Slovenian Validation of the Capacity to Love Inventory – A Preliminary Study

Vita Poštuvan[1, 2], Timotej Glavač[3], Jim Schmeckenbecher[4], and Nestor D. Kapusta[4]

[1] University of Primorska, Andrej Marušič Institute, Slovene Centre for Suicide Research, Koper, Slovenia

[2] University of Primorska, FAMNIT, Department of Psychology, Koper, Slovenia

[3] University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Department of Psychology, Ljubljana, Slovenia

[4] Medical University Vienna, Department of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, Vienna, Austria

Abstract

Our study aimed to test the psychometric properties of the Slovenian version of the Capacity to Love Inventory (CTL-I, Kapusta et al., 2018). The CTL-I is a 41-item self-report questionnaire that measures the construct of capacity to love. The measure itself has been operationalized based on findings from clinical practice and psychodynamic theory and relates to both clinically relevant symptoms as well as healthier manifestations of personality. The CTL-I measures six dimensions: interest in the life project of the other, basic trust, gratitude, common ego ideal, permanence of sexual passion and loss and mourning. Due to the concept of capacity to love being closely related to relationship quality, we used the Quality of Relationship Inventory (QRI) to examine external validity. Our final study sample consisted of 224 non-clinical adults. Overall, the Slovenian version of the CTL-I showed a satisfactory model fit, comparable to that of previous validation studies. The QRI subscales were found to correlate with most of the CTL-I factors, as well as the CTL-I subscales with each other. Because of the instrument being tested on a smaller convenience sample in this study, we believe our findings should be viewed as a preliminary attempt at validating the Slovenian translation of the CTL-I. While the results of the present study are promising, we believe additional research is needed to fully assess the psychometric properties of the Slovenian CTL-I.

*Keyword*s: capacity to love, factor analysis, mental health, psychodynamic, validation

Introduction

Intimate relationships are evolutionarily important for our survival and reproduction, and thus a fundamental human need (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). For

---

✉ Vita Poštuvan, University of Primorska, Andrej Marušič Institute, Slovene Centre for Suicide Research, Muzejski trg 2, 6000 Koper, Slovenia. E-mail: *vita.postuvan@upr.si*

many people, the most important interpersonal bond is the spousal relationship. While interpersonal relationships can be a source of happiness and fulfilment on the one hand, relationship conflict is likely to negatively impact subjective and physiological aspects of a person's functioning as well as their overall well-being (Cramer, 2002; Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 2005). There is a growing body of evidence showing that marital discord increases the risk for physical health problems. Studies from the 1980s and 1990s have consistently shown that the quality of romantic relationships is associated with health outcomes (Burman & Margolin, 1992; Kiecolt-Glaser & Newton, 2001). Some studies have even shown that the quality social relationship contributes to a 50% higher likelihood of survival (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010).

Social support is a well examined psychological factor influencing health outcomes (Uchino, 2009). For example, marriage has been shown to affect spousal health behaviours consistently over time (Homish & Leonard, 2008; Meyler et al., 2007). Recently, low marital satisfaction was found to be related to health outcomes such as increased levels of inflammation in a large sample (Whisman & Sbarra, 2012). Further, couples who engage in more hostile behaviours during marital discussions have generally elevated blood pressure and heart rate compared to less hostile couples (reviewed in Robles & Kiecolt-Glaser, 2003). Finally, healthy romantic relationships appear to have benefits ranging from lower stress reactivity to better physical health (Coan et al., 2013; Kiecolt-Glaser & Newton, 2001).

Similarly, relationship quality is related to mental health. Marital maladaptivness and relationship discord is associated with perceived stress, which might contribute to mental health problems (Funk & Rogge, 2007; Whisman & Baucom, 2012), however, the direction of the association can also be opposite (Benazon & Coyne, 2000). Studies have shown that individuals who report greater relationship discord are at increased risk for mental health problems, and this association has been demonstrated for many psychological disorders (Whisman, 2013). Because of the detrimental effects it can have on an individual's health, relationship distress can be considered a public health issue (Foran et al., 2015).

The Importance of Love and Capacity to Love

Love is a fundamental human phenomenon (Fletcher et al., 2015), however, love research has not settled on a common theory of love, leading to many unanswered questions (Levin, 2000). Some empirical approaches to love have focused on specific aspects such as the characteristics of romantic love (Rubin, 1970) or definitions of love styles commonly referred to as eros, agape, pragma, or others (Lee, 1976; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). One of the first unified theories of love was proposed by Sternberg and Barnes (1988), who pointed to *intimacy*, *passion* and *commitment* as love-components that can be coalesced into different phenotypes of love relations. However, empirically established conceptions of love taking

etiological dimensions into account are still to be established. The concept of capacity to love examined in this study is based on an integrated developmental object relations theory (Bergmann, 1971; Gottlieb, 2002; Kapusta et al., 2018; Kernberg 1974, 1977, 2011a, 2011b; Modell, 1963). It consists of multiple components and refers to the ability to enter into and maintain lasting romantic love relationships (Kernberg, 2011a). Capacity to love integrates several dimensions (used interchangeably with the terms subscales and factors throughout the text) closely related to personality characteristics, which is based on the observation, that individuals with personality disorders struggle both in forming and sustaining close relationships (Whisman et al., 2007; Zimmerman & Coryell, 1989) and if related, they commonly experience conflict, violence and instability in relationships (South, 2014). The mechanisms involved in poor romantic relationship functioning are not yet fully understood (Boutwell et al., 2012; Krueger et al., 1998; Lavner et al., 2015).

The Purpose of the Study

Our primary objective was to establish psychometric properties of the Capacity to Love Inventory (CTL-I) (Kapusta et al., 2018) in a Slovenian sample, thereby adding to the growing set of validation studies, the CTL-I currently being validated on Austrian, Polish and Italian samples (Kapusta et al., 2018; Margherita et al., 2018). Our secondary goal was to examine the association between the capacity to love and quality of relationship functioning assessed by the Quality of Relationship Inventory (Pierce et al., 1991) in terms of external validity.

Method

Procedure and Participants

An online invitation to participate in the study was sent to psychology and natural science students at two public universities in Slovenia with the approval of faculty departments. Faculty departments sent out invitation links to participate in the study to all enrolled students with an active university e-mail address. Participants could also forward the invitation to their social network.

In order to participate in the study, participants had to agree to the Privacy policy, which included information about the aim of the study, participants' rights regarding anonymity, data storage, and use of the data collected. Participants were guaranteed anonymity throughout the process – there was no data collected that would allow the identification of the participants. The research data was used exclusively for the dissemination procedures. The procedure followed the ethical and research standards of the University of Primorska and the Helsinki declaration.

The selection of psychology and natural science students balanced the target population proportionally to gender differences: psychology is dominated by females, while natural sciences by males. However, more women (79.5%) participated in the study. A similar overproportion of females emerged in previous validation studies on this topic (Kapusta et al., 2018; Margherita et al., 2018).

The online survey consisted of the Capacity to Love Inventory (Kapusta et al., 2018) and the Quality of Relationship Inventory (Pierce et al., 1997) as well as demographic variables (presented in Table 1). The Capacity to Love Inventory was translated from English to Slovenian for the purpose of the study, using the back-translation procedure (Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997).

A total of 601 individuals opened the online invitation letter, and 37% of the questionnaires were completed entirely. Our final sample consisted of 224 participants. The average age of participants was 24.5 years ($SD = 6.07$, range 18 – 50). Demographic data is presented in Table 1.

Descriptive statistical analyses were performed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 19.0. Confirmatory factor analysis of the CTL-I was conducted in R 4.1.1. (R Core Team, 2019), using lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012).

Table 1

Characteristics of the Sample

Variables	Percentages (Mean $\pm$ *SD*)
Sex	
Man	46
Woman	178
Age – *M*(*SD*)	(24.50 $\pm$ 6.07)
Education Level	
High school	61%
Bachelor's degree	22%
Graduate degree or higher	17%
Relationship Status	
In a relationship	71%
Single	28%
Divorced	1%
Widowed	0%

Measures

The Capacity to Love Inventory (CTL-I; Kapusta et al., 2018), is a 41 item self-report questionnaire rated on a 4-point scale (1 – *disagree* to 4 – *agree*). The questionnaire consists of six dimensions: Interest in the life project of the other (INT; "*I feel enriched to see the personal growth and life experience of my partner.*"), basic trust (BRT; "*I am comfortable with my partner and I usually feel safe in his/her*

company"), gratitude (GRT; "*I feel gratitude for the existence of my partner*"), common ego ideal (CEI; "*We always try to work on our relationship*"), permanence of sexual passion (PSP; "*Sexual boredom arises in long-term relationships*", reversed) and loss and mourning (LOM; "*I am often unwilling to accept the end of my relationships*", reversed). The scale has been translated through the back translation process (Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997) into Slovenian.

In the original version, Cronbach's alpha of the total scale is .90, for the subscales values are .73 for Interest in the other, .86 for Basic trust, .81 for Gratitude and Humility, .81 for Common Ego Ideal, .83 for Permanence of sexual passion, and .75 for Loss and mourning. A second validation on an Italian sample showed Cronbach's alpha values in a similar range (Kapusta et al., 2018).

The Quality of Relationships Inventory (QRI; Pierce et al., 1997), is used to assess relationship-specific perceptions of social support (*Support* subscale), consisting of individual's expectations about the availability of support from particular significant others (Pierce et al., 1991, 1997). The QRI focuses on perceived support within an intimate relationship, rather than reflecting a person's perceived support from any individual in his or her social network. The QRI includes an assessment of two other features highly relevant to relationship quality: Conflict (the extent to which the relationship is a source of conflict, anger and ambivalent feelings) and Depth (the importance of the relationship). The QRI has proven useful in both clinical and nonclinical relationship research. For example, research has demonstrated that an individual's relationship-specific perceptions, as assessed by the QRI, are useful in predicting that person's adjustment (e.g., loneliness, self-esteem, anxiety, depression, coping; Pierce et al., 1997; Ptacek et al., 1999). QRI is based on the assumption that general predispositions to engage in and respond to social behaviour are grounded in expectations, derived from Bowlby's (1980) theory of working models and relations between the self and important others.

In our study, we used the Slovene version of the QRI (Zager Kocjan & Avsec, 2014), consisting of 25 self-report items evaluated on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (*not true*) to 4 (*almost always true*). The scale has three dimensions with sufficient internal consistency measured by Cronbach alpha: the Support subscale (.86) measures the level of mutual support in the relationship, the Depth subscale (.82) measures the dependency and depth of the interpersonal relationship and the Conflict subscale (.90) measures critical and conflict-related issues. The Support and Depth dimensions reflect better relationship quality, while higher scores in the Conflict subscale are interpreted as lower relationship quality.

Results

We tested the theory-driven model developed by Kapusta et al. (2018) with a CFA analysis: a six-factor model with 41 items and scales being allowed to correlate with each other. Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of our sample. The results of

the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of scales and subscales indicated that most of the scales and subscales did not have a normal distribution. Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted using a maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors and a Satorra-Bentler scaled test statistic.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for the Studied Measures and Comparison of Means

	Mean (*SD*)	Skewness	Kurtosis
Interest in the other (INT)	3.47 (0.32)	-0.92	0.76
Basic trust (BTR)	3.61 (0.46)	-1.04	0.78
Gratitude (GRT)	3.52 (0.45)	-0.97	0.24
Common ego ideal (CEI)	3.46 (0.41)	-0.50	-0.81
Permanence of sexual passion (PSP)	3.38 (0.63)	-1.60	3.60
Loss and mourning (LOM)	3.35 (0.50)	-1.70	3.86
CTL-I total	3.47 (0.28)	-0.86	0.65

Model fit was assessed using the following fit indexes: (1) the chi-squared statistic and its degree of freedom; (2) the Standardized Root Mean Square Residuals (SRMR); and, (3) the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and its 90% confidence interval (90% CI). In line with what Schermelleh-Engel and colleagues (2003) affirmed, the model fits the data when χ^2/df equal or < 2, RMSEA equal or $< .05$ (90% CI: the lower boundary of the CI should contain zero for exact fit and be $< .05$ for close fit), although Browne and Cudeck (1993) argued that values ranging from .05 to .08 are indicative of good model adequacy. Internal consistencies for the scales of the best fitting model were computed using Cronbach's coefficient alpha for each factor.

Based on the results of the chi-squared test, a lack of overall fit for the model tested ($p < .01$) was shown; which may be due to the sensitivity of this statistic to large sample sizes (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kahn, 2006). In fact, chi-square is highly sensitive to sample size: as the size of the sample increases, absolute differences become a smaller and smaller proportion of the expected value. Moreover, a lack of this fit index is common in social sciences due to the interconnectedness of psychological concepts (Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003; Vandenberg, 2006).

An RMSEA value of less than .06 suggests an excellent data fit, while an RMSEA value of less than .08 suggests an acceptable fit (Schreiber et al., 2006). The goodness-of-fit indices (RMSEA and SRMR) show acceptable scores for the RMSEA (.06) with less than .08 being acceptable (Steiger, 2007) as well as satisfactory scores for the SRMR at .07 with an acceptable score cut-off being less than .08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Results show a comparable fit to the results obtained in the original version of the CTL-I (Kapusta et al., 2018) CTL-I: chi^2/degrees of freedom = 3.13 (2391.9/764), SRMR = .060, RMSEA = .062 (90% CI .060 – .065)

as well as the Italian version where fit indices were: chi^2/degrees of freedom = 3.40 (2598.87/764), SRMR = .05, RMSEA = .06 (90% CI .055 – .060) (Margherita et al., 2018). Table 4 shows the results of the confirmatory factor analysis.

Table 3

Fit Indices for Our and Previous Studies

	Chi square	*df*	RMSEA (90% CI)	RMSEA	SRMR
Slovenian	1689.93	764	.050 – .060	.058	.074
Austrian	2391.90	764	.060 – .065	.060	.062
Polish	1482.30	764	.058 – .067	.063	.070
Italian	2598.87	764	.055 – .060	.057	.053

Table 4

Results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis – Item Loadings of the Slovenian CTL-I

#	Item	INT	BTR	GRT	CEI	PSP	LOM
1	It is important to me to know the life plan of my partner.	.40					
2	I share my life plans with my partner.	.51					
3	I am joyful to share my partner's success.	.55					
4	I feel enriched to see the personal growth and life experience of my partner.	.60					
5	When my partner is unhappy, I also feel sad.	.28					
6	I can be empathic with my partner and try to understand her/him.	.32					
7	I am often bored with my partner.	.25					
8	I trust that my partner is empathic with me when necessary.		.68				
9	My weaknesses, inner conflicts and problems are open to the other.		.68				
10	I can express my feelings and needs to my partner openly.		.86				
11	I can trust my partner that in situations of uncertainty and ambivalence she/he can be emotionally supportive.		.79				
12	I feel being honest to my partner.		.43				
13	I keep secrets from my partner.		.30				
14	I can confess my weaknesses to my partner.		.67				
15	I sometimes feel that my relationships are limited.		.25				
16	I am comfortable with my partner and I usually feel safe in his/her company.		.76				
17	I feel gratitude for the existence of my partner.			.74			
18	I feel gratitude for the love received.			.73			
19	When separated I still feel connected with the partner.			.73			
20	I accept that I need my partner.			.59			

#	Item	INT	BTR	GRT	CEI	PSP	LOM
21	I like to convey comfort to my partner.			.61			
22	I like to take care of the other, when he/she needs my help.			.66			
23	I like to share responsibilities in our daily life in order to take the pressure off of my partner.			.66			
24	I am dedicated to my relationships.				.62		
25	We always try to work on our relationship.				.45		
26	I respect the personality and essential values of my partner.				.59		
27	I love to watch my partner's gestures and reactions.				.39		
28	I feel committed to our joint life.				.76		
29	I search compromise solutions when conflicts and competing agendas arise.				.79		
30	I often tell my partner that I love him.				.63		
31	I feel deeply connected with my partner.				.39		
32	Sexual boredom arises in long-term relationships.					.48	
33	The sexual desire diminishes throughout time.					.57	
34	It is hard for me to accept if a loved person is not able to respond to my love.						.14
35	When a relationship is over, I often blame my ex-partner.						.46
36	I sometimes have wishes for revenge when my partner dismisses me.						.36
37	I am often unwilling to accept the end of my relationships.						.51
38	I am often jealous.						.35
39	I have feelings of guilt after a separation.						.44
40	I sometimes devaluate myself if my partner abandoned me.						.55
41	It is hard for me to move on after a relationship.						.33

Note. *Reverse-coded item. INT = Interest; BTR = Basic Trust; GRT = Gratitude, CEI = Common Ego Ideal; PSP = Permanance of Sexual Passion; LOM = Loss and Mourning.

Table 5

Spearman Correlations Coefficients between the CTL-I and QRI

	INT	BTR	GRT	CEI	PSP	LOM	CTL-I_Sum
QRI support	.39**	.71**	.56**	.50**	.10	.10	.62**
QRI depth	.43**	.59**	.62**	.57**	.16*	.05	.62**
QRI conflict	-.19*	-.44*	-.32**	.24**	-.05	-.09	-.37**
QRI sum	.41**	.71**	.61**	.53**	.12	.09	.66**

Note. INT = Interest; BTR = Basic Trust; GRT = Gratitude; CEI = Common ego ideal; PSP = Permanence of sexual passion; LOM = Loss and mourning; CTL-I_Sum = Capacity to love Sum. *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$.

As the QRI was used as a measure of convergent validity for the CTL-I dimensions, we expected significant correlations on the majority of the dimensions. In line with these expectations, most QRI subscales and the CTL-I subscales correlated significantly (Table 5). As expected, the Conflict subscale of the QRI correlated negatively with all the CTL-I subscales, while the highest (negative) correlation was with Basic trust. The QRI subscales of Social support and Depth showed significant correlations with the CTL subscales Interest, Basic trust, Gratitude, and Common go ideal with correlations ranging from .39 to .71. These were moderate to high correlations significant at $p < .05$. The subscales of Permanence of sexual passion showed only a slight correlation with QRI depth, while Loss and mourning showed no correlations with any of the subscales. Overall, results indicate a significant, moderate to strong correlation between quality of relationship and capacity to love ($r = .66$, $p < .01$) and its subscales (social support $r = .62$, $p < .01$; depth $r = .62$, $p < .01$; conflict $r = -.37$, $p < .01$).

CTL-I subscales Basic trust, Gratitude and Common ego ideal significantly correlated between each other (Table 6). The Permanence of sexual passion and Loss and mourning subscale did not show significant correlations with the other 4 subscales. CTL-I total showed significant correlations with all six subscales.

Table 6

Correlation between CTL-I Subscales

	INT	BTR	GRT	CEI	PSP	LOM
INT		.45**	.54**	.57**	.05	.04
BTR			.67**	.57**	.09*	.07
GRT				.74**	.15*	-.09
CEI					.10	.01
PSP						-.10
CTL-I total	.63**	.74**	.78*	.77**	.39**	.24**
Cronbach alpha	.56	.83	.84	.79	.63	.56

Note. INT = Interest; BTR = Basic trust; GRT = Gratitude; CEI = Common ego ideal; PSP = Permanence of sexual passion; LOM = Loss and mourning; CTL-I total = Capacity to Love Inventory total score. $^*p < .05$; $^{**}p < .01$.

Discussion

The purpose of our study was to continue the validation process of the Capacity to Love Inventory (CTL-I), a quantitative measure for assessing an individual's capacity to love, on a Slovene sample.

The Cronbach's alphas for the subscales were lower for the subscales interest, loss and mourning and permanence of sexual passion, while basic trust, gratitude and common ego ideal showed good internal consistency. Model fit was tested using

CFA showing satisfactory results (RMSEA and SRMR) in confirming the factor structure of the Slovenian version of the CTL-I. However, the chi-squared test analysis showed a lack of overall model fit, as was also the case in the previous validation studies (Kapusta et al., 2018; Margherita et al., 2018). As the chi-squared test is sensitive to sample size (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kahn, 2006) this result is common in psychological constructs exhibiting high intercorrelations. Overall, our results are comparable to the results of the two previous validation studies (Kapusta et al, 2018; Margherita et al., 2018).

Due to the importance of love in forming and maintaining intimate bonds, we hypothesized a positive association between the CTL-I and relationship quality. Strong and significant correlations were found between the QRI subscale of Social support and the CTL-I subscales Interest, Basic trust, Gratitude, and Common ego ideal. The same was found for the QRI Depth subscale. The QRI Conflict subscale also showed significant negative correlations with the four CTL-I subscales mentioned above. The Permanence of sexual passion and Loss and mourning subscales, however, showed little to no correlation with the QRI subscales. A result, which is in line with Kapusta and colleagues' (2018) weak associations between these scales. Given the fact of smaller sample size in our study, replication in larger Slovenian samples is needed.

Also, the correlational analysis between CTL-I subscales and the total score showed slightly lower values than those found previously (Kapusta et al., 2018; Margherita et al., 2018). Correlations between Interest in the other, Basic Trust, Gratitude, Common ego ideal and the Total CTL-I score were moderately to high as well as statistically significant. Additionally, unlike the aforementioned studies, we found no significant correlation between Permanence of sexual passion and Loss and mourning with the other subscales. Loss and mourning as measured by the CTL-I refers to an individual's reactions to and the level to which they are affected by inevitable relationship ruptures. In both previous studies, correlations between these two subscales were significantly lower compared to the other subscales, with Loss and mourning having very modest to no correlation with any of the factors. The PSP and LOM subscales should be reviewed in further studies especially using the Slovenian translation of the CTL-I. In Kapusta and colleagues (2018) and Margherita and colleagues (2018) correlations, while being statistically significant, were the lowest between PSP and LOM among the six subscales. We would therefore suggest further studies to be conducted to re-examine the validity of the two subscales and improve on the Slovenian CTL-I.

The Capacity to Love Inventory was developed in an attempt to gain deeper insight into the dimensions of the psychotherapeutic process and its outcomes and could thus be an important tool for monitoring the effectiveness of clinical intervention (Margherita et al., 2018). Authors have also theorized the potential of the instrument in promoting protective factors in the general population (Margherita et al., 2017; Tessitore & Margherita, 2017). The CTL-I could prove valuable in

further exploring the mechanisms of relationship functioning in nonclinical and subclinical populations, as these mechanisms of relationship quality have not yet been fully understood (Boutwell et al., 2012; Lavner et al., 2015).

Perhaps the largest advantage of the CTL-I as compared to other relationship measures is that it can be used as a measure of psychodynamically conceptualized difficulties in relationship functioning thus valuable in clinical settings as a diagnostic tool for problems in intimate relationships. For example, psychoanalytic theories suggest an association of depression with the loss of loved objects (Desmet, 2013). Accordingly, a mature capacity to love is associated with the ability to bear depressive feelings (Klein, 1940, 1946). In line with psychoanalytic theories, the original validation study showed significant negative correlations between depression and all the capacity to love dimensions (Kapusta et al., 2018) pointing to further validity of the construct.

Implications

As intimate relationship functioning is associated with aspects of both mental and physical health, it is important to find ways to assess and improve the quality of relationships. The primary evolutionary goal of intimate relationships is essentially the bearing of offspring. Thus, parent relationship quality is of vital importance for a child's psychological development (Schore, 2013). Parental discord has been shown to be associated with child psychological outcomes (Davies et al., 2018; Knopp et al., 2017; Tan et al., 2020). In line with developmental cascades (Masten & Chichetti, 2010) parent relationship quality can have far-reaching consequences on a child's mental health consequentially influencing the child's romantic interactions and relationship quality (Handley et al., 2019). Improving relationship functioning could thus have far-reaching societal benefits and measures such as the CTL-I can aid in the process of identifying and treating specific psychological sources of intimate relationship distress.

Limitations

Traditional power estimations for Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) (e.g., Bentler & Chou, 1987; Tanaka, 1987) might suggest that the sample size of the current study is too small to reach adequate power. However, more recent power estimations for SEM suggest sample sizes of 200 and above, as in our study to be adequate (Boomsma & Hoogland, 2001; Hoogland & Boomsma 1998; Kim et al., 2005; Kline, 2005). A second aspect, the disproportionate number of women participating in the study compared to men needs also to be considered. In line with previous CTL-I studies, gender bias can be explained by findings that women might be interested in relationships and participating in research more than men (Fraley et al., 2011; Su et al., 2009). To be argued similarly, our sample was composed of young participants ($M = 24.5$). Given the fact that age is related to relationship experience,

this might have also an effect on the overall result. For example, some recent research has shown a decline in sexual experience among young adults (Herbenick et al., 2021). However, the mean age and age range of our sample was very similar to the age of the two previous samples (16 to 66, $M = 28.92$, Austrian [Kapusta et al., 2018] and 18 to 50, $M = 23.24$, Polish [Kapusta et al., 2018]) of the original validation study (Kapusta et al., 2018). An additional potential limitation in the generalizability of our findings was the inclusion of both humanistic and natural science students in our study. Some research has shown personality factors to be associated with vocational choice (Balsamo et al., 2012; Coenen et al., 2021). These personality traits could in turn be associated with relationship quality and experience (Vater & Schröder–Abé, 2015).

Conclusion

The main objective of the present study was primarily to validate the Slovenian version of the Capacity to Love Inventory. We were largely able to confirm the factor structure of the CTL-I. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis were analogous to those of the previous two validation studies. A second goal of the study was to assess its association with the QRI, which was in turn also a measure of the CTL-I's convergent validity. The dimensions Loss and mourning and Permanence of sexual passion, showed lower than expected associations with the QRI dimensions as well as CTL-I subscales, which warrants further examination. We believe the CTL-I is an important measure for assessing both clinical as well as non-clinical relationship functioning. Overall, we believe our study should be seen as a preliminary attempt at the validation of the Slovenian version of the CTL-I as well as a valuable supplement to the process of validating the concept of the capacity to love internationally.

References

Balsamo, M., Lauriola, M., & Saggino, A. (2012). Personality and college major choice: Which come first? *Psychology*, *3*(05), 399–405. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2012.35056

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497–529. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497

Benazon, N. R., & Coyne, J. C. (2000). Living with a depressed spouse. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *14*(1), 71–79. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.14.1.71

Bentler, P. M., & Chou, C. P. (1987). Practical issues in structural modeling. *Sociological Methods & Research, 16*, 78–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124187016001004

Bergmann, M. S. (1971). Psychoanalytic observations on the capacity to love. *Separation-individuation: Essays in honor of Margaret S. Mahler*, 15–40.

Boomsma, A., & Hoogland, J. J. (2001). The robustness of LISREL modeling revisited. In R. Cudeck, S. du Toit, & D. Sörbom (Eds.), *Structural equation models: Present and future. A festschrift in honor of Karl Jöreskog* (pp. 139–168). Scientific Software International.

Boutwell, B. B., Beaver, K. M., & Barnes, J. C. (2012). More alike than different: Assortative mating and antisocial propensity in adulthood. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *39*(9), 1240–1254. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812445715

Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss. III, Loss: Sadness and depression*. Basic Books.

Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. Bollen & J. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136–162). Sage.

Burman, B., & Margolin, G. (1992). Analysis of the association between marital relationships and health problems: An interactional perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 39–63. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.39

Coan, J. A., Kasle, S., Jackson, A., Schaefer, H. S., & Davidson, R. J. (2013). Mutuality and the social regulation of neural threat responding. *Attachment & Human Development*, *15*(3), 303–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2013.782656

Coenen, J., Borghans, L., & Diris, R. (2021). Personality traits, preferences and educational choices: A focus on STEM. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *84*, 102361. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2021.102361

Cramer, D. (2002). Relationship satisfaction and conflict over minor and major issues in romantic relationships. *The Journal of Psychology*, *136*(1), 75–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980209604140

Davies, P. T., Martin, M. J., & Cummings, E. M. (2018). Interparental conflict and children's social problems: Insecurity and friendship affiliation as cascading mediators. *Developmental Psychology*, *54*(1), 83–97. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000410

Desmet, M. (2013). Some preliminary notes on an empirical test of Freud's theory on depression. *Frontiers in Psychology, 4*, 158. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00158

Fletcher, G. J., Simpson, J. A., Campbell, L., & Overall, N. C. (2015). Pair-bonding, romantic love, and evolution: The curious case of Homo sapiens. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *10*(1), 20–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614561683

Foran, H. M., Whisman, M. A., & Beach, S. R. (2015). Intimate partner relationship distress in the DSM-5. *Family Process*, *54*(1), 48–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12122

Fraley, R. C., Heffernan, M. E., Vicary, A. M., & Brumbaugh, C. C. (2011). The experiences in close relationships-relationship structures questionnaire: A method for assessing attachment orientations across relationships. *Psychological Assessment 23*(3), 615–625. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022898

Funk, J. L., & Rogge, R. D. (2007). Testing the ruler with item response theory: Increasing precision of measurement for relationship satisfaction with the Couples Satisfaction Index. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *21*(4), 572–583. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.21.4.572

Gottlieb, S. (2002). The capacity for love. In D. Mann (Ed.), *Love and hate: Psychoanalytic perspectives.* Brunner-Routledge.

Handley, E. D., Russotti, J., Rogosch, F. A., & Cicchetti, D. (2019). Developmental cascades from child maltreatment to negative friend and romantic interactions in emerging adulthood. *Development and Psychopathology*, *31*(5), 1649–1659. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095457941900124X

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

Herbenick, D., Rosenberg, M., Golzarri-Arroyo, L., Fortenberry, J. D., & Fu, T. C. (2022). Changes in penile-vaginal intercourse frequency and sexual repertoire from 2009 to 2018: Findings from the National survey of sexual health and behavior. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *51*(3), 1419–1433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-02125-2

Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. *PLoS Medicine*, *7*(7), e1000316. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316

Homish, G. G., & Leonard, K. E. (2008). Spousal influence on general health behaviors in a community sample. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, *32*(6), 754–763. https://doi.org/10.5555/ajhb.2008.32.6.754

Hoogland, J. J., & Boomsma, A. (1998). Robustness studies in covariance structure modeling: An overview and a meta-analysis. *Sociological Methods & Research, 26*, 329–367. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124198026003003

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1–55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Kahn, J. H. (2006). Factor analysis in counseling psychology research, training, and practice: Principles, advances, and applications. *Counselling Psychology, 34*, 684–718. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006286347

Kapusta, N. D., Jankowski, K. S., Wolf, V., Chéron-Le Guludec, M., Lopatka, M., Hammerer, C., Schnieder, A., Kealy, D., Ogrodniczuk, J. S., & Blüml, V. (2018). Measuring the capacity to love: Development of the CTL-Inventory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, 1115. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01115

Kernberg, O. F. (1974). Barriers to falling and remaining in love. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, *22*(3), 486–511. https://doi.org/10.1177/000306517402200302

Kernberg, O. F. (1977). Boundaries and structure in love relations. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, *25*(1), 81–114. https://doi.org/10.1177/000306517702500104

Kernberg, O. F. (2011a). Limitations to the capacity to love. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *92*(6), 1501–1515. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-8315.2011.00456.x

Kernberg, O. F. (2011b). The sexual couple: A psychoanalytic exploration. *The Psychoanalytic Review*, *98*(2), 217–245. https://doi.org/10.1521/prev.2011.98.2.217

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., & Newton, T. L. (2001). Marriage and health: His and hers. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(4), 472–503. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.4.472

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Loving, T. J., Stowell, J. R., Malarkey, W. B., Lemeshow, S., Dickinson, S. L., & Glaser, R. (2005). Hostile marital interactions, proinflammatory cytokine production, and wound healing. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *62*(12), 1377–1384. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.62.12.1377

Kim, K. H. (2005). The relation among fit indexes, power, and sample size in structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling, 12*, 368–390. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1203_2

Klein, M. (1940). Mourning and its relation to manic-depressive states. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, *21*, 125–153

Klein, M. (1946). Notes on some schizoid mechanisms. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, *27*, 99–110.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Knopp, K., Rhoades, G. K., Allen, E. S., Parsons, A., Ritchie, L. L., Markman, H. J., & Stanley, S. M. (2017). Within-and between-family associations of marital functioning and child well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *79*(2), 451461. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12373

Krueger, R. F., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Bleske, A., & Silva, P. A. (1998). Assortative mating for antisocial behavior: Developmental and methodological implications. *Behavior Genetics*, *28*(3), 173–186. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1021419013124

Lavner, J. A., Lamkin, J., & Miller, J. D. (2015). Borderline personality disorder symptoms and newlyweds' observed communication, partner characteristics, and longitudinal marital outcomes. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *124*(4), 975–981. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000095

Lee, J. A. (1976). *The colors of love*. New Press.

Levin, J. (2000). A prolegomenon to an epidemiology of love: Theory, measurement, and health outcomes. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *19*(1), 117–136. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2000.19.1.117

Margherita, G., Gargiulo, A., Troisi, G., Tessitore, F., & Kapusta, N. D. (2018). Italian validation of the Capacity to Love Inventory: Preliminary results. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, 1434. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01434

Masten, A. S., & Cicchetti, D. (2010). Developmental cascades. *Development and Psychopathology*, *22*(3), 491–495. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579410000222

Meyler, D., Stimpson, J. P., & Peek, M. K. (2007). Health concordance within couples: A systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*, *64*(11), 2297–2310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.02.007

Modell, A. H. (1963). The concept of psychic energy. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, *11*(3), 605–618. https://doi.org/10.1177/000306516301100308

Pierce, G. R., Sarason, I. G., & Sarason, B. R. (1991). General and relationship-based perceptions of social support: Are two constructs better than one? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*(6), 1028–1039. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.61.6.1028

Pierce, G. R., Sarason, I. G., Sarason, B. R., Solky-Butzel, J. A., & Nagle, L. C. (1997). Assessing the quality of personal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *14*(3), 339 –356. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407597143004

Ptacek, J. T., Pierce, G. R., Eberhardt, T. L., & Dodge, K. L. (1999). Parental relationships and coping with life stress. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, *12*(4), 427–453. https://doi.org/10.1080/10615809908249320

R Core Team. (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/

Robles, T. F., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. (2003). The physiology of marriage: Pathways to health. *Physiology & Behavior*, *79*(3), 409–416. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0031-9384(03)00160-4

Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software, 48*(2), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02

Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *16*(2), 265–273. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0029841

Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online, 8*, 23–74.

Schore, A. N. (2013). Relational trauma, brain development, and dissociation. In J. D. Ford & C. A. Courtois (Eds.), *Treating complex traumatic stress disorders in children and adolescents: Scientific foundations and therapeutic models* (pp. 3–23). The Guilford Press.

Schreiber, J. B., Nora, A., Stage, F. K., Barlow, E. A., & King, J. (2006). Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: A review. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *99*(6), 323–338. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.99.6.323-338

South, S. C. (2014). Synthesizing social and clinical approaches to relationships and health. In C. R. Agnew & S. C. South (Eds.), *Interpersonal relationships and health: Social and clinical psychological mechanisms* (pp. 275–281). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199936632.003.0013

Steiger, J. H. (2007). Understanding the limitations of global fit assessment in structural equation modeling. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*(5), 893–898. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.017

Sternberg, R. J., & Barnes, M. L. (Eds.). (1988). *The psychology of love*. Yale University Press

Su, R., Rounds, J., & Armstrong, P. I. (2009). Men and things, women and people: A meta-analysis of sex differences in interests. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*(6), 859–884. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017364

Tan, P. Z., Oppenheimer, C. W., Ladouceur, C. D., Butterfield, R. D., & Silk, J. S. (2020). A review of associations between parental emotion socialization behaviors and the neural substrates of emotional reactivity and regulation in youth. *Developmental Psychology*, *56*(3), 516–527. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000893

Tanaka, J. S. (1987). "How big is big enough? ": Sample size and goodness of fit in structural equation models with latent variables. *Child Development, 58*(1), 134–146. https://doi.org/10.2307/1130296

Tessitore, F., & Margherita, G. (2017). A review of asylum seekers and refugees in Italy: Where is the psychological research going? *Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology, 5*(2), 1–33. https://doi.org/10.6092/2282-1619/2017.5.1612

Uchino, B. N. (2009). Understanding the links between social support and physical health: A life-span perspective with emphasis on the separability of perceived and received support. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *4*(3), 236–255. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01122.x

Van de Vijver, F. J., & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research* (Vol. 1). Sage.

Vandenberg, R. J. (2006). Introduction: Statistical and methodological myths and urban legends: Where, pray tell, did they get this idea? *Organizational Research Methods*, *9*(2), 194–201. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428105285506

Vater, A., & Schröder-Abé, M. (2015). Explaining the link between personality and relationship satisfaction: Emotion regulation and interpersonal behaviour in conflict discussions. *European Journal of Personality, 29*(2), 201–215. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1993

Whisman, M. A. (2013). Relationship discord and the prevalence, incidence, and treatment of psychopathology. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *30*(2), 163–170. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407512455269

Whisman, M. A., & Baucom, D. H. (2012). Intimate relationships and psychopathology. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *15*(1), 4–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-011-0107-2

Whisman, M. A., & Sbarra, D. A. (2012). Marital adjustment and interleukin-6 (IL-6). *Journal of Family Psychology*, *26*(2), 290–295. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026902

Whisman, M. A., Tolejko, N., & Chatav, Y. (2007). Social consequences of personality disorders: Probability and timing of marriage and probability of marital disruption. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *21*(6), 690–695. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2007.21.6.690

Zager Kocjan, G., & Avsec, A. (2014). Napovedniki zadovoljstva v partnerskem odnosu pri moških in ženskah [Predictors of relationship satisfaction for men and women]. *Psihološka obzorja*, *23*, 31–40.

Zimmerman, M., & Coryell, W. (1989). DSM-III personality disorder diagnoses in a nonpatient sample: Demographic correlates and comorbidity. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *46*(8), 682–689. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1989.01810080012002

Slovenska validacija Inventara sposobnosti za ljubav – preliminarno istraživanje

Cilj je ovoga istraživanja bio ispitati psihometrijske karakteristike slovenske verzije Inventara sposobnosti za ljubav (CTL-I; Kapusta i sur., 2018). CTL-I je upitnik za samoprocjenu od 41 čestice koji mjeri konstrukt sposobnosti za ljubav. Sama je mjera operacionalizirana na temelju istraživanja u kliničkoj praksi i psihodinamskoj teoriji, a odnosi se na klinički relevantne simptome, kao i na zdravije manifestacije ličnosti. CTL-I mjeri šest dimenzija: zanimanje za životni plan drugoga, osnovno povjerenje, zahvalnost, zajednički ego ideal, postojanost seksualne strasti te gubitak i žalost. Budući da je poznato da je koncept sposobnosti za ljubav usko povezan s kvalitetom veze, koristili smo Inventar kvalitete odnosa (QRI) za ispitivanje vanjske valjanosti. Konačni se uzorak ispitanika sastojao od 224 nekliničke odrasle osobe. Slovenska verzija CTL-I-ja pokazala je zadovoljavajuće pristajanje modela usporedivo s onim u prethodnim validacijskim studijama. Supskale QRI-ja koreliraju s većinom faktora CTL-I-ja, kao i supskale CTL-I-ja jedna s drugom. Budući da je instrument u ovome istraživanju testiran na manjemu prigodnom uzorku, vjerujemo da bi dobivene nalaze trebalo promatrati kao preliminarni pokušaj validacije slovenskoga prijevoda CTL-I-ja. Iako su rezultati ove studije obećavajući, potrebna su daljnja istraživanja da bi se u potpunosti procijenila psihometrijska svojstva slovenskoga prijevoda CTL-I-ja.

Ključne riječi: sposobnost za ljubav, faktorska analiza, mentalno zdravlje, psihodinamski, validacija

Appendix 1

Slovene Version of the CTL

#	Item
1	Pomembno se mi zdi poznati življenjske načrte mojega partnerja.
2	S partnerjem delim svoje življenjske cilje in načrte.
3	Veselim se uspehov mojega partnerja.
4	Osebna rast in življenjske izkušnje mojega partnerja me osebno bogatijo.
5	Žalosten sem, ko je moj partner nesrečen.
6	Lahko sem empatičen do partnerja in ga poskušam razumeti.
7	Pogosto mi je s partnerjem dolgčas.
8	Zaupam, da me bo partner razumel in mi nudil oporo, ko bom to potreboval.
9	Moj partner pozna moje pomanjkljivosti, notranje konflikte in probleme.
10	S partnerjem lahko odprto podelim svoja čustva ali potrebe.
11	Partnerju zaupam, da mi bo v trenutkih negotovosti in dvomov nudil čustveno podporo.
12	Čutim, da sem iskren do partnerja.
13	Partnerju prikrivam svoje skrivnosti.
14	Partnerju lahko priznam svoje pomanjkljivosti.
15	Včasih imam občutek, da imajo moje zveze meje, ki jih navkljub trudu ne morem preseči.
16	Dobro in varno se počutim v družbi mojega partnerja.
17	Hvaležen sem za obstoj mojega partnerja.
18	Hvaležen sem za prejeto ljubezen.
19	Tudi ko sva ločena dalj časa, čutim povezanost s partnerjem.
20	Sprejmem, da potrebujem mojega partnerja.
21	Partnerja rad potolažim.
22	Rad poskrbim za partnerja, ko potrebuje mojo pomoč.
23	V vsakdanjiku rad prevzamem del odgovornosti, da razbremenim partnerja.
24	Predan in angažiran sem v svoji zvezi.
25	Vedno se trudiva delati na medosebnem odnosu.
26	Spoštujem osebnost in ključne vrednote mojega partnerja
27	Rad opazujem geste in reakcije mojega partnerja.
28	Potrudim se za najino skupno življenje.
29	Kadar se pojavijo nesoglasja ali razlike v željah, poskušam najti kompromise.
30	Partnerju pogosto povem, da ga ljubim.
31	S partnerjem sem globoko povezan.
32	V dolgotrajnih odnosih pride kdaj do dolgočasja v spolnosti.
33	Želja po spolnosti se s časom zmanjša.
34	Težko sprejmem, če mi ljubljena oseba ne more vrniti ljubezni.
35	Ko se odnos konča, pogosto za to krivim nekdanjega partnerja.
36	Včasih imam željo po maščevanju, ko se s partnerjem razideva.
37	Pogosto težko sprejmem prekinitev odnosa.
38	Pogosto sem ljubosumen.
39	Po razvezi imam pogosto občutke krivde.
40	Če me partner zapusti, se začnem slabše vrednotiti.
41	Po razhodu težko začnem novo razmerje.