RELATIONSHIPS
FORMATION OF ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Reward/need satisfaction theory: (Byrne and Clore, 1970)
- things we find rewarding reflect our unmet needs
- Operant conditioning: positive presence of some individuals is reinforced, we seek it / are attracted
- Classical conditioning: associating (positively) a person with an (pleasant) event

Similarity: (Byrne, Clore and Smeaton, 1986)
- similarity promotes liking, avoid dissimilar people
- Berscheid and Reis (1998) research generally consistent; similar personality = more attraction
- Caspi and Herbener (1990) married couples w/ similar personalities were happiest
- ‘attitude alignment’: so partners “become more similar"

Social exchange theory: (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959)
- Profit and loss: all social behaviour a series of exchanges to maximise rewards and minimise costs, rewards may be companionship and sex, costs may be financial investment
- Comparison level: created against which all relationships are judged against, profit in potential relationship must exceed this = worthwhile investment

RE: 
- Rusbuldt et al. (1995) women stay in abusive relationships if incomes are high (e.g. MBAs) and alternatives low (e.g. no other home)
- Simpson et al. (1990) Ps in relationship lower ratings for members who have site sex

Limitations: Ducks and Sants (1983) focuses on individual’s perspective, ignores social aspects

Equity theory: (Walster et al., 1978)
- Messick and Cook (1983) strive for fairness, distressed at unfairness
- equity not equality – amounts contributed can vary
- inequity perceived, CL consulted

RE:
- Stafford and Canary (2006) 200 married couples, relationship satisfaction highest for ‘equity’, then ‘over-benefited’, then ‘under-benefited’
- Clark and Mills (1979) exchange relationships better suited to colleagues, ‘communal’ relationships (more to do with responding needs) to friends/lovers
- Ragsdale and Brandeu-Brown (2007) relationship satisfaction too complex for equity theory to explain all

Gender differences: Steil and Weltman (1991) married couples, both rated husband’s career if most income as most important, but if less income both of equal importance – equity perceived differently

BREAKDOWN OF ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS
Reasons: (Duck, 1999)
- Lack of skills: individuals may lack interpersonal skills; poor conversation/interest/interactions
- Lack of stimulation: Baxter (1994) belief that relationship isn’t going anywhere
- Maintenance difficulties: strain due to inability to regularly see each other (e.g. job hours, uni)


Model of breakdown: (Rollie and Duck, 2006)

INTRAPSychIC PROCESSES: social withdrawal, rumination, re-evaluation of alternatives
DYADIC PROCESSES: discussion of discontents, equity, roles, reassessments, possibilities
SOCIAL PROCESSES: going public, denigration of partner
GRAVE-DRESSING PROCESSES: tidying up memories, reinterpret view of partner
RESURRECTION PROCESSES: recreate own social value, looking to future

RE: Tashiro and Frazier (2003) survey of undergrads recently broken up, reported experience of emotional distress and personal growth, support for grave-dressing and resurrection processes, new insight into selves and idea of future partners

Correct order?: arguably stages could occur in different order or some may skip stages, non-linear revision of model necessary?

IDA: (ethical issues) vulnerability, privacy and confidentiality in potentially sensitive area