanic Americans in our sample is one of the study's strengths. Researchers should continue to examine this topic amongst diverse individuals including ethnic minorities, inter-ethnic pairs, same-sex pairs, and individuals at various stages of the lifespan (e.g., young adulthood, older adulthood).

A final limitation of our study relates to the self-report nature of the measures. Although, as reviewed in Silvia et al. (2012), such tests show strong reliability and evidence of validity, they are not a replacement for an actual creativity test. Future studies may wish to use such measures as Amabile's (1996) Consensual Assessment Technique, in which experts evaluate creative work (with products that can range from poems to mathematical equations; see Kaufman & Baer, 2012). Different results may emerge for individuals who are especially high in creative ability such as professional artists or musicians.

Compared to work on personality and love, research on creativity and love is in its infancy, which leaves many areas open for exploration in future work. We hope our study will inspire research on this topic. Considering the negative outcomes associated with relationship dissatisfaction and dissolution, it is important to identify factors that help sustain love. Practitioners can then begin making recommendations to couples who struggle with passion, intimacy, and commitment. For example, they can recommend that partners adopt more creative practices into their everyday life such as trying a new recipe, starting a hobby together, and finding unique ways to communicate love. Such practices may help strengthen the relationship and avoid dissolution. Given that relationships tend to dissolve once love fades (Coontz, 2005; Regan et al., 1998), partners must continually find ways to sustain it. Our findings suggest that creativity, particularly in everyday interactions, may provide one means for maintaining long-term love.

References

Acevedo, B., Aron, A., Fisher, H., & Brown, L. (2012). The neural correlates of long-term intense romantic love. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 7 (20),* 145-159.

Ahmetoglu, G., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2013). *Personality 101*. New York: Springer.

Ahmetoglu, G., Swami, V., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2010). The relationship between dimensions of love, personality, and relationship length. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 39,* 1181-1190.

Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., & Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 50,* 367-403.

Aron, A., Fisher, H., Mashek, D. J., Strong, G., Li, H., & Brown, L. (2005). Reward, motivation, and emotion systems associated with early stage intense romantic love. *Journal of Neurophysiology, 94*, 327-337.

Baer, J., & Kaufman, J. C. (2005). Bridging generality and specificity: The Amusement Park Theoretical (APT) Model of creativity. *Roeper Review, 27*, 158-163.

Baer, J., & Kaufman, J. C. (2008). Gender differences in creativity. *Journal of Creative Behavior, 42,* 75-106.

Beghetto, R. A. (2006). Creative self-efficacy: Correlates in middle and secondary students. *Creativity Research Journal, 18*, 447-457.

Beghetto, R. A., Kaufman, J. C., & Baxter, J. (2011). Answering the unexpected questions: Student self-beliefs and teacher ratings of creativity in elementary math and science. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 5,* 342-349.

Canary, D. J., & Emmers-Sommer, T. M. (1997). *Sex and gender differences in personal relationships*. New York: Guilford Press.

Carson, S., Peterson, J. B., & Higgins, D. M. (2005). Reliability, validity and factor structure of the Creative Achievement Questionnaire. *Creativity Research Journal, 17,* 37–50.

Clegg, H., Nettle, D., & Miell, D. (2011). Status and mating success amongst visual artists. *Frontiers in psychology*, *2*, 310.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience.* New York: Harper & Row.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention.* New York: HarperCollins.

Davila, J., Karney, B. R., Hall, T. W., & Bradbury, T. N. (2003). Depressive symptoms and marital satisfaction: Within-subject associations and the moderating effects of gender and neuroticism. *Journal of Family Psychology, 17,* 557–570.

Doherty, W. R., Hatfield, E., Thompson, K., & Choo, P. (1994). Cultural and ethnic influences on love and attachment. *Personal Relationships, 1(4),* 391-398.

Donnellan, M. B., Conger, R. D., & Bryant, C. M. (2004). The Big Five and enduring marriages. *Journal of Research in Personality, 38*, 481–504.

Donnellan, M. B., Larsen-Rife, D., Conger, R. D. (2005). Personality, family history, and competence in early adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88(3),* 562-576.

Engel, G., Olson, K. R., & Patrick, C. (2002). The personality of love: Fundamental motives and traits related to components of love. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32,* 839–853.

Feist, G. J. (1998). A meta-analysis of personality in scientific and artistic creativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2,* 290–309.

Fisher, H. (2006). The drive to love: The neural mechanism for mate selection. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (2nd ed.) (pp. 87-115). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Forgeard, M. J. (2013). Perceiving benefits after adversity: The relationship between self-reported posttraumatic growth and creativity. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *7*, 245-264.

Förster, J., Epstude, K., & Özelsel, A. (2009). Why love has wings and sex has not: how reminders of love and sex influence creative and analytic thinking. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35,* 1479-1491.

Furnham, A., Batey, M., Anand, K., & Manfield, J. (2008). Personality, hypomania, intelligence and creativity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44,* 1060–1069.

Geher, G., & Kaufman, S.B. (2013). *Mating Intelligence Unleashed*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "Description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 1216-1229.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe*, Vol. 7 (pp. 7-28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. C. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*, 84-96.

Gow, A. J., Whiteman, M. C., Pattie, A., & Deary, I. J. (2005). Goldberg's 'IPIP' Big-Five factor markers: Internal consistency and concurrent validation in Scotland. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39,* 317-329.

Graham, J. M., & Christiansen, K. (2009). The reliability of romantic love: A reliability generalization meta-analysis. *Personal Relationships, 16,* 49-66.

Haselton, M. G., & Miller, G. F. (2006). Women's fertility across the cycle increases the short-term attractiveness of creative intelligence compared to wealth. *Human Nature*, *17*, 50–73.

Heaven, P. C. L., Smith, L., Prabhakar, S. M., Abraham, J., & Mete, M. E. (2006). Personality and conflict communication patterns in cohabiting couples. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40,* 829–840.

Helie, S., & Sun, R. (2010). Incubation, insight, and creative problem solving: A unified theory and a connectionist model. *Psychological Review, 117*, 994-1024.

Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50* (2), 392–402. Doi 10.1037/0022-3514.50.2.392.

Ivcevic, Z. (2007). Artistic and everyday creativity: An act-frequency approach. *Journal of Creative Behavior, 41*, 271-290.

Ivcevic, Z., & Kaufman, J. C. (2013). The can and cannot do attitude: How self estimates of ability vary across ethnic and socioeconomic groups. *Learning and Individual Differences, 27,* 144-148.

Ivcevic, Z., & Mayer, J. D. (2007). Creative types and personality. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 26,* 65–86.

Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1997). Neuroticism, marital interaction, and the trajectory of marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 1075–1092.

Kaufman, J. C. (2001). The Sylvia Plath effect: Mental illness in eminent creative writers. *Journal of Creative Behavior, 35*, 37-50.

Kaufman, J. C. (2006). Self-reported differences in creativity by gender and ethnicity. *Journal of Applied Cognitive Psychology, 20,* 1065-1082.

Kaufman, J. C. (2009). *Creativity 101*. New York: Springer.

Kaufman, J. C. (2010). Using creativity to reduce ethnic bias in college admissions. *Review of General Psychology, 14,* 189-203.

Kaufman, J. C. (2012). Counting the muses: Development of the Kaufman-Domains of Creativity Scale (K-DOCS). *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 6,* 298-308.

Kaufman, J. C., & Baer, J. (2004). The Amusement Park Theoretical (APT) Model of creativity. *Korean Journal of Thinking and Problem Solving, 14*, 15-25.

Kaufman, J. C., & Baer, J. (2012). Beyond new and appropriate: Who decides what is creative? *Creativity Research Journal*, *24,* 83-91.

Kaufman, J. C., Baer, J., & Gentile, C. A. (2004). Differences in gender and ethnicity as measured by ratings of three writing tasks, *Journal of Creative Behavior, 38*, 56-69.

Kaufman, J. C., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Beyond big and little: The Four C Model of Creativity. *Review of General Psychology, 13,* 1-12.

Kaufman, J. C., Niu, W., Sexton, J. D., & Cole, J. C. (2010). In the eye of the beholder: Differences across ethnicity and gender in evaluating creative work. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40,* 496-511.

Kaufman, J. C., Pumaccahua, T. T., & Holt, R. E. (2013). Personality and creativity in realistic, investigative, artistic, social, and enterprising college majors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54,* 913-917.

Kaufman, J. C., Waterstreet, M.A., Ailabouni, H. S., Whitcomb, H. J., Roe, A. K., & Riggs, M. (2009). Personality and self-perceptions of creativity across domains. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 29,* 193-209.

Kenrick, D. T., Sadalla, E. K., Groth, G., & Trost, M. R. (1990). An evolutionary perspective on human relationships. In W. Ickes & S. Duck (Eds.), *The social psychology of personal relationships* (pp. 9-35). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Kyaga, S., Landén, M., Boman, M., Hultman, C. M., Långström, N., & Lichtenstein, P. (2012). Mental illness, suicide and creativity: 40-Year prospective total population study. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *47,* 83-90.

Kyllonen, P. C., Walters, A. M., & Kaufman, J. C. (2005). Noncognitive constructs and their assessment in graduate education. *Educational Assessment, 10*, 153-184.

Lee J.A. (1973). *Colours of love: an exploration of the ways of loving*. Toronto: New Press.

Lee J. A. (1988). Love styles. In M. H. Barnes & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 38–67). New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.

Lemieux, R., & Hale, J. L. (2002). Cross-sectional analysis of intimacy, passion, and commitment: Testing the assumptions of the triangular theory of love. *Psychological Reports*, *90*(3,Pt1), 1009-1014.

Ludwig, A. M. (1995). *The price of greatness.* New York: Guilford.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as human universal. *American Psychologist, 52*, 509-516.

McCrae, R. R., & Terracciano, A. (2005). Universal features of personality traits from the observer's perspective: Data from 50 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 547-561.

Mlačić, B., & Goldberg, L. R. (2007). An analysis of a cross-cultural personality inventory: The IPIP Big-Five factor markers in Croatia. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 88*, 168-177.

Mouchiroud, C., & Lubart, T. (2002). Social creativity: A cross-sectional study of 6-to 11-year-old children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*,*26*, 60-69.

Mueller, J. S., Goncalo, J. A., Kamdar, D. (2011). Recognizing creative leadership: Can creative idea expression negatively relate to perceptions of leadership potential? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*, 494-498.

Mueller, J.S., Melwani, S. & Goncalo, J.A. (2012). The bias against creativity: Why people desire but reject creative ideas. *Psychological Science, 23,* 13-17.

Nettle, D. (2006). The evolution of personality variation in humans and other animals. *American Psychologist, 61*, 622-631.

Nettle, D., & Clegg, H. (2006). Schizotypy, creativity and mating success in humans. *Proceedings of the Royal Society: B*, *273*, 611–615.

Nicol, J. J., & Long, B. C. (1996). Creativity and perceived stress of female music therapists and hobbyists. *Creativity Research Journal, 9*, 1-10.

O'Leary, D. K., Acevedo, B. P., Aron, A., Arthur, Huddy, Mashek, D. (2011). Is long-term love more than a rare phenomenon? If so, what are its correlates? *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3 (2),* 241-249.

Post, F. (1994). Creativity and psychopathology: A study of 291 world-famous men. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 165*, 22-34.

Rawlings, D., & Locarnini, A. (2008). Dimensional schizotypy, autism, and unusual word associations in artists and scientists. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42,* 465–471.

Regan, P.C., Kocan, E.R., and Whitlock, T. (1998). Ain't love grand! A prototype analysis of the concept of romantic love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15(3),* 411-420.

Riela, S., Rodriguez, G., Aron, A., Xu, X., & Acevedo, B. P. (2013). Experiences of falling in love: Investigating culture, ethnicity, gender, and speed. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27(4),* 473-493.

Schlesinger, J. (2009). Creative mythconceptions: A closer look at the evidence for the "mad genius" hypothesis. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 3,* 62-72.

Silvia, P. J., Beaty, R. E., Nusbaum, E. C., Eddington, K. M., Levin-Aspenson, H., and Kwapil, T. R. (2014). Everyday creativity in daily life: an experience-sampling study of "little c" creativity. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *8*, 183–188.

Silvia, P. J., Wigert, B., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Kaufman, J. C. (2012). Assessing creativity with self-report scales: A review and empirical evaluation. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 6*, 19-34.

Sprecher, S., & Regan, P.C. (1998). Passionate and companionate love in courting and young married couples. *Sociological Inquiry, 68(2),* 163-185.

Sternberg, R. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, *93*(2), 119-135. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.93.2.119.

Sternberg, R. J. (1997). Construct validation of a triangular love scale. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 27*, 313-335.

Sternberg, R. J. (1998). *Cupid's arrow: The course of love through time.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R. J., & Weis, K. (Eds.). (2006). The new psychology of love. Yale University Press.

Stuckey, H. L., & Nobel, J. (2010). The connection between art, healing, and public health: A review of current literature. *American Journal of Public Health, 100, 254*-263.

Vellante, M., Zucca, G., Preti, A., Sisti, D., Rocchi, M. B. L., Akiskal, K. K., & Akiskal, H. S. (2011). Creativity and affective temperaments in non-clinical professional artists: An empirical psychometric investigation. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 135*(1), 28-36.

Westby E. L., & Dawson, V. (1995). Creativity: Asset or burden in the classroom? *Creativity Research Journal*, *8*, 1-10.

White, J. K., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2004). Big five personality variables and relationship constructs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 1519-1530.

Wigert, B., Reiter-Palmon, R., Kaufman, J. C., & Silvia, P. J. (2012). Perfectionism: The good, the bad, and the creative. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46,* 775-779.

Wiggens, J. S. (Ed.). (1996). The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives. New York: Guilford Press.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Love Components, Creativity Types, and Relationship Length

Variables	M	SD
Passion (total score)	93.93	24.77
Intimacy (total score)	103.70	19.39
Commitment (total score)	100.65	24.16
Agreeableness (total score)	40.41	5.84
Conscientiousness (total score)	35.95	6.30
Extroversion (total score)	32.94	7.69
Openness (total score)	36.98	5.70
Emotional stability (total score)	30.70	7.72
Self-assessed creativity (total score)	25.73	5.52
Relationship length (years)	3.62	5.17

Note. The ranges for passion, intimacy, and commitment are 15-120; for agreeableness, conscientiousness, extroversion, openness, and emotional stability are 10-50; for self-assessed creativity is 6-36; and for relationship length is 0-48.

Table 2

Rotated Factor Matrix, Creativity Behaviors

	Factor One (Artistic)	Factor Two (Everyday)
Made collages	.062	**.552**
Painted clothes	.180	**.453**
Visited an art museum	.114	**.441**
Invented a recipe	.182	**.351**
Told a joke	.041	**.432**
Made a photo collage	.052	**.557**
Watched an art program on TV	.154	**.357**
Made picture frames	.174	**.443**
Visited a museum (other than art)	.085	**.446**
Read the local newspaper	.013	**.375**
Made posters	.090	**.524**
Did research on the internet on a topic of interest	-.023	**.406**
Laughed out loud	-.042	**.385**
Read music magazines	.107	**.440**
Read music reviews	.105	**.458**
Made scrapbook	.151	**.461**
Published in an art magazine	**.368**	.067
Danced ballet in a production	**.441**	.005
Acted on stage	**.471**	.269
Played in a band	**.363**	.135
Practiced lines for a play	**.455**	.282
Choreographed a dance	**.470**	.175
Member of acting club in high school	**.482**	.085
Played music in public	**.410**	.199
Member of choir in high school	**.385**	.121
Entered dance competition	**.512**	.044
Published short story/poem	**.407**	.157
Received money for music performance	**.445**	.002
Did modern dance in a production	**.552**	-.034
Won an award for writing in previous year	**.398**	.100
Member of a music group in college	**.455**	.031
Member of dance team in high school	**.526**	-.045
Had writing published in newspaper/magazine	**.400**	.090
Staged a play	**.484**	.095

Note: Factor loadings above .35 are in boldface. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 3

Correlations for Love Components, Personality Traits, Creativity Types, Relationship Length, and Gender

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Passion	1.00	.785**	.814**	.128**	.119**	.035	.116**	.036	-.039	.132**	.125**	-.082**	.05
2. Intimacy		1.00	.821**	.256**	.157**	.087**	.200**	.123**	-.123**	.152**	.176**	.005	.115
3. Commitment			1.00	.187**	.138**	.038	.154**	.067*	-.068*	.155**	.130**	.084**	.080
4. Agreeableness				1.00	.252**	.310**	.339**	.167**	-.045	.168**	.195**	.077**	.172
5. Conscientiousness					1.00	.087**	.177**	.188**	-.011	.117**	.104**	.060*	.05
6. Extroversion						1.00	.296**	.196**	.129**	.161**	.241**	.016	.01
7. Openness							1.00	.117**	.121**	.298**	.639**	.075**	-.04
8. Emotional Stability								1.00	-.011	.082**	.103**	.045	-.13
9. Artistic behaviors					.075**	.1946**	-.051		1.00	.075**	.146**	-.048	.02
10. Everyday behaviors						.301**	-.018			1.00	.307**	-.021	.151
11. Self-assessed creativity							.070**				1.00	.069**	-.04
12. Relationship length												1.00	.00
13. Gender (men=0, women=1)													

Note. $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$.

Table 4

Stepwise Regression Results Predicting Passion from Personality and Creativity

Independent Variables	B	SE B	β
Entire Sample			
Agreeableness	.029	.009	.099**
Artistic creativity	-.156	.055	-.086**
Everyday creativity	.186	.060	.099**
Self-assessed creativity	.162	.054	.096**
Women			
Agreeableness	.025	.010	.085**
Artistic creativity	-.132	.061	-.072*
Everyday creativity	.157	.066	.082*
Self-assessed creativity	.154	.059	.092**
Men			
Openness	.074	.027	.238*

Notes. Adjusted R^2 for entire sample = .043, $p < 0.001$; Adjusted R^2 for women = .031, $p < 0.001$; Adjusted R^2 for men = .049, $p < 0.01$; only significant beta weights are displayed; *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$.

Table 5

Stepwise Regression Results Predicting Intimacy from Personality and Creativity

Independent Variables	B	SE B	β
Entire Sample			
Agreeableness	.035	.007	.188**
Conscientiousness	.012	.006	.077**
Artistic creativity	-.235	.042	-.165**
Everyday creativity	.095	.046	.086*
Self-assessed creativity	.134	.051	.125**
Women			
Agreeableness	.029	.007	.133**
Conscientiousness	.014	.006	.072*
Emotional stability	.015	.005	.094**
Artistic creativity	-.230	.044	-.168**
Self-assessed creativity	.136	.051	.110**
Men			
Agreeableness	.080	.023	.298**
Openness	.070	.025	.240**

Notes. Adjusted R^2 for model = .111, $p < 0.001$; Adjusted R^2 for women = .092, $p < 0.001$; Adjusted R^2 for men = .188, $p < 0.001$; only significant beta weights are displayed; *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$.

Table 6

Stepwise Regression Results Predicting Commitment from Personality and Creativity

Independent Variables	B	SE B	β
Entire Sample			
Agreeableness	.032	.008	.115**
Conscientiousness	.017	.008	.068*
Artistic creativity	-.193	.052	-.165**
Everyday creativity	.201	.055	.114**
Self-assessed creativity	.133	.051	.083**
Women			
Agreeableness	.021	.010	.115**
Conscientiousness	.016	.008	.068*
Artistic creativity	-.173	.057	-.109**
Everyday creativity	.196	.060	.114**
Men			
Agreeableness	.084	.024	.295**
Self-assessed creativity	.310	.153	.171*

Notes. Adjusted $R^2 = .063$, $p < 0.001$; Adjusted R^2 for women = .043, $p < 0.001$; Adjusted R^2 for men = .127, $p < 0.05$; only significant beta weights are displayed;
*$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$.