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INTRODUCTION

This review focuses on interpersonal attraction and informal affective relationships between adults. Such relationships, as we conceive of them, are those which are generally thought to be voluntary and sustained largely because the partners find interaction pleasurable. The bondedness of “close affective relationships” is prosaically illustrated in the following statement culled from an interview with a college student: “... I adore her. When I’m with her, I look at her constantly. ... We are united together.” Three elements integral to describing close relationships are reflected in this young man’s pronouncement: a favorable attitude (“I adore her”), as evidenced in affection, respect, liking, or love; behavioral involvement (“I look at her constantly”), as manifested in affiliative action; and joint belongingness (“We are united together”), a relational force indicative of perceived mutual identity. Weak involvement would be shown by indifference, a failure to seek out the other, and the absence of joint bonds.

Interpersonal attraction, as defined by social psychologists, refers to the first of the three elements—attitudinal positivity. Although theory and research on “interpersonal attraction” is a recent social psychological concern, the subject has given rise to a great deal of empirical work. Naturalistic settings were the locus for Moreno’s (222) early ventures into sociometry, for Festinger, Schachter & Back’s
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research into network cohesiveness, and for Newcomb's (232) studies of developing acquaintance processes, but laboratory settings have been the site of most recent social psychological research on attraction (13, 48, 205). This shift from the field to the laboratory has been accompanied by a change in focus from studying attraction as it occurs in ongoing relationships to attraction based on first impressions.

Reviews of the attraction literature have followed a similar evolution. Secord & Backman's 1964 (276) textbook chapter on attraction, which provided the first systematic overview of the topic, relied almost exclusively on field studies of attraction. However, more recent reviews (29, 59), including Byrne & Griffitt's 1973 Annual Review chapter (51), have focused almost entirely on attraction between strangers in short-term laboratory contacts.

The more general topic of affective relationships has been a crossroads for travel. The topic has interested animal ethologists and humanistic clinicians concerned with attachment; family sociologists studying mate selection, marital satisfaction, and divorce; and cultural anthropologists and social historians focusing on the ties of friendship and kinship that bind societies. In social psychology, an increasing interest is illustrated by three recent edited books on attraction (91, 138, 217), and several publications concerning growth and decline of close relationships (10, 46, 55, 74, 87, 193, 229, 262, 321, 323).

Attraction between adults, whether it is based on first impressions, a series of superficial encounters, or sustained involvement, is the central concern of this review. There have been noteworthy accomplishments in related areas outside our domain. The attachment between infants and their adult caretakers has received considerable attention (39, 106, 196), as has peer group interaction among children (197). Work on humans has been complemented by research on attachment among animals (177, 335) and by the work of sociobiologists interested in the evolutionary underpinnings of social relationships (5, 6, 312, 325).

The remainder of this introductory section presents a scheme for classifying the empirical literature (Figure 1) and examines various approaches to explaining the development and decline of attraction in relationships (Figure 2).

**Toward a Taxonomy of Pair Relationships**

Research on pair relations is generally directed at specific sorts of pairs without reference to the larger universe. There exists no comprehensive classification of relationships, a problem that is beginning to be recognized (134, 135). A recent study (Levinger, unpublished) attempts to identify people's categories for discriminating among dyadic relationships. Persons were required to discover a relationship between a pair of individuals by posing a series of questions which could be answered with a "yes" or a "no." About 95% of the participants' questions fit five general dimensions of relationship: (a) kinship vs nonkinship, the latter divisible into social versus task relations; (b) degree of affective involvement; (c) sex composition; (d) age composition; and (e) content of interaction, itself a multidimensional category.

These five categories help to describe the research on attraction summarized in Figure 1, where studies published from 1972 to 1976 are classified according to the
Figure 1  Classification of published studies on attraction (1972–76). This tabulation includes all empirical studies pertaining to interpersonal attraction which we identified through a search of 34 social and behavioral science journals. All of the major psychology and sociology journals known to have published work on attraction were included in the search. Studies which fit more than one classification—such as those which included both same- and cross-sex pairs, or those which considered attraction in two types of relationships—were apportioned across the relevant categories. For instance, a study which included both same- and cross-sex pairs was placed half in each category. The figure does not break down the studies in terms of the gender of the participants and stimuli; such a breakdown, were it to be shown, would not be particularly revealing. A more fine-grained categorization of the literature, however, would reveal some interesting patterns; for example, studies on physical appearance tend to use female stimuli, and studies on self-disclosure in encounters most often use female participants.

degree of involvement of Person and Other, the sex composition of the relationship, and the type of alliance. More than two-thirds of the studies focus on impressions after a person is given information about another or after a brief encounter. Nearly all studies of long-term attraction center on voluntary relationships involving persons (including spouses) in their twenties who are not birthright kin. Only three relationships have been given extensive attention: same-sex friendships, primarily among college students, though a few studies have examined friendships among the elderly; cross-sex romantic relationships, again chiefly among college students;
and marriage. Other sorts of relationships, such as between young and old or between people generally tied by kinship or occupation, are hardly ever studied by attraction researchers; nor are cross-sex friendships, homosexual partnerships, or extramarital relationships.

Several systematic studies have looked at the content dimension of interaction. Benjamin (20) has reanalyzed the structure of social behavior to arrive at procedures for characterizing "opposite," "complementary," and "antidote" behaviors. Her model moves beyond the earlier two-dimensional models which conceived of interpersonal behavior along the axes of positivity-negativity and dominance-submission (53, 180, 273). Wish and his colleagues (329, 330) have used multidimensional scaling techniques to uncover dimensions that people use for distinguishing among relationships. Their extensive analysis revealed four major dimensions, which they interpreted to consist of (a) cooperative and friendly vs competitive and hostile, (b) equal vs unequal, (c) intense vs superficial, and (d) socioemotional and informal vs task-oriented and formal. It remains extremely difficult, however, to characterize situational contexts (246) or behavioral norms (173) that affect social conduct in relationships.

Approaches to Explaining Attraction and Relationship Development

Figure 2 depicts our organizing schema. Person-Other attraction is shown as affected by several elements: 1. P-O interrelatedness, ranging from (a) individual awareness of the other, through (b) surface contact, to (c) P-O mutuality (195); 2. P's and O's social networks, which may affect their interest in each other, and which are themselves affected by changes in the P-O relation; 3. societal influences from both persons' cultural backgrounds; and 4. time. Variables from these loci can be tied to the experience and stability of attraction between Person and Other. We will consider approaches that emphasize, in turn, the individual perceiver, the dyadic relation, the social network, and the cultural backdrop. The time dimension cuts across all of these levels.

INDIVIDUALISTIC APPROACHES Work on impression formation, regardless of whether it is cast within an information-processing (11, 98, 334) or a reinforcement-affect (48, 59, 60, 205, 206) framework, spotlights the initial beliefs or feelings of one individual toward another. Despite occasional controversies (3, 49, 158), individualistic orientations appear rather similar when contrasted with other approaches. Individual approaches tend to focus on one person's unilateral awareness of another and ignore how attraction is developed and maintained. Models of impression formation neglect issues of social motivation, a shortcoming which is now beginning to be recognized (27, 139). Since most studies have been done with college students, little attention has been given to life cycle changes in motivational or cognitive capabilities that affect attraction (167, 202, 279).

DYADIC APPROACHES Work on the dyad tends to bypass the experimentalist's independent-dependent variable format and concentrates on reciprocal behavior contingencies. Recent dyadic approaches have been derived from exchange theory (10, 100, 136, 195, 271, 296), equity theory (22, 315), and communication theory
Such approaches focus on dyadic outcome matrices and/or sequential patterns of communication in order to analyze the properties of interdependence; they de-emphasize characteristics of individuals or of their wider environment.

**NETWORK APPROACHES** In Figure 2, P and O are assumed to have networks which are generally independent of one another during their initial phases of involvement; if they develop a joint relationship, their separate networks shrink and their joint network grows. This figure illustrates a way in which social networks and dyadic relationships might be linked. To date, little research has been published concerning the interface of social networks and relationships. Bott (38), however, has reviewed studies by sociologists and anthropologists regarding network correlates of conjugal relations, and the recent appearance of other work (36, 119, 221, 252) suggests that network analysis might soon add to our understanding of relationships.

**SOCIOCULTURAL APPROACHES** Societal and cultural influences on attraction have also received little systematic attention, though there are recent reviews on the social context of mate selection (162), cross-cultural similarities and differences in attraction (40, 255), and on "subjective culture" (311).
TIME One important but neglected aspect of attraction and relationships is the aspect of time. People change, relationships develop and deteriorate, networks evolve, and the cultural contexts of living alter. Nonetheless, attraction researchers generally overlook the time dimension. Rarely is it acknowledged that observations are bound by our sociohistorical context, even though the meaning of intimacy has changed greatly over the years (104, 248). Attraction studies use respondents of a narrow age range and ignore the ways in which the determination and consequences are affected by one’s stage in life (167, 202). Moreover, since most studies examine first impressions or brief encounters (as Figure 1 shows), they truncate the perspective of changing relationships.

Figures 1 and 2 provide the organizing scheme for our review. We begin with studies of attraction based on first impressions, then examine work done on attraction after brief encounters; finally, we turn to data concerned with affective relationships. Much of the material we review stems from the efforts of social psychologists; therefore, our focus will be on research which is cast in individualistic, dyadic, and social network terms.

IMPRESSIONS

Knowledge of what makes for a favorable or unfavorable first impression is important for several reasons: a favorable first impression may stimulate the perceiver to try to learn more about the person, influence his search for new information, and affect his interpretation of such information (4, 27, 126, 250). Moreover, a favorable first impression may invite one to affiliate with the other and condition how this is done.

The typical research procedure for studying first impressions has been to provide persons with standardized information about another and then to ask them to rate their attraction toward the other. Such a procedure allows investigators to explore the impact of various types, amounts, and combinations of information on attraction. Nonetheless, several features of this procedure undercut the generalizability of data to natural settings. First, the perceiver is rendered both passionless and passive. As Berscheid & Graziano (27) have recently noted, little is known about factors which direct a perceiver's attention to one person more than to others in the environment. In one study, for example, males anticipating extended future interaction with one female and not others selectively attended to the first one, remembered more about her, and were more attracted to her, even though she had the same attributes as the others (28).

Second, the standard experiment isolates information about the stimulus person from its usual context in order to heighten its salience. The information made available usually far outstrips what normally is likely to be known. Attitude similarity studies, for example, inform participants of a large array of attitudes, manipulate "agreement" across a wide range of levels, and provide the perceiver with little other information about the person. We lack data about how various stimulus attributes are weighted against one another in natural settings; thus it is difficult to judge the relative importance of attributes in such settings.
Third, little information has been uncovered until recently concerning the bases of the attractiveness of particular attributes. We know, for instance, that persons are more attracted to others they perceive to be similar rather than dissimilar in attitudes (48, 120), and that the perception of similarity is often "reinforcing" (60); also we have substantial evidence that physically attractive individuals are liked (at least initially) more than their less attractive peers (31). The nature of the reinforcing properties of these attributes and their limits as reinforcers are just beginning to become apparent. Ajzen (4) has argued that it is not the stimulus attributes themselves which lead to attraction; rather it is the beliefs about the person which one infers from such attributes that are important. We would go even farther. The discovery of another's attributes (e.g. attitudes) also has an impact on the perceiver's own attitudes and feelings toward himself (e.g. self concept or mood), and on the perceiver's projections concerning the likely consequences of future interaction with the stimulus person.

Material on unilateral first impressions can be examined in roughly the order in which a person might discover another's attributes. First, we review the effects of another's physical attributes on attraction; then we examine attraction as it might be affected by another's pattern of behavior; finally, we consider attraction toward others who differ in terms of cognitive attributes.

**Physical Appearance and Attraction**

Less than a decade ago, Aronson (13) noted the paucity of attraction research concerned with physical appearance. From 1972 through 1976, however, there were more than 40 studies that pertained to physical appearance and attraction. Most examined the reactions of persons to individuals varying in "facial attractiveness," though a few considered responses to other physical features such as race (125, 128), height (170), physique (19, 171, 178, 185), and dress (107).

Berscheid & Walster (31) have carefully reviewed the physical attractiveness literature; they note that the ingredients of beauty have yet to be elucidated and suggest that efforts to do so might prove fruitless. Good looks may depend more on a Gestalt than on singular physical elements. The lack of data defining the characteristics of physical beauty, however, has not deterred researchers. They generally employ pictures of persons of varying levels of beauty according to consensus among judges. As Berscheid & Walster (31) note: "If a significant number of 'judges' designate a person as physically attractive, then that person is defined as physically attractive. Whether it was the dimple on the chin...[or] whether more redheads than brunettes were classified as attractive, is not typically a matter of concern" (p. 181).

**WHAT IS THE CONNECTION BETWEEN PHYSICAL APPEARANCE AND ATTRACTION?** Physically attractive individuals clearly are regarded with more favor than their less physically appealing peers. Nursery school age children (80), adolescents and young adults (79, 81, 137), and adults as old as the mid-sixties (2) evidence such a preference. Good-looking individuals are given preferential treatment: they
are seen as more responsible for good deeds (278) and less responsible for bad ones (93, 278, 288); their evaluations of others have more potent impact (286); their performances are upgraded (176); others are more socially responsive to them (17), more ready to provide them with help (21), and more willing to work hard to please them (289). Two studies which have examined “jurors’” reactions to “defendants” varying in attractiveness, however, showed such jurors to be particularly harsh on attractive individuals who either appear to “use” their beauty to get away with something (288) or who fail to have justifiable reasons for their misdeeds (142).

Physical attractiveness also appears to be more important to males’ evaluations of females than vice versa. This is true regardless of whether individuals are making judgments of the desirability of persons as partners for relationships ranging in intimacy from casual encounters to marriage (219). Females’ physical attractiveness has a strong influence on their dating frequency, whereas for males the connection is weak (25, 171, 314). The attraction of males toward computer arranged dates appears more influenced than that of females by their partner’s physical attractiveness (31, 314), though the evidence is not entirely consistent (50).

**HOW DOES PHYSICAL APPEARANCE AFFECT ATTRACTION?** Although physical beauty and initial attraction are often linked, the question remains why, when, and for whom this is so. Attractive persons may be appreciated for aesthetic reasons, as is good art. A second reason, one which has received considerable support, is that people believe there is more to physical beauty than “meets the eye,” with physical appearance providing the basis for inferring “internal” qualities to persons (2, 17, 79, 81, 218).

Dion, Berscheid & Walster (81), in the best known social stereotyping study, found that both males and females rated pictures of physically attractive individuals of both sexes as more sexually warm and responsive, interesting, poised, sociable, kind, strong, and outgoing than persons of lesser attractiveness. They were also seen as more likely to attain high occupational status, to be more competent as husbands and wives, and to have happier marriages than less attractive individuals. The stereotype for physically attractive females is not entirely “favorable,” however; Dermier & Thiel (79), for example, found that physically attractive females were perceived as more likely to be bourgeois, vain, and adulterous than females of lesser attractiveness. Sex differences in physical attractiveness stereotypes, though infrequently found, suggest that attractive females may be regarded with more favor than good-looking males, and that homely females may be denigrated to a greater extent than physically unattractive males (2, 218). Research investigating individual differences in the traits attributed to others based on physical appearance and the value persons place on such traits remains to be done.

A third reason, related to the second, is that persons may desire to associate with physically attractive individuals to enhance their own social standing. Several studies (18, 127, 287) have shown that males thought to be romantically involved with a beautiful female are elevated in status by peers. The social desirability of females, in contrast, has been found to be either unrelated (18) or inversely related (127) to the attractiveness of their apparent romantic partner.
The importance of physical attractiveness beyond first impressions is not yet fully understood. Persons are known to avoid highly attractive individuals on occasion in favor of persons of lesser beauty in order to enhance their chances of acceptance (see section on "Choosing a Partner"). Once interaction is begun, the physical attractiveness of the parties may affect its course. Physically attractive persons, particularly females, have been found to exhibit greater social confidence than those lacking beauty (1, 143, 184, 186, 212); social confidence, in turn, has been found to relate to behaving so as to elicit favorable regard from others (155). Physical attractiveness stereotypes may also result in individuals attempting to "pull" behavior from the other to confirm their stereotypic expectations. Snyder, Tanke & Berscheid (291), for example, have found that males interacting (over an intercom) with females they believe to be of differing levels of physical attractiveness elicited from the females patterns of behavior consistent with stereotypes. Thus, at least within the limits of this experiment, reputed looks were correlated with behaving in an attractive manner. But as relationships unfold and as new information about each partner enters in, we would expect the effects of external appearance to diminish; the few data now available, however, suggest that even if our general assessment is accurate, the effects of physical beauty on attraction extend beyond initial encounters, at least within cross-sex relationships (133, 211, 226, 230).

**Impressions of Behavior**

First impressions gathered at a distance are influenced not only by the other's physical appearance, but also by the other's pattern of behavior. Nonetheless, researchers have devoted little attention to how the behavior of someone we watch affects our attraction toward them. The connection undoubtedly is enormously complex. For one thing, it is the *inferences* we draw from our observation (210)—not the behavior itself—which determine our attraction. The meaning we attach to the behavior not only depends on who we are, but also on who the actor is, where the action is taking place, and who, if anyone, is its target (152). Moreover, the inferred meanings are apt to vary from subculture to subculture, from individual to individual, and even within the same subculture and individual across time and place.

Several studies have shown that persons who behave according to "norms of social appropriateness" are liked more than those who violate such norms (57, 58, 165), although there are circumstances when the reverse occurs. For example, when Kiesler (165) induced female college students to seek predictability in others, they tended to like a person who behaved in accordance with social norms better than a norm violator; other subjects who were induced to prefer unpredictability liked the norm violator better than the norm follower. Derlega et al (77) found that a female who observed the "reciprocity norm" and matched the level of intimacy of her partner was liked more than one who responded intimately to a nonintimate disclosure, or who failed to reciprocate an intimate one. The nonintimate norm-breaker was perceived by viewers as "cold," whereas the intimate norm-breaker tended to be regarded as "maladjusted."

Males in our society traditionally are expected to be unemotional and self-contained. Females, in contrast, are encouraged to be "expressive." In a recent study,
males were perceived to be better adjusted when they failed to disclose intimate information than when they disclosed it; for females, the reverse pattern was found (76). Similarly, Chelune (58) found that males who disclosed little personal information about themselves in an encounter were liked more by observers than males who revealed a great deal, whereas for females it was the high disclosers rather than the low disclosers who were better liked.

Reactions to behavior incongruent with traditional sex-roles are more complicated, however, than the above studies imply. Spence and her colleagues (172, 294, 295) have examined the likability of males and females who, during the course of an interview, "come across" as either "competent" or "incompetent," and as having either "masculine" or "feminine" interests. The results of their work, when coupled with that of others (75, 281, 282), suggest that the likability of males with "feminine" interests and females with "masculine" interests depends in a complex fashion on such things as the observer's sex and sex-role attitudes, as well as the "competence" of the observed person.

Impressions of Cognitive Compatibility

Impressions are affected not only by the other's physique and behavior, but also by information about cognitions and feelings. Information from third parties or from perception of another's behavior and memberships results in an impression about how he thinks. The more compatible he appears, the more attracted one tends to be.

To like another and to be alike have the same root in Old English. It is not surprising, then, that a similarity-leads-to-liking hypothesis is the most general statement about the effects of another's perceived cognitions and feelings, or that we found more than 60 recent studies that dealt with it. Nevertheless, the connection of similarity to attraction has been challenged. To illuminate both its generality and its limitations, we shall examine (a) the nature of P-O similarity, (b) the means by which it may affect attraction, and (c) its boundaries and qualifications.

WHAT IS THE NATURE OF SIMILARITY? Manipulations of a stranger's attitude similarity, following Byrne's (48) attraction paradigm, involve varying the degree to which the research participant and a "bogus stranger" agree in their evaluations of attitude objects; this may be labeled "evaluative similarity." Information about evaluative similarity usually influences initial impressions favorably, but other forms of similarity also affect attraction. They include describing constructs similarly—"descriptive similarity" (65); and having a parallel attitude structure—"structural similarity" (147, 307). Other work has reported that the similarity of interpersonal attitudes promotes liking, whereas similarity in intrapersonal attitudes does not (270), and that evidence of "interpersonal congruency" exerts a stronger impact on attraction than does evaluative similarity (310). The effects of similarity on attraction may also depend on the "relatedness" of attitudes perceived in the cluster (157), the "importance" of the topics to which they refer (175) and the potential "payoff correspondence" they imply for two persons' future interaction (136). Finally, Ajzen (3, 4) has argued that it is less the other's similarity per se than the favorableness
of the corresponding information we obtain about the person which leads to our positive impression; we consider that idea further below.

**How Does Similarity Affect Attraction?** Byrne (47) in his early writings argued that similarity itself is affectively reinforcing. Today, he and other theorists have become interested primarily in examining the boundaries of its effects and its cognitive mediators. Reasons offered for the similarity-attraction effect can be grouped under four headings: (a) another's similarity itself is directly reinforcing as in classical conditioning; (b) another's similar responses support the perceiver's sense of esteem or comfort; (c) such responses indicate the other's future benevolence or compatibility; and (d) another's degree of perceived similarity is conflated with the affective value of his responses and has no independent effect by itself.

(a) That another's similar responses are directly reinforcing has been espoused by Byrne and his collaborators (48, 49, 59, 60) on the basis of a number of experiments (e.g. 115, 116, 203, 204, 290).

(b) Another's similarity may help confirm one's own feeling of rightness or goodness (48) and indicate that the other is also good (15, 130, 145, 182, 187). The latter effect would occur particularly among those subjects who have high self-esteem (182). Another's agreement can also buoy one's self-esteem, particularly when one's self-confidence has been lowered (111, 203, 204). Mehrabian (214), for example, found that high arousal-seekers, who presumably were already quite self-confident, were less discomfited by another's attitude discrepancy than were low arousal seekers.

(c) Another's similarity also gives promise of his future liking and favorableness toward us, and it can be argued that such inferences are responsible for its impact on our liking of him. Information about another's similarity is frequently interpreted to mean that the other is likely to be benevolent (146, 159, 292, 297), to be compatible (303), or to have greater ability than a dissimilar other to provide rewards (42). The other's similarity also makes it seem more likely that he will like us in return (141, 150, 153, 179). Yet as Jones et al (150) argue from a pair of studies, direct information that the other likes one is probably far more influential than indirect inferences based on information about attitude similarity: in the first, but not in the second, of their imaginative laboratory studies, Jones et al showed that subjects were more repelled by a similar than by a dissimilar other who ostensibly disliked them. In this study, and undoubtedly in many others, the manipulation of similarity-dissimilarity did not take account of such things as topic importance, interpersonal relevance, or congruency.

(d) Finally, it may be argued that if the similarity and the affective value of another's characteristics could be varied independently—a most difficult experimental operation—then the similarity-attraction effect would disappear. From an information-processing orientation, Ajzen (3, 4) has indeed suggested this; his experimental variation of a stimulus person's trait similarity demonstrated that the effects could be washed out by variations in the positivity of similar or dissimilar characteristics.
We believe that an information-processing perspective may be particularly helpful for interpreting many instances where another's similarity is not found to further one's attraction, as when it appears to reduce one's sense of uniqueness (102), to engender self-consciousness or a sense of inadequacy (183), to constrict learning opportunities (123), or when similarity suggests that the other may wish to compete for scarce resources. In each of these instances, the meaning of similarity information seems to be interpreted as likely to lead more to displeasure than to pleasure. Regarding the conflict between information-processing (98, 158) and reinforcement-affect (49) interpretations of the mediation of attraction, our own view is that neither emphasis excludes the alternative one: cognitive process theorists (4) incorporate affective value into their formulations, while recent statements of reinforcement theorists (60) acknowledge the mediating influence of cognitions.

WHAT QUALIFICATIONS APPLY TO THE SIMILARITY-ATTRACTION EFFECT? Our review has already suggested the importance of distinguishing among the various qualities and meanings of "similarity"; we believe there is no singular "similarity" effect, but a multiplicity of effects that depend on both content and context. The experimental literature so far reviewed is limited almost entirely to giving information to a college student about an unfamiliar student and measuring its impact on his judgment.

But what will happen when a perceiver becomes better acquainted with the other? Much of the evidence on this matter will be discussed under "Relationships." We can note here, though, that many of the above-mentioned mediators change in their function. If, for instance, a stranger's similarity elicits our attraction because it promises that he will like us, this basis would be removed if he already were our friend. Or if we already know that another is competent or benevolent, then information that he disagrees with us need not be upsetting; rather, we might consider it to be edifying.

FROM IMPRESSION TO INTERACTION

Murstain (225) identifies as "open field" those situations in which persons are free to choose whether or not to engage one another's attention. Persons desiring interaction in such open field situations are faced with two interrelated decisions. First, they must choose with whom to interact; second, they must decide how to structure their interactive behavior to make themselves attractive to the other. We shall examine each of these decisions.

Choosing a Partner

When selecting a game partner, a date, a companion to converse with, or a work partner, it is usually desired that the other reciprocates one's choice. Prior to interaction, however, the initiator often does not know clearly how various potential partners will respond. The person contemplating initiating an encounter must consider at least two factors: (a) the degree to which he finds the attributes of the
potential partners attractive, and (b) the degree to which he anticipates they would find his attributes attractive and hence respond favorably to his initiative.

Support for this two-factor model of social choice is provided by three independent lines of inquiry having to do with the psychological and interpersonal processes in choosing dating partners. The first line concerns simulations of "dating situations" in which investigators examined the affiliative decisions of the individuals involved (25, 137, 166, 302). These studies required participants either to choose a date from an array of potential dates or to specify the qualities they desired in a date. Huston (137) found that male college students selected a more physically attractive female as a dating partner when assured of their acceptability to her than when left unclear about their acceptability. Kiesler & Baral (166) manipulated the self-esteem of males and found that those whose self-confidence had been lessened exhibited more "romantic" behavior toward a moderately attractive female than toward a highly attractive one; the reverse pattern was found for males whose self-esteem has been bolstered.

Shanteau & Nagy (283) in a second line of research have used information integration theory (11) to analyze decision processes in dating choice. In their first study, females rated the desirability of several males after examining their pictures as well as bogus information concerning the likelihood that each male would date them. When there was "no chance" of acceptance, the desirability of the males was indistinguishable. As chances of acceptance were increased, however, the highly attractive males became increasingly desirable compared to the less attractive ones.

In a second study, females participants saw all possible pairs in a set of male pictures; for each pairing they indicated the male they most desired as a date. At a separate time, the females rated each photo for attractiveness and also indicated the likelihood that each male would accept them as dates. The males' desirability was best predicted by both the attractiveness ratings and the data on the probability of being accepted, although for some females, the males' desirability appeared to depend on their own attractiveness. Shanteau & Nagy argue that these females did not so much ignore the probability of rejection; rather, they regarded themselves as beautiful and therefore assumed rejection to be extremely unlikely. These authors report that these two studies were replicated with similar results using male participants and female stimuli. Shanteau & Nagy (283) also make applications of their information processing approach to judgments of future compatibility, and find that estimates of compatibility combine with other judgments to influence ratings of the desirability of others as dates.

The third line of evidence pertains to efforts to identify parameters of "dating anxiety" among college students. Students who wish to date but feel uncomfortable doing so are reported to lack self-confidence; thus, even when they identify someone they like, they fail to make an overture for fear of rebuff. Curran (69) recently reviewed research on "dating anxiety" and the numerous programs on college campuses designed to help students who wish to increase their involvement in dating activities do so.

Several years ago, after examining the then available literature on interpersonal attraction, Levinger & Snoek (195) observed that much work on attraction implicitly
assumes an isomorphism between liking and affiliation. It is now clear that liking leads to affiliation only insofar as the potential affiliator anticipates a favorable response. The boundary conditions of this proposition have yet to be established. Persons undoubtedly differ in how much they are buoyed by favorable treatment and hurt by rejection (301). Furthermore, since empirical research has been preoccupied with dating situations involving college students, we know little about how affiliative decisions are modulated by concerns of acceptance and rejection in other types of settings and for individuals of other age groups. For instance, very lonely persons may almost indiscriminately affiliate with anyone they think ready to accept them or they may cast aside all fears of rejection (321). Within dating situations, many females, holding traditional views regarding sex-roles, would not take the initiative even if they believed a male to be both attractive and receptive.

Attraction and the Structuring of Interaction

Surprisingly little is known about how attraction affects behavior in initial encounters. Blau (33) suggests attraction serves as a stimulant for social intercourse. He notes (pp. 41, 42):

For a new social situation to be experienced as a challenge by an individual, the others present must be sufficiently significant for him to make him concerned with impressing them and winning their approval. For it to be experienced as a stimulating challenge rather than a debilitating threat, he must be fairly confident in his ability to earn their acceptance. It is the social gathering in which a person cannot take his success in impressing others for granted but has a reasonable chance of success that animates his spirit and stimulates his involvement . . . (italics ours).

Thus persons should be most motivated to impress when (a) they are attracted to the other, and (b) when they are uncertain, yet reasonably confident of gaining the other's favor. A recent study (284) has shown the importance of attraction in regulating efforts to make a favorable impression; however, the influence of social confidence on impression management has yet to be demonstrated. There are limits—often quite broad ones—to the gyrations people will permit themselves to gain favorable attention. Blumstein (34), for example, in a recent role-play study, had males try to get a date with a female who demanded they perform in a fashion either irrelevant to their self-concept or inconsistent with it in order to gain her favor. The males were more likely to accommodate to the female if doing so did not require them to compromise their psychological integrity.

Although little work has been done on what leads people to decide to impress, much attention has been given to examining the effectiveness of differing attraction-seeking tactics. Jones & Wortman's (154) thoughtful review of this work classifies attraction-seeking strategies into four categories: (a) attempts to buoy the other's esteem by conveying the feeling that one thinks highly of him or her; (b) rendering favors to the other; (c) agreeing with the other; and (d) ascribing attractive characteristics to oneself, either directly or indirectly. Their review shows that effectiveness of these various strategies depends on the personality of the target, the nature of the interactants' relationship (e.g. their relative status), how well the tactic is employed, and on subtleties of the social context.
ENCOUNTERS AND CONTACTS

A large part of our interpersonal lives consists of brief encounters and of lasting, but superficial, acquaintanceships. Such limited interactions lend themselves to controlled laboratory and field research, which is not feasible for the study of deeper relationships. Figure 1 indicates that research on “Encounters and Contacts” constituted almost a third of all published studies during 1972-76. It also shows that three-quarters of the reports deal with same-sex or sex-unspecified interactants, a potentially important limitation given that the meaning of social behavior (e.g. gaze and touching) is dramatically transformed in cross-sex encounters (129). Many of the cross-sex studies pertained to surface contacts between computer dates, a topic to be treated later in “Premarital Romantic Relationships.”

Research on superficial contacts can be divided into two categories, nonverbal and verbal interaction, even though these dimensions are normally intertwined (9). Nonverbal behavior and verbal disclosure each vary on a continuum from nonintimate to intimate or from distant to close.

Nonverbal Interaction

A theoretical paper by Patterson (239) offers “an arousal model of interpersonal intimacy” in an attempt to order the accumulating but contradictory evidence regarding the expression of intimacy. One stream of evidence has favored the idea that interactants attempt to maintain a stable amount of intimacy, and that approach on one nonverbal dimension leads to compensatory avoidance on a different dimension; thus Argyle & Dean’s (12) “equilibrium hypothesis” proposes that one tends to meet another’s increasing amount of eye contact by reducing one’s spatial proximity—by moving away or turning one’s body to a less direct angle. A second stream of findings considered by Patterson suggests the operation of a “reciprocity process” (8). Reciprocity occurs whenever another’s increasing intimacy is met by a corresponding positivity, the result being a total increase in overall intimacy.

Patterson (239) argues that both compensatory and reciprocal changes in behavior are explainable if we assume that they “share a necessary common mediator of arousal change” (p. 241); if a person labels another’s approach to be a threat, then his arousal leads to avoidance—and this seems to occur frequently in laboratory studies among strangers. On the other hand, if he labels it as pleasant, then he will meet it with reciprocity. Patterson’s interpretation is useful for contemplating the work noted below. We shall review studies on a continuum of communication modalities from distant to close: interpersonal distance and space, eye contact, body orientation, and touch.

INTERPERSONAL DISTANCE AND SPACE Space is an important correlate of social interaction. Proximity heightens the probability of interaction (97), which tends to enhance familiarity and liking (43, 269) which again may further proximity (7); continuing nearness, in turn, is found to promote attraction (277, 306). The end result of this probabilistic process is confirmed by field studies in housing complexes. Athanasiou & Yoshioka (16) found that the cumulative percentage of friendship choices was a direct logarithmic function of distance between living units. And
Nahemow & Lawton (231), focusing particularly on social relations of the elderly, found that spatial nearness between tenants occurred in almost all social choices that went across differences in age or social background.

Proximity, translated into social density, also has its negative effects. The psychological experience of crowding is likely to promote negative interpersonal feelings, particularly among males (121, 274), though feelings engendered by physical density depend greatly on the setting and the sex composition of the group (209, 299). A general effect of this principle is suggested by findings from a study of Schiavenbauer & Schiavo (275): Physical closeness intensifies feelings already present. While positive interaction is more pleasant between physically close than between distant interactants, the opposite is true for negative interaction. Their suggestion, that closeness acts as an “amplifier” of existing dispositions, fits well with Patterson’s (239) arousal hypothesis.

GAZE AND EYE CONTACT  Eye contact is an important modality of nonverbal communication. So far results of research are complex, perhaps for the reasons suggested by Patterson (238, 239), Argyle & Dean’s (12) equilibrium hypothesis received several tests, but with mixed results (62). For example, in Ellsworth & Ross’s (94) laboratory study, evidence was obtained that eye contact promoted intimacy between females but reticence between males. Russo’s (267) well-designed classroom study of children from kindergarten, third grade, and sixth grade examined the link between distance and eye contact in a large sample of pairs varying in age; half male, half female; and half friends, half nonfriends. She found that there was a greater proportion, but not greater mean length, of eye contact at far as compared to near distances—again only partial support for the equilibrium theory. Females used more eye contact than did males, and friends more than nonfriends; these differences seemed to increase with the age of the children. Russo’s findings suggest how socialization may affect later interactive norms among adults; for example, they shed some light on Rubin’s (261) finding that female members of dating couples gazed more at their partner than did the males.

BODY ORIENTATION  Patterson (238) included body orientation and lean in his review of “nonverbal immediacy behaviors” pertinent to the equilibrium hypothesis. From the laboratory evidence, he concluded that closer approach was generally reported to lead to a “less directly confronting” orientation; leaning behavior, however, seemed to be “the weakest link in the compensatory process” (p. 245). Our own review uncovered little additional evidence about this interaction modality since the publication of Mehrabian’s (213) monograph summarizing his work in this area.

TOUCH  Touch is the only other nonverbal modality for which there was empirical research. (Despite our own intense sniffing of the literature, we found no work on smell— or tasting either.) In two different studies—one conducted in the laboratory (35) and the other at a library checkout counter (99)—female respondents were found to like a previously unknown confederate better after a brief touch on the hand than after no touch. Males, who participated in equal numbers in the second study, showed no consistent positive effect. Touch, too, has no single meaning. Its
meaning depends on the body area touched, the interpersonal situation, and one's relationship to the other person (233).

Verbal Interaction

This heading embraces self-disclosure and other verbal contact, including responses to another's feedback over time.

SELF-DISCLOSURE Work on this topic has been ably summarized in three review articles (57, 64, 110). We will confine ourselves to three focal questions: Does attraction lead to self-disclosure? Does disclosure lead to attraction? And to what extent is self-disclosure reciprocal?

1. Does attraction lead to self-disclosure? Experimental work provides positive answers (57). One study, for example, found that subjects reported a greater willingness to reveal themselves to others whom they liked a lot than to those whom they liked little (168).

2. Does disclosure lead to attraction? The answer depends on the timing and the content of what is disclosed. Some studies indicate that among strangers intermediate degrees of disclosure are most likely to enhance attraction (63). Others suggest that attraction is strongly affected by whether intimate, and damaging, information is revealed early or late (149, 151, 331); attraction is reduced if damaging disclosures occur early in the interaction, but if one already knows the damaging information, early disclosure does not adversely affect attraction. Ajzen (4) has proposed that attraction to another is not determined so much by the intimacy, but by the desirability of the information about the self that is disclosed. An experiment, conducted with pairs of female strangers, confirmed that proposal (73); however, the lack of clear norms about appropriate disclosure to a stranger in the laboratory may have reduced the impact of varying intimacy on attraction. A study concerned with the intimacy of probes rather than of disclosures (156) found that setting formality affected subjects' responses to the intimacy of questions: for example, in a highly formal business setting, an interviewer's intimate questions led to dislike rather than to attraction.

3. Does self-disclosure lead to reciprocity? This question has received the most attention and the answer is generally affirmative (56, 77, 263, 280). In a series of interesting field studies that avoided many of the demand characteristics associated with self-disclosure research, Rubin (263, 264) tried to separate two hypothetical components of "modeling" and "trust" that seem to affect reciprocity. In general, his studies find clear evidence of disclosure reciprocity; overdisclosure, however, seems to give rise to suspicion rather than trust, and thus leads to a reduction of disclosure.

Chaikin & Derlega (57) suggest that "underlying the notion of a reciprocity norm is the idea of equity and equality" (p. 19). Altman (8) has proposed that immediate reciprocity is far more likely to occur in shallow than in deep social relationships. His hypothesis accords well with findings that strangers adhere to norms of reciprocity, while disclosures among intimates are governed by additional determinants of rewards and costs (78). Altman's suggestion fits comfortably within an exchange-theory interpretation of interpersonal relationships (10, 136).
Altman & Taylor's (10) book on disclosure as a "penetration process" theorizes about disclosure as it unfolds in relationships through time. Our review shows a general lack of longitudinal research on disclosure. Problems of reactivity make it difficult to do sound repeated-measure research on self disclosure, but without such data, it is hard to extrapolate from existing findings.

"GAIN-LOSS" SEQUENCES Aronson & Linder (14) found that the sequence of another's positive and negative reactions influenced attraction more than the total amount of positivity. Attempts to replicate this effect, however, have produced inconsistent results. Recent reviews (61, 216) report that many studies have failed to find any gain-loss effect, and others found only gain effects; only one study has found both gain and loss effects.

To tame this elusive phenomenon, Clore, Wiggins & Itkin (61) devised an ingenious videotape procedure in which a male actor receives systematic sequences of nonverbal feedback from a female who faces the camera; observers see one such sequence (either warm-warm, cold-cold, cold-warm, or warm-cold) and then estimate the male's attraction to the female and her attraction to the male; they also rated their own attraction to the female. Clore et al. found both gain (cold-warm > warm-warm) and loss (warm-cold < cold-cold) effects in subjects' attributions of the male actor's attraction to the female evaluator, but not for their other two sets of ratings.

Berscheid et al. (24) have also used a videotape procedure for studying the gain-loss effect. Their subjects received evaluations over a TV monitor either from one evaluator or from two who gave their evaluations at the same time. At any given moment, subjects in the dual evaluator condition could choose to see either of two screens; one screen showed a steady positive evaluator, the other a gain evaluator. In the single-evaluator condition, the gain evaluator was liked more than the steady positive evaluator, but the reverse was true when a subject had a choice between seeing either one or the other in a competing double-evaluator situation. Thus response to such sequential feedback is another instance where attraction to another is affected by its particular context.

*Encounters as a Focus for Attraction Research*

A variety of other studies could be subsumed under the heading of Encounters and Contacts. Many of the results are unsurprising, methodologically intricate, or theoretically unimportant—or some combination of all three. Furthermore, as shown in Figure 1, most of these studies were done on same-sex meetings between college students, and there seems to be discontinuity between such work and research on more established relationships.

**RELATIONSHIPS**

Our deeper relationships do much to locate us in social and psychological space. The Person-Other relationship depicted in the third frame of Figure 2 develops, very likely, out of numerous superficial encounters and even a larger number of earlier unilateral impressions. "Close" relationships are affected not only by the larger
cultural environment and the individual personalities of the partners, but also by the pair's own history of interaction with each other and with the matrix of social relationships within which their evolving partnership is fit.

The ongoing relationship defies the manipulations of the traditional experiment. Few of the studies tabulated under "Relationships" in Figure 1 have appeared in journals devoted to experimental social psychology. Studies, furthermore, have focused almost entirely on relationships between peers: on friendship, romance, and marriage relationships.

Theoretical models of relationship development (198, 225, 268, 296) have primarily dealt with courtship and marriage. Several recent models (10, 136, 140, 181, 191, 195, 271), however, have attempted to construct generic conceptions of pair formation and maintenance. These generic models use exchange principles to account for the developmental course of relationships. Many of them (136, 181, 191, 271) may be viewed (46) as elaborations of the frameworks proposed by Levinger & Snoek (195) and Altman & Taylor (10).

Levinger & Snoek (195) propose that Person-Other pairs differ in degrees of relatedness. Their three primary "levels" of relatedness (schematically illustrated in Figure 2) are simple awareness of another without contact, surface interaction, and "deeper" relationship. Their approach provides a vocabulary for denoting transitions across levels of involvement, and it links changes in relatedness to variations in the nature of attraction and in the importance of different determinants of attraction. Although the framework is cast in social exchange terms, it assumes that evaluation of "outcomes" evolves from individualistic to joint criteria as the relationship moves toward deeper involvement. This model has led to the construction of dyadic outcome matrices for computer simulation analyses of longitudinal interaction (136, 191).

Altman & Taylor's (10) model of "social penetration" makes similar assumptions. They suggest that relationships develop in an orderly sequence from superficial interaction to increasingly intimate exchange. They have shown that the balance of the partners' rewards and costs governs their increasing or decreasing progress; "depenetration" occurs when this balance becomes negative. Altman and his associates have focused much of their work on self-disclosure, but they have been interested in examining movement toward and away from intimacy along multiple channels (9, 160, 224, 304).

At the individual level of study, there are solid procedures for work on impression formation (11, 334), for the evaluation of attitude objects (98) and the measurement of liking or love (48, 261). In contrast, approaches to studying dyadic attraction are less established; it is difficult to compare the closeness of pairs without resorting to individualistic procedures. Riskin & Faunce (253) illustrated this point in their review of much of the research concerned with marriage and family relationships. Levinger (189) has suggested a fourfold classification of indices of pair relatedness which differentiates between individual partners and pairs as objects of measurement, and between observation and self-report as sources of data.

Few studies have examined ongoing relationships at more than one point in time; there has been very little sound longitudinal research. Aside from its heavy cost and lengthy time commitment, longitudinal work is hampered by problems of subject-
investigator reactivity. There are also unsolved statistical problems, some of which may be amenable to procedures of path analysis (308) or cross-lagged panel analysis (71).

Two other issues deserve mention: the observer's own relation to the observed and ethical considerations in relationship research. Kelley (161) has extended the perspective of attribution theory to examine differences between participants' and researchers' view of relationships. The researcher's "outside" view is often orthogonal to that of the partners. Kelley's analysis suggests that researchers' attributions may be biased toward overstating actors' intersituational consistencies and he discusses ways of countering such a bias. In a companion paper, Olson (235) emphasizes the importance of a combination of self-report and observational methods in order to tap both the subjective and the objective realities of relationships.

Ethical responsibilities are rarely discussed in the literature on relationships, though it is likely that the data-gathering process has some impact on at least some of the participants' lives. Rubin & Mitchell (266) have argued that couples research is akin to "couples counseling," and they make several suggestions for safeguarding its conduct.

Friendships

The changing importance people attach to friendships as they move through their adult years may be inferred from recent data gathered by Campbell, Converse & Rodgers (52) as part of a national survey. They found that a sense of well-being for both young and older adults is more strongly anchored in the size of their friendship network than it is for middle-aged persons. These results are extended by recent studies which indicate that both young and older adults report their friendships to be more extensive and multifaceted in nature than do middle-aged persons (285, 318).

What might account for these apparent changes in friendship patterns? It is possible, of course, that the changes are more apparent than real, given that the data cited above is cross-sectional rather than longitudinal. A more plausible possibility is that there are changes through the adult life-span in the needs people have and the degree to which such needs are provided for by components in a person's network of relationships (322). A network of friends during the early adult years may be important to help people establish a sense of personal competence (52), and because younger adults are often "between families" (285). During the middle years, family relations and obligations often supersede one's need for friendships. As Hess (131) has recently noted: "... in middle-age, the multiplicity and variety of roles played, the linking of friendship to these, the focusing and segmentation of interests among work, family, and community, often operate to compartmentalize friendships, to make their bases more diffuse" (pp. 373-74). It is not surprising, given the tasks peculiar to middle-age, that a considerable minority of middle-aged persons reported in a recent study (285) that kin comprised most of their network of "close" relationships. During the later years, when children have left home, when the spouse has died, and when employment has terminated, persons may again seek out old and new friendships as a means to gain the life sustenance that in earlier years was
provided by spouse, kin, and job associates (37, 131, 242). Males during old age tend to seek out multiple friendships, whereas females maintain a few, more intimate, friends (245).

WHAT MAKES A FRIEND A FRIEND? Within the American culture, three aspects of non-kin friendship appear ubiquitous: friends are generally of the same age, sex, and race (231, 318). There are exceptions to this pattern, of course, as when co-workers of different ages or races befriend one another, when college students of different sex establish a friendship, or when a husband and wife establish joint friendship with another couple. Little is known about friendships which cross age, race, and sex lines, except that such crossings are facilitated by opportunities for informal interaction (16, 37, 231).

What else seems to be involved in making a friend a friend? Weiss & Lowenthal (318) provide part of the answer in a study which content-analyzed more than 1700 descriptive statements about friends provided by 216 respondents of varying age. Most statements had to do with the nature of the relationship between the persons; thus friends were described as persons with whom one has shared interests, experiences, and activities, and with whom one feels comfortable talking. In addition to this cluster of "doing things together," friends were also seen as supportive, dependable, understanding, and accepting; in short, they were seen as people "one can count on." Such descriptions of friendships were similar for persons of all age groups from late Adolescence through adulthood. Interesting sex differences were found, however; men tended to emphasize sharing activities and interests more than did women, who tended to stress the importance of supportiveness.

The above research grouped all "friends" into a single category. La Gaipa (174) has examined dimensions of friendship at four different levels of involvement: social acquaintance, good friend, close friend, and best friend. He reported in one U.S. sample that females make greater distinctions between levels of friendship than males; in a Canadian sample, however, he found no notable sex differences. La Gaipa's (174) findings are consistent with those of Weiss & Lowenthal (318), though he labels his friendship dimensions somewhat differently. His friendship dimensions differed in how they distinguished among levels of involvement. For example, the degree to which one felt he could count on the other to be helpful and supportive was important in characterizing the difference between "good" and "close" friends; ease of self-disclosure, however, best differentiated "close" from "best" friends.

Wright (332) defined friendship in terms of the degree to which persons voluntarily coordinate plans, activities, and decisions. Using samples of college students, he found friendship related to perceiving one's partner as stimulating, cooperative, helpful, supportive, encouraging, and nonthreatening. More recently, Wright (333) empirically expanded his conceptualization of friendship with data suggesting that people perceive friends to be irreplaceable, "genuine," and to respond to them as unique individuals.

The foregoing descriptive information helps to provide perspective on recent laboratory studies which have concerned friendship. Morgan & Sawyer (223) recently suggested that friends interact so as to maintain solidarity and status equality. Using an ingenious adaptation of the prisoner's dilemma game, they compared
friends and acquaintances in terms of how they jointly allocated rewards. Friends were more likely than acquaintances to indicate a desire for equal rewards and actually to choose to allocate rewards in such a way; they were also less likely to attribute "competitive" intent to their partner, even when their partner made what game theorists would regard as self-serving moves. Another series of studies, conducted by Taylor & Koivumaki (305), had persons ascribe responsibility for "positive" and "negative" behavior to an acquaintance, a friend, and a spouse. Friends more than acquaintances (and spouses more than friends) were seen as more responsible for positive behavior and less responsible for negative behaviors.

Keiser & Altman (160) asked drama students to roleplay "good friends" and "casual acquaintances" discussing intimate and nonintimate topics. They videotaped the conversations and then coded the "immediacy" (e.g. eye contact, touching) of the role players' behavior and relaxation (e.g. leg symmetry). The most dramatic differences were found in the contrast of good friends discussing intimate topics as compared to casual friends talking about nonintimate topics; the former showed immediate and relaxed types of nonverbal behavior, whereas the latter evidenced "distance" and more tension in their nonverbal behavior. These findings are consistent with Altman & Taylor's (10) social penetration theory of relationship development. Though friends may usually receive the other's intimate self disclosure favorably (10), they do not necessarily respond with the same degree of disclosure, (10, 251). Indeed, in one recent study (78), friends were less likely to reciprocate intimate disclosures than strangers; another study (237) found that friends overestimate the degree to which they have reciprocally disclosed to one another. Friends also overestimate each other's degree of attitude similarity, and they may come to see one another as having "good" personalities, presumably because they generalize from their own positive experience with their friend and also because this implies that they themselves are good.

Such material suggests that sophisticated attempts to predict who will befriend whom will need to gather descriptive data concerning the ways in which friendships are formed, maintained, and allowed to fall by the wayside. Our own belief is that most adult friendships evolve from existing role relationships; thus, for example, co-workers discover they both play tennis about equally well. Within this domain, they have discovered they share a similar attitude, and they have also discovered a point of similarity in their personality—if tennis ability is an aspect of personality. Suppose they also discover both organize their leisure life around tennis; one could then say that they have found that they place a similar value on tennis as an activity.

If the above example is accurate, similarity is necessary to friendship. The question then becomes not whether similarity leads to attraction, but rather what kinds of similarity are important, how important they are and for whom. Studies attempting to determine the role of similarity in the formation of friendship have failed to clarify these issues; instead, researchers have been preoccupied with establishing whether a connection between similarity and friendship exists. Results of such studies are mixed, with some data showing an association (87, 88, 208) between similarity and attraction while others have failed to find one (71, 188, 208).

As an example, consider the minimal yield provided by Griffitt & Veitch's (122) study of the determinants of sociometric choice in a simulated fall-out shelter. After
filling out a 44-item attitude questionnaire, male volunteers were confined to a warm and crowded "shelter" and their interpersonal preferences monitored over a 10 day period. It was found that after only one day the average person's three most preferred shelter mates were significantly more similar to him than the three least preferred; these results remained relatively unchanged over the 10 day period. The difference in preacquaintance attitude similarity between chosen and rejected others was substantively small (66.6% agreement versus 62.7%). Reciprocal choosers agreed on a significantly higher proportion of attitude items than did nonreciprocal choosers (70% to 65%), and reciprocal rejectors were significantly less similar than nonreciprocal rejectors (61% to 64%). What does one make of these findings? If one focuses only on their statistical significance, then one would conclude that preacquaintance attitude similarity influences subsequent attraction. If, on the other hand, one examines their substantive significance, such results are disappointing. This sort of study reveals little about how much of what kinds of similarity are important for whom, and under what conditions; it is these questions which now need to be addressed [see Duck (89, 90) for a similar argument].

**Romantic Relationships**

Systematic empirical work concerning interpersonal processes in premarital relationships dates from Burgess & Wallin's 1953 (45) benchmark study, *Engagement and Marriage*. Shortly thereafter, Winch (327) published his first paper on complementary needs, and nearly a decade of research and controversy ensued which culminated in a study of dating pairs by Kerckhoff & Davis (164). Kerckhoff & Davis reported that, for couples less than 18 months into their dating relationships, "courtship progress" over a 6-month period was predictable from their degree of value similarity but not from their need complementarity; for "long-term" couples, however, courtship progress was related to need complementarity rather than to value similarity. To interpret these results, Kerckhoff & Davis proposed a "sequential filter theory". Persons were said to compare themselves first in terms of social characteristics; later, filtering was expected to proceed with regard to similarity in values; and finally, for those couples still together, continued progress would depend on the complementarity of their needs.

Though recent work (194) has failed to replicate the Kerckhoff & Davis results, the idea of a sequentially ordered series of filters has continued to prove appealing. Indeed, two such "filter" models recently have been advanced. One is an elaboration of the Kerckhoff & Davis model in social-exchange terms (225, 229); the other model suggests that six sequentially related processes mediate the development of premarital relationships (198). These models have been criticized (163, 265), primarily because their proponents have not produced convincing evidence for a sequential operation of fixed set of filters or processes. Indeed, the earlier proponents have conceded that deficiency (201, 227, 229); what remains open to question is whether sequential filter frameworks will ever be able to account for the progression of cross-sex romantic relationships. Much more descriptive work on the nature and development of premarital relationships seems to be necessary before sophisticated explanatory models can be erected.
The research on premarital romantic relationships which we review below is organized into two general areas: studies of heterosexual encounters and contacts, and studies concerned with interaction in and the building up and tearing down of premarital involvements. It is important to keep in mind, however, that a fuller understanding of the evolution of romantic relationships requires one to reach back to their beginnings—to first impressions—and to trace them to the point where the individuals merge into an identifiable couple. Moreover, successful accounts of the development of relationships are apt to be anchored in analyses of social systems; relationships are likely to evolve differently depending on the cultural (255, 257, 313), subcultural (162, 215), and sociohistorical (104, 132) context.

HETEROSEXUAL ENCOUNTERS AND CONTACTS Work on cross-sex romantic encounters and contacts falls into two general domains: (a) studies of social interaction in encounters, and (b) studies of computer dating.

Social interaction in encounters A few studies have dealt with how “love” is sparked. Berscheid & Walster (30), borrowing from Schachter’s (272) theory of emotional labeling, suggest that people experience “passionate love” when two things coalesce: (a) “They are intensely aroused physiologically,” and (b) “situational cues indicate that ‘passionate love’ is the appropriate label for their feelings” (p. 360). Direct evidence supporting such a conceptualization is lacking. Dutton & Aron (92), however, in three separate studies report that arousal appears to intensify attraction. In the most ingenious study, males crossing a fear-arousing suspension foot bridge were briefly interviewed by an attractive female; others while on the same bridge were interviewed by a male. Two other groups of males were interviewed by male and female interviewers on another bridge—one which was considerably more stable. Attraction toward the female interviewer was stronger when she conducted the interview on the suspension bridge rather than on the stable bridge; attraction toward the male interviewer was not affected by where the interview was held.

Walster & her colleagues (316) have examined whether a “hard-to-get” woman engenders more attraction than one who is readily available. Their data, in general, suggest that she does not; the only circumstance in which men preferred “hard-to-get” women was when women were hard for others to attract but easy for themselves. A recent study (101) replicated the earlier findings, but only when males were not frustrated prior to seeing information about the females; when “frustrated,” males liked “easy-to-get” women as much as “selectively hard-to-get” ones.

Computer dating studies Curran and his colleagues (67, 68, 70, 207) have conducted a series of “computer dating” studies which attempt to extend laboratory-based principles of attraction to cross-sex encounters. In each of these studies, partners were matched so that the male would be taller than the female and as old or older than she; they were also matched in terms of physical beauty. Even though couples were matched for physical attractiveness, looks had a strong effect on attraction (207). This finding confirms earlier research on dating (31, 314), and a recent study showing physical attractiveness and liking to be strongly related over a series of five laboratory encounters (211). Attitude similarity accounted for much
less of the variance in attraction than did physical beauty (70). Personality characteristics, either examined alone or in various combinations, had little to do with liking (68, 207). In Curran's research (67), which was conducted on a rather conservative campus, partners were preferred who fit traditional male-female roles. Females were attracted to assertive, independent males, while males preferred conforming and shy females. Collectively, Curran's data suggest that persons whose personalities are compatible with enacting culturally prescribed roles are attractive in initial cross-sex encounters. "Role fit," then, may be important from the outset of a relationship and not only later as sequential-filter theories (198, 229) have suggested.

INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR OF INTIMATE COUPLES  Another line of research has examined the laboratory behavior of intimately involved couples. Dion & Dion (84) found that females' attraction toward their partners—as measured by a scale combining liking, love, and trust—was related to accurate perception of them in an Ames room—a room which distorts perception. Another study (41) found "caring" to be related to the degree to which people experienced vicarious "stage fright" for partners performing before an audience; this same study also found caring to relate to the amount the partners touched each other during the course of the experiment.

Two studies have examined the interaction of seriously dating couples in cooperative vs competitive situations. In one, Peplau (240) found that women traditional in sex-role attitudes performed less well when competing against their boyfriend than when working together with him; the reverse pattern was found for nontraditional women. This study is complemented by Pleck's (243), which found that men identified by a paper and pencil measure as highly threatened by competence in women elevated their performance when competing against their dating partner; males unthreatened by female competence did not alter their performance level when competing. These studies illustrate the diverse nature of male-female roles in contemporary relationships among dating couples. Komarovsky (169) in her recent book, Dilemmas of Masculinity, offers an illuminating account of how the current flux in sex-roles has influenced the behavior of college-age men in their cross-sex relationships.

THE DEVELOPMENTAL COURSE OF PREMARITAL ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS  Cross-sex relationships can be mapped across time in terms of increases in interdependency and feelings of affection. A study of involved couples showed that those who said they were "in love" also reported feeling "dependent" on their partner; dependency and insecurity, however, were unrelated (26). Thus, though love and dependency go together, whether dependency produces insecurity (or vice versa) appears to be contingent on other matters. It is not known whether partners who combined love, dependency, and insecurity were in an earlier stage of involvement than those who were secure in their love in spite of their dependency. It may take time for couples to develop a sense of mutual dependency, and until they do, each partner is likely to feel vulnerable. That feelings of vulnerability are reduced
with time and commitment is supported in two studies (85, 86) which show love and trust to be increasingly fused as couples move toward greater involvement.

The multidimensional path of relationships eventuating in marriage has been charted in a creative study by Stambul & Kelley (296). Using retrospective accounts of courtship provided by newlyweds, these authors identified four relationship dimensions: (a) love, (b) conflict and negativity, (c) ambivalence, and (d) maintenance (which included problem solving efforts, self-disclosure, and attempts to change behavior of self or partner). Love and maintenance activities were reported to increase as a couple moved from casual dating through serious dating to engagement. Conflict and negativity increased from casual to serious dating and then leveled off, presumably as a consequence of the couple working out the terms of their relationship. Ambivalence tended to be high during the casual and the serious dating stages, and then declined slightly. Particularly interesting was the way the dimensions were interrelated at various stages. Early in the cycle, love was associated with efforts to maintain the relationship; later on, however, love had little to do with maintenance activities. Instead, such activities were associated with conflict. Ambivalence was tied to conflict early in the relationship; later ambivalence had more to do with concerns about love than conflict. At all stages, love and conflict were orthogonal; indeed, some couples reported conflict throughout their relationship, while others experienced little at any stage. Stambul & Kelley suggest that attention should be devoted to identifying styles of courtship; we agree, particularly since the predictors of “courtship progress” are apt to differ from one style to another.

What solidifies commitment between partners? Social psychologists have taken varying paths toward an answer to this question. At the individualistic level, researchers have shown that personal attributes—such as the propensity to fall in love—affect the likely course of relationships (82, 83, 133). At the dyadic level, combinations of partners’ attributes— their similarity along various dimensions—affect the likely “success” of the relationship (e.g. “courtship progress”). Moreover, the nature of the relationship at one point in time—its symmetry of involvement (133) or the members’ agreement about its definition (224)—is used to predict its future course. Alternatively, the network of the pair’s associations is found to influence its evolution (see our earlier discussion of Figure 2).

(a) Individual approaches. Some evidence suggests that college-age women “fall in love” (or acknowledge having done so) more frequently than do men (82, 83); once involved, however, men appear to “fall” faster (133). The nature of the love experience also appears to be different for men and women, with men being more “idealistic” and more “cynical” but less pragmatic in their attitudes (82). Female pragmatics also may be responsible for the finding that breakups are somewhat more often precipitated by women than by men (133).

Some recent work suggests that particular personality attributes, when considered in combination with the individual’s sex, affect the likelihood that one’s relationship will move toward long-term commitment (228, 298). In one study (298), males (but not females) high in need for power were more likely to report a history of breakups; moreover, over a 2-year follow-up period, such males were more likely to break with their partner (or be broken up with) than males low in need for power.
(b) *Dyadic approaches.* Most of the research regarding personality attributes has attempted to see whether some dyadic *combinations* are more likely than others to lead to escalating involvement. Sociological evidence shows that partners similar in social characteristics are more likely to marry (162). Mate-selection theorists argue that social life is structured so that socially similar persons are more likely to meet; persons also are said to "filter" out socially dissimilar persons by either avoiding them or by quickly terminating relationships with them (164, 198, 229). Recent data gathered by Hill, Rubin & Peplau (133), however, suggests that some "filtering" on the basis of social background occurs after the partners have become involved with one another. Dating partners who remained together over a 2-year period were found to be more similar than those who broke up in terms of age, educational aspirations, intelligence, and physical attractiveness. These same researchers report no evidence that couples who remained together were more similar in attitudes than those who broke up. This finding confirms several earlier studies. Levinger and his colleagues (188, 194) found attitude similarity unrelated to courtship progress over 6- and 12-month periods; this was true for both short and long-term couples—indeed, for one sample of long-term couples, pairs with high value consensus were less likely to progress than those with low consensus. Centers (54) has found that attitude similarity did not differentiate among five groups of partners ranging upward in involvement from "most preferred date" to married. Murstein (229) found, in two of three samples, that couples who seriously contemplated marriage were somewhat more similar in values than random pairs; his data, however, are cross-sectional and do not allow determination of whether attitude similarity, independent of its correlation with social background, contributes to the escalation of involvement.

Recent attempts to account for courtship progress in terms of similarity or complementarity in needs, or in terms of personality "fit," have also proved unsuccessful (194, 200); these recent findings are generally consistent with most earlier research (229, 262).

There are probably many reasons why attempts to predict the evolution of relationships on the basis of combinations of personal characteristics have proved fruitless. Two seem to stand out. The first is that little is known about the ways combinations of attributes affect the behavior of partners in their interpersonal relationship. Recent efforts to reconceptualize personality (53, 220) have stressed the importance of understanding the way situational and interpersonal contexts affect the expression of individuality. A second reason is that social psychologists studying close relationships may overestimate their degree of intimacy and hence the degree to which partners' psychological attributes come into play. Partners are motivated to move close relationships toward marriage for many reasons. Lillian Rubin (260), in her excellent book on working class marriages, for instance, found little evidence that courtships were characterized by intense interpersonal involvement. Courtship is not a unitary phenomenon; indeed, there appears to be much diversity in courtship styles, with some couples showing only surface involvement and others evidencing great intensity.

Research examining "relationship" characteristics to predict courtship progress has been more successful than that which focuses on combinations of the psycholog-
ical attributes of the partners. Relationship research suggests that partners who “understand” each other and who agree in their definition of their relationship are more apt to escalate their commitment; thus persons whose partners see them the way they see themselves are more likely to report having moved closer to marriage when queried about their relationship several months later (199, 200, 229). Moreover, persons who report that they and their partner are equally involved in their relationship are less likely to break than those who report asymmetrical involvement (133). In spite of the recent upsurge of interest in topics such as cohabitation and premarital sex, little is known regarding the impact of either on commitment. Hill et al (133) found cohabitants no more likely to stay together than partners not living together; in another study based on the same sample, Peplau, Rubin & Hill (241) reported that whether partners engage in sexual intercourse—and if so, whether intercourse occurs early or late in their relationship—was unrelated to pair continuance.

(c) Social networks. The impact of social networks on premarital dyads has received little attention. Ridley & Avery (252), however, provide a thorough conceptualization of the conditions under which such networks are apt to have an influence on the course of premarital relationships. The promise of interesting research in this area is illustrated by a recent study by Driscoll, Davis & Lipetz (86) which found that parental interference intensified romantic love between seriously dating partners. Work concerned with the impact of third parties on relationships will need to begin with a conceptualization of the nature of the network within which the premarital relationship is embedded, and then to proceed to an analysis of the dynamic interplay of the couple’s relationship with various elements in the social network.

In summary, the more promising approaches emphasize partners’ social characteristics, the congruence between self-perception and other’s perception of self, the partners’ consensus in defining their relationship, and the supportiveness or disruptiveness of their social network. Attempts to predict “courtship progress” and commitment on the basis of attitude similarity, need complementarity, or personality “fit” seem to be less promising.

Marriage

Recent changes in people’s conception of marriage (23) are part of a long-term evolution in societal norms, work patterns, and life styles (104, 234, 248). Whatever changes have occurred, both old and young continue to see marriage as desirable (52, 192) and to perceive it as more intimate, more interdependent, and more durable than any other relationship (173, 330). Participation in marriage is regulated by the partners’ personality dispositions, the social network in which the relationship is embedded (36, 252, 326), and the wide, societal context (260).

An exchange-theory perspective (309) suggests that a marriage will endure as long as its outcomes exceed both partners’ most attractive alternative; a field-theory formulation (190) emphasizes the additional importance of barriers or commitments—the costs of terminating the relationship. Since our discussion of romantic relationships has already considered many aspects of pair formation, the focus here is on the maintenance and dissolution of relationships.
MARRIAGE MAINTENANCE  Recent research on this topic will be discussed under two headings. The first pertains to spouses' feelings of attraction and commitment, while the second deals with processes of communication and conflict.

Attraction and commitment  Recent data (124) have shown that a sample of young, high status people tended to "idealize" their spouses; such persons consistently described their spouses more positively than either themselves or a friend. We doubt, however, whether such a tendency would hold true among the older or the less affluent. Regional and national probability surveys have suggested that marital satisfaction changes over the life cycle; respondents report high satisfaction immediately after marriage, followed by a slight downward drift after children arrive, succeeded by a mild upswing after the children leave home. Such a U-shaped association was found in two recent surveys (52, 254). Findings from a third set of surveys (293) gave "only limited support" to this curvilinear association, and the authors discuss artifacts that may contaminate such cross-sectional survey data; without longitudinal assessment of the same cohort of pairs over time, age-related selection biases and response biases limit the interpretability of these data.

Bernard's (23) contrast between "his" and "her" marriage has stimulated considerable interest. She assembled data to demonstrate that men have gained more and lost less than women in the average American marriage. Some confirmatory findings have been assembled (108, 117, 118); nonetheless, other data (109), as well as a recent national probability survey (52), indicate no difference between average male and female marital satisfaction.

In a literature review, Levinger (190) employed his "barrier" concept to integrate a variety of findings on the restraining forces that hold marriages together. Aside from divorce research, there has been little empirical work on indices of barriers. A study by Johnson (148) compared the relative strengths of commitment in two matched samples of married and unmarried cohabitants. As would be expected, the married pairs far more frequently felt a desire to remain together for a long time, identified more people who would disapprove of their breakup, and had higher "potential costs" of a breakup. A cross-cultural analysis (258) found that marriage ceremonies become more elaborate as they are accompanied by greater amounts of inheritance or property transfer; furthermore, couple commitment generally tends to be linked to the strength of kin group commitment. Rosenblatt (256) has enumerated a variety of questions on the role of commitment in marriage.

Communication and conflict  Couples differ in their ability to maintain the attractiveness of their relationship. Many differences seem indirectly attributable to socio-economic sources, such as low income (72), unstable employment (259), or unplanned children (103). Other differences are attributable to husband-wife interaction itself.

A valuable theoretical and empirical approach to marital conflict has been provided by Raush (247, 249). He and his colleagues used communication theory and informational analysis to examine conflict resolution processes among 46 couples who were part of a larger longitudinal study. Quantitative analyses illuminate the
contextual effects of type of conflict, stage of a couple's relationship, and each partner's prior acts on each spouse's contingent acts. Both destructive and constructive conflict sequences are analyzed to ascertain such contingencies. Important differences occurred between issue-oriented and relationship-oriented conflicts, and between typical husband (high-power "supportive") and typical wife (low-power "appealing") tactics. Raush's work illustrates how quantitative and qualitative approaches can be meaningfully combined.

Gottman and his colleagues (112–114) have also drawn on communication theory and contingency analysis to study how spouses make joint decisions around conflict issues. In their most recent study (113), they coded marital interaction sequences in terms of the content and affect of messages, as well as the affect of the recipient of the messages. Comparison of communication patterns in "distressed" and "nondistressed" marriages showed that relationships could be differentiated not only in terms of content and sequencing of messages, but also in terms of the nonverbal affect accompanying the communication process. In another project, Gottman et al (114) had spouses continuously code both the intended impact of their own behavior and the received impact of the other's behavior. Two separate studies showed that "distressed" and "nondistressed" couples differed little in terms of intentions, but significantly in how the spouses interpreted each other's behavior. Among the distressed couples, but not in the nondistressed, behavior was perceived more negatively by the spouse than the actor intended; these differences were greater for high-conflict as compared to low-conflict issues. Gottman et al propose that distressed pairs tend to suffer from a "communication deficit."

A communication deficit interpretation may help us understand why "spontaneous agreement" is found more frequently in "normal" than in "abnormal" couples, or why implicit agreements may increase in number with length of marriage in normal but not in "abnormal" couples (96, 328). Communication deficits may also help account for differences among cooperative and competitive couples in mixed-motive conflict simulations (95).

As part of their research on behavior modification, Weiss and his co-workers (32, 319, 320, 324) have been analyzing the maintenance and the modification of couple distress. Their work assumes that harmonious and conflictual pairs differ in the reciprocity, frequency, and salience of exchanged reinforcements. To establish means and criteria for improving harmony, they ask partners to construct a "hierarchy of response costs and benefits" (320, p. 311); spouses thereby discover those reinforcers they already exchange and also those that they fail to use. Such an approach is said to enhance couples' abilities to locate specific criteria for assisting conflict resolution.

In this difficult area, the most useful research seems to be a blend of behavioral and cognitive analyses of interpersonal costs and benefits. Work in still another research program bears mention. Kelley and his collaborators (161, 236, 296) have begun to apply attribution theory to the understanding of conflict in pair relationships. From an attributional viewpoint, conflict may occur when a partner sees the actor's negative behavior as reflective of the actor's personal characteristics, while the actor sees it merely as a response to external, temporary causes.
MARRIAGE DISSOLUTION A relationship deteriorates when negative events occur without the partners having the ability to cope with them. Highly positive relationships usually have ample resources for meeting deteriorating circumstances, provided they are not unduly burdensome, but even harmonious pairs are susceptible to spiralling negativity. Without strong barriers against breakup, marriages caught in such negative spirals are vulnerable to an attractive alternative for either spouse (190).

Findings on marital dissolution are limited almost entirely to self-reports and archival statistics; they rarely include observation of preseparation behavior. From a practical standpoint, it is difficult to observe couples who interact destructively and thereby to trace the processes that eventuate in divorce; at the same time, the findings on differential attribution (114, 236) suggest extreme caution in interpreting ex-spouses' self-reports.

At the demographic level, rising rates of marital separation have been well documented (234) and socioeconomic determinants identified (72, 259). At the interpersonal level, proneness to breakup has been linked to sources of social dissimilarity (44, 190), to "intergenerational transmission" of divorce (244), and to a variety of other objective sources of system strain (144, 192).

Consequences of marital breakup have only recently begun to receive systematic attention, although considerable research is in progress. From his work with ex-spouses, Weiss (323) has reported that marital separation is normally accompanied by a long period of emotional distress; alternating extremes of negative and positive feelings toward the exspouse commonly continued, with declining intensity, over a period of a year or longer. In his specialized sample of separated persons seeking help in "Seminars for the Separated," Weiss found emotional distress almost unrelated to either the quality of the broken marriage or the reasons for its breakup. Other consequences of separation on one's relationship with children, with kin, and with friends are being investigated in ongoing research that awaits systematic report (192).

CONCLUSION

The three major sections of our review—Impressions, Encounters and Contacts, and Relationships—follow the conception of Figure 2. We were able to categorize the literature within those three domains, but it was difficult to build bridges among them. Various discontinuities became apparent. As one moves from research on first impressions through encounters to relationships, focus tends to shift from the individual actor, to social interaction, and occasionally to the societal milieu. More than two-thirds of the studies reviewed dealt with impressions and encounters, usually removed from their social context; such work was published primarily by social psychologists. The remaining studies examined ongoing relationships; such research was mounted by a variety of social scientists, some concerned mainly with the relationships themselves and others with broad societal issues.

Ideological issues are rarely acknowledged. It seems that pragmatic concerns govern our selection of research questions and our sampling of research participants
and interpersonal relationships. The tabulations in Figure 1 show that empirical work has concentrated on highly visible and traditional social liaisons—same-sex friendships and heterosexual romances of unmarried college-age adults, and to a lesser extent marriages and friendships of older adults. While homosexuals are studied as individuals, their relationships are not; "affairs" are examined mainly insofar as they impinge upon marriage; cross-sex friendships are infrequently studied; attraction among work partners or between superiors and subordinates is rarely reported on. The effects of physical beauty and attitude similarity are commonly investigated, while other antecedents of attraction are ignored. For instance, we found no studies on the effects of power and wealth on sexual attractiveness; Marxists would attach considerable importance to such effects. Also, while our culture and clinical practice focus on sex, there are few reliable data on the impact of sexual interaction on relationships.

The acknowledgment of gaps can be the occasion for noting opportunities. Regarding the future, we foresee increasing efforts to bring theoretical coherence to this broad area. The present review is a part of a wider attempt to emphasize the interconnections among individual, dyadic, network, and societal approaches (105, 138, 193, 300), and to create languages for describing the development of relationships (10, 181, 195, 271, 296). If such theoretical work is combined with methodological advances, it will contribute to a fuller understanding of how relationships emerge and how they fall by the wayside.
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