

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

**University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600**

Order Number 9009742

**Factors facilitating romantic attraction and their relation to
styles of loving, relationship satisfaction and complementarity
theory**

Jacobs, John Russell, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1989

Copyright ©1989 by Jacobs, John Russell. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A

**FACTORS FACILITATING ROMANTIC ATTRACTION
AND THEIR RELATION TO STYLES OF LOVING,
RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION AND COMPLIMENTARITY THEORY**

by

JOHN R. JACOBS

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in
Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University
of New York

1989

© 1989

JOHN R. JACOBS

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May 31, 1989 Alden E. Wessman
Date Chair of Examining Committee

June 5, 1989 Hubert D. Rettig
Date Executive Officer

DR. Wessman

DR. Rettig

DR. Denmark

Supervisory Committee

Abstract

**FACTORS FACILITATING ROMANTIC ATTRACTION
AND THEIR RELATION TO STYLES OF LOVING,
RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION AND COMPLIMENTARITY THEORY**

by

John R. Jacobs

Advisor: Dr. Wessman

Experimental studies and clinical speculation have suggested that numerous internal states and/or external conditions facilitate romantic attraction. The responses of 190 adults consisting of 129 females and 61 males to a Romantic Attraction Questionnaire were investigated. Approximately two-thirds of the subjects were under 25 years of age and over 95 percent were under 40. Items comprising possible facilitators were factor analyzed, resulting in four internally consistent scales labelled: aging fears and social expectations, desire for self-expansion, relief from adversity, and sexual desire. As hypothesized only subjects reporting an intensification of desire for self-expansion prior to romantic involvement choose lovers described as having complementary characteristics. Subjects reporting an intensification on the other facilitating factors choose lovers described as having similar traits. This finding suggests that complementary attractions are not relevant for all romantic involvements but perhaps only in those where one partner's primary desire is characterological change rather than ameliorating distress. Subjects

reporting an intensification of any of the facilitating factors also reported, in Lee's (1977) terminology, more "manic" symptoms characterized by affective ability and somatic discomfort. Women reported not only more manic symptoms than men, but also were more likely to begin the most important romantic relationship of their life influenced by the desire for self-expansion and pressure from aging fears and social expectations. Men were most likely to report being influenced by an intensification in sexual desire. Gender differences involving facilitating factors lend support to Blau's (1964) social exchange theory or sociobiological theorists such as Buss (1987) and Symons' (1979) contentions that the early stages of romantic involvements involve women's exchange of sexual services for evidence of commitment, economic stability, and willingness to share economic resources. The author views this exchange as a result of the prevalence of traditional attitudes about sex roles, achievement, and long-standing conditions of socio-economic disparity.

Acknowledgments

I want to express my deep, heartfelt thanks to Dr. Alden Wessman who served as Chair on my dissertation. He has encouraged my independence both as a researcher and earlier as a student when the topic of romantic love was a shocking doctoral exam topic. His encouragement, advice and generous allotment of time and effort greatly enriched my graduate education.

Also I want to thank Dr. Rettig for the many hours of stimulating conversations both as a member of my committee and over informal lunches. Also, for sharing his office space and computer facilities which greatly assisted in completing the dissertation in a timely manner. I want to thank Dr. Denmark for serving on my committee and her encouragement and excellent advice during graduate school and the dissertation, in particular. I would also like to thank Dr. Krauss and Dr. Rabinowitz who served as outside readers and offered many valuable suggestions during the process.

Fellow graduate students Andrea Martin, Greg Bovasso, and John Gunn made insightful comments through the development of the project. Andrea Martin's advice concerning statistical and editorial matters was especially helpful.

My research assistants have also been very helpful. Hilda Speicher provided proofreading and editorial comments which were very valuable. Mary Loos and Susan Woellfle provided proofing, and data entry services which facilitated finishing. I would also like to thank Mindy Wexler-Marks for providing word processing services often at the 23rd hour before an impending deadline.

Finally, I want to dedicate this dissertation to my long time friend, Catherine Gallant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Facilitating Factors 3

 Relief from Adversity 3

 Sexual Desire 5

 Aging Fears and Social Expectations 8

 Desire for Self-Expansion 11

 Revision of Complementarity Theory 12

**Factors Facilitating Romantic Attraction and Their Relationship
 to Various Aspects of Passionate and Companionate Lovestyles** 14

Hypotheses 17

 Hypotheses Regarding Facilitating Factors 18

 Hypotheses Regarding Subsequent Relationship Satisfaction 20

 Hypotheses Regarding Revising Complementarity Theory and
 Perception of Lover 22

 Hypotheses Regarding Gender Differences 23

 Hypotheses Regarding Age Differences 25

Method 26

 Subjects 26

 Materials 26

 Procedure 28

Results 29

 Factor Analysis: Factors Facilitating Romantic Attraction 29

 Factor Analysis: Subsequent Relationship Satisfaction 30

 Factor Analysis: Self Ratings on Personality Traits 30

 Reliability: Love Styles Scales 31

 Hypotheses: The Relationship Between Factors Facilitating Romantic
 Attraction and Various Love Styles 31

 Hypotheses: Subsequent Relationship Satisfaction 32

 Hypotheses: Gender Differences 33

 Hypotheses: Age Differences 33

 Hypotheses: Complementarity Theory 34

 Racial Differences 36

 Curently/Not Currently Involved 36

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Discussion	37
Facilitators of Romantic Attraction and Complementarity of	
Personality	37
Mania and Other Lovestyles	41
Gender Differences and Facilitating Factors	45
Age Differences	51
Limitation of Study	52
Summary	53
Tables	56
Appendix	71
References	82

List of Tables

1. Factors Facilitating Romantic Attraction: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis	56
2. Percentages of Subjects Reporting Intensification of the Various Facilitating Factors	59
3. Intercorrelations Among Scales for Facilitating Factors	60
4. Correlations of Facilitating Factors with Social Desirability	61
5. Subsequent Relationship Satisfaction: Factor Analysis	62
6. Factor Analysis of Self-Ratings on Personality Traits	65
7. Tests of Hypotheses 2-5: The Relationship of Factors Facilitating Romantic Attraction and Mania: Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance	66
8. Gender Differences	67
9. Age Differences	68
10. Significant Correlations Between Factors Facilitating Romantic Attraction and Self and Lover Personality Trait Ratings	69

List of Appendices

A. Facilitating Factor: Relief from Adversity	71
B. Facilitating Factor: Sexual Desire	72
C. Facilitating Factor: Aging Fears and Social Expectations	73
D. Facilitating Factor: Self-Expansion Wishes	74
E. Love Style: Eros (Passionate Love)	75
F. Love Style: Mania (Passionate Love)	76
G. Love Style: Idealization (Passionate Love)	77
H. Love Style: Caring (Companionate Love)	78
I. Love Style: Respect and Communicative Intimacy (Companionate Love) . .	79
J. Love Style: Friendship (Companionate Love)	80
K. Love Style: Pragmatism	81

**FACTORS FACILITATING ROMANTIC ATTRACTION
AND THEIR RELATION TO RELATIONSHIP GRATIFICATION**

Introduction

Historically, the subject of romantic relationships has been neglected by social scientists in general and psychologists in particular. Harlow (1958) humorously remarked that as far as research was concerned, most psychologists could live without love and both they and love would benefit from the neglect. In the 1960's, a handful of studies about romantic involvements were published. In the mid-seventies, studies on romantic relationships became increasingly more popular and by the mid-eighties this research had flourished (Rubin, 1988).

The "flourish" in research has been mostly limited to attempts at constructing a scale to define "types" or "styles" of love (Berscheid, 1988). Other aspects of romantic attractions, such as factors which might make a person more willing to fall in love, or to fall in love with a particular type of person, or to have a particular type of relationship, are still under researched.

This dissertation will attempt to develop a questionnaire based on both the clinical and experimental literature about situations and internal states which facilitate romantic attraction. Four main facilitating factors are hypothesized, and referred to as relief from adversity, aging fears and social expectations, sexual desire and self-expansion desires. Differences between subjects who report an intensification on any of the four facilitating factors and those subjects who did not

report such intensification will be assessed on an additional lovestyle dimension designated as "mania" consisting of items representing affective lability and somatic discomfort. Differences on further lovestyle scales of caring and erotic behavior will be assessed for those subjects who report an intensification on the facilitating factor relief from adversity and sexual desire.

Differences in degree and type of relationship satisfaction between subjects who did report an intensification on any of the four facilitating factors and those who did not will be assessed with a scale developed by the author. Hypotheses will be developed between the specific facilitating factors and various aspects of the relationship such as satisfaction with affection expressed, companionship and leisure activities and instrumental activities such as finances, housekeeping, career development etc. Also, gender and age differences will be assessed in terms of the facilitating factors, lovestyles, and relationships.

The study will also attempt to provide a revision of complementary theory of romantic attraction originally proposed by Reik (1949) and subsequently examined by Winch (1967) and Kerekhoff & Davis (1962). Factors which facilitate relationships may also provide some guidelines for predicting what types of traits certain individuals find complementary. Thus, subjects whose relationships are facilitated by certain conditions and internal states will select a partner who is perceived as having characteristics which will gratify the needs related to this facilitating factor. For example, subjects whose relationships are facilitated by relief from adversity are likely to choose a lover who is psychologically and emotionally familiar and has similar qualities, while subjects whose relationships are facilitated

by the desire for self-expansion are likely to choose lovers with coveted qualities that they lack. Such differences suggest that choice of a complementary lover may be based on the type of needs the individual wants gratified within the relationship.

Facilitating Factor: Relief from Adversity

Kenrick and Cialdini (1977) argued that the role of adverse circumstances in facilitating attraction is a frequently neglected yet crucial condition in understanding relationships. They viewed attraction under adverse conditions in behavioristic terms: receiving "negative reinforcement" from the beloved. The "negative reinforcement" is a diversion or escape from circumstances or feelings that the lover wants to avoid. Thus, the lover seeks the beloved as a relief from unpleasant emotions.

Fromm (1956) argued that one of the most important motivators for people to fall in love is to escape loneliness, anxiety, and helplessness caused by an alienating social world. The initial process of falling in love is a way of overcoming alienation and human separateness. Fromm writes that falling in love is "...a sudden collapse of the barriers which existed until that moment between two strangers" (p. 44). Alberoni (1983) emphasized that people who usually do not show strong dependent tendencies are slow to fall in love. He argued that most people only fall in love under conditions of extreme dissatisfaction with life. He writes "the experience of falling in love originates in extreme depression, an inability to find something of value in everyday life" (p. 61).

Experimental studies suggest that varied types of high arousal situations facilitate strong attractions which may or may not be considered romantic. Dutton

and Aron (1974) found that when males were subjected to high anxiety conditions, such as crossing a rickety bridge over a deep valley, that they were more attracted to the female confederate than those males subjected to less anxiety provoking situations.

In a similar study, Dutton and Aron (1974) hypothesized that stress would increase romantic attraction. They found that male subjects who anticipated receiving a severe electric shock found the female confederate more physically attractive than those subjects who expected a mild electric shock or who had no adverse expectations. Riordan and Tedeschi (1983) confirmed these findings with the contingency that exposure to the female confederate could occur before or after the threat of electric shock was made but that she could not be present when the threat was communicated.

In a similar vein, Hatfield's (1965) experiment involved freshman female subjects who were given false information about how much psychopathology they displayed in response to several projective tests. The women who were told that they were probably too mentally ill to complete their undergraduate education were more likely to give their phone number and accept an invitation for a date from the male confederate.

Bersheid and Walster (1974) suggested that stressful situations which have not been mastered lower self-esteem and, therefore, a boost in self-esteem might be attained by having another to love and approve of them. Studies (Berscheid and Walster, 1974; Dion and Dion, 1973) on dating behavior have shown that having another person express romantic sentiment and display courtship behavior increases

the recipient's self-esteem. Dutton and Aron (1974) proposed an alternative explanation: that stressful conditions produce a "disinhibition effect" where people might feel less inhibited about expressing romantic sentiment or displaying romantic behavior. Berscheid (1988) follows this reasoning by arguing that deep emotions, including love, are the result of some "highly organized behavior sequences" starting to change. In other words, the emergence of strong emotions (e.g., fear, anxiety, grief) allows for the emergence of other equally strong emotions.

The relief from adversity scales will include family, career and school crises as well as internal states such as anxiety, depression, and loneliness. The relief from adversity scale is shown in Appendix A.

Facilitating Factor: Sexual Desire

The role of sexual desire as an important facilitator of attraction is a greatly neglected topic in the study of romantic relationships. Ellen Berscheid (1988), one of the first and most frequently cited researchers on romantic attraction, subtitled her review of the literature, "Whatever Happened to Old-Fashioned Lust?" lamenting the omission of sexual desire from contemporary research on love and the failure of emotion theorists to be concerned with the role of sexual desire in interpersonal relations.

For example, Rubin (1970), who developed the first questionnaire to measure love, did not include any sexual or erotic items. Further studies have corrected this glaring omission, but there is little or no empirical or even clinical work on the role sexual desire plays in forming a love relationship.

The earliest speculation by a social scientist concerning the role of sex in forming love relationships was done by Freud (1905). He argued that love is the result of frustrated sexual energy that is not gratified. When libidinal energy aimed at a certain person is not gratified, either the relationship with the person has to be abandoned or the desired object has to be idealized. For Freud, love was "a temporary psychosis," wherein the lover idealizes the unavailable person in order to avoid or delay the loss of this person. Freud explains this as a fundamental element (although not the sole factor) in a child's love for his/her parent. As an adult each person finds someone who recalls the idealized image of his/her parents as formed during early childhood. Thus, the adult lover is free to select among numerous traits or physical characteristics of the idealized parents. Love is a process of "rediscovering" the traits of the idealized parent and releasing pent-up libido which was cathected upon the infant's love object. Freud stressed that any type of love is pent-up libido searching for gratification. Although love is not solely sexual desire since it also involves rediscovering an idealized image of the parent, sexual desire is the primary motivator for falling in love and triggering the process of rediscovery.

Buss and Barnes (1986) also viewed sexuality as the primary motivator of mate selection, but from an evolutionary perspective in which both sexes strive to reproduce. Males are sexually excited by physically attractive females since good looks are a sign of health and, therefore, reproductive capability. Females select males with resources that can provide economic support for themselves and children.

Fromm (1956) made a similar point, arguing that love has become a commodity in modern Western societies, and that men and women turn their personalities into products in order to market themselves on the supply-demand curve of mate selection. Men use prestigious accomplishments and financial success in order to attract women, and women present themselves as sexual objects to offer physical attractiveness in exchange. Empirical studies on dating offer indirect evidence for Fromm's theory. Berscheid and Walster (1974) found that for both adolescent males and females physical attractiveness was the best predictor of dating and satisfaction. In considering marriage partners, however, the first priority for males remains physical attractiveness, while females choose men with emotional and economic stability.

The importance of physical arousal has received support from several empirical studies: Ralhus (1983) found that physical attractiveness was the major factor in influencing people to approach potential partners and to develop and continue romantic relationships. White (1980) found that in males an increase in physiological arousal (running in place for two minutes) significantly increased positive evaluations of the physical appearance of female confederates as well as their desire to have sexual relations with them. Clark's (1982) study found that an increase in sexual arousal resulted in male subjects perceiving an opposite sex confederate as more altruistic and generally more positive than under less arousing circumstances.

Berscheid and Walster (1974) stressed that passionate love is preceded by physiological arousal but that other factors such as escape from adversity are

necessary for love to occur. Berscheid (1988) re-emphasized this point 14 years later, claiming that romantic attraction is "a hodgepodge of emotions," where love, sexual desire, fear, depression, and idealization are inseparably entwined. Therefore, some items representing sex-related behaviors and cognitions may load on other factors, such as self-expansion. A man may seek an unusually physically attractive partner not solely for sexual gratification but also to inflate his self-concept. With this qualification, I predict that a distinct sexual desire factor will emerge in the factor analysis. This factor will involve an increased desire to have sex, an increase in the amount of time spent fantasizing and talking about sex, as well as seeking an increase in seeking situations where potential partners might be available. Items for this scale are listed in Appendix B.

Facilitating Factor: Aging Fears and Social Expectations

The third factor which is expected to emerge will be aging fears and social expectations. The roles of social expectations and aging concerns as facilitators are important in the initiation of romantic relationships.

The most obvious stressor contained in this category involves the "biological clock" of women, in that their reproductive years are limited. In addition, family and social pressures often encourage a woman to look for a partner who will provide not only for herself but also for her offspring. Sociobiological theorists (Wilson, 1979; Buss, 1987) argue that the degree of anxiety concerning societal expectations and aging concerns are greater for women. According to Western culture, women are considered most physically attractive in their early twenties. If they fail to marry during these years, their value on the mate exchange decreases

with time. However, men ordinarily do not develop careers until their late twenties, and, therefore, their value on the mate exchange increases with career and financial success.

Dion and Dion (1973) and Hendricks and Hendricks (1986) empirical research supports the socio-biological theory in that women's attitudes toward attraction are less romantic and more pragmatic than men's. Men are more likely to express romantic attitudes about relationships because marriage is not likely to involve financial dependence for them. Further, Kanin, Davidson and Scheck (1970) found that men are only more romantic during the early stages of the relationship. Women's attitudes, however, become increasingly more romantic as the relationship becomes more stable and the probability of marriage increases. Subsequently, men's attitudes become less romantic as the relationship demands more responsibility and commitment. Aging concerns may make women feel more pressure to have committed romantic involvements than men, however, social expectations about being romantically involved and in a committed relationship, if not a marriage, are considerable for both sexes.

Kephardt (1967) found that women were more "marriage directed" than men but men were also substantially oriented in that direction. Both men and women reported a strong desire to marry before forty and that marriage is a substantial life goal. Greenfield (1965) argued that romantic love is an illusion which serves to motivate individuals to occupy roles of husband-father and wife-mother which might involve more sacrifices than rewards for the persons involved. Greenfield believes that love must be "mystified" by the culture and presented as something which

makes life meaningful in order for many people to forego personal freedom and enter the confines of the nuclear family.

Neugarten (1968) introduced the term "social clock" to describe the type of activities individuals feel that the cultural norms require them to become involved with during certain periods of their life. Individuals struggle to reconcile their accomplishments and possible accomplishments in terms of their perception of what norms, roles, and accomplishments are expected of them. Most people marry in their early twenties (Patterson & Pettijohn, 1962; Thornton & Freedman, 1983). Therefore, unmarried people past their early twenties are more likely to feel pressure to become romantically involved. Campbell, Converse, Rodgers' (1976) study found that social networks which provide both emotional support and sources of possible mates greatly diminish as the individual becomes older. Also, he found that marriage serves as a primary social support for both male and female adults over thirty. Further, Peele (1975) argued that our society is "couple-oriented," placing the individual under intense pressure to conform. Failure to become involved in a committed romantic relationship or marriage is viewed as an emotional or characterological disturbance.

Items representing aging fears and social expectations involve pressure from both biological and social clocks. The aging and social concerns scale includes items dealing with becoming romantically involved because of the fear that romantic relationships might be more difficult to obtain and less rewarding in the future, as well as pressure from social forces such as friends, parents, and societal norms. Items expected to load on this factor are listed in Appendix C.

Facilitating Factor: Desire for Self-Expansion

The concept of self-expansion was emphasized in the clinical writing of Theodore Reik (1949). Reik claimed that the essential unconscious condition for romantic attraction is the desire to emulate the loved one. The lover is searching for someone who has the desired qualities which he/she lacks. In Reik's words, "love is a substitute for another desire, self-fulfillment, it is a vain urge to reach one's ego-ideal" (p. 152). In turn, the beloved may also find desired qualities they lack in the other, or their partner's infatuation may create a pleasing illusion of having these traits. For example, an anxious insecure woman may be drawn to a seemingly cool, confident man in order to possess his assurance and love. In turn, the seemingly cool, confident man may need the woman to support the illusion of self-assurance which otherwise he may not be able to maintain for himself. Another scenario may involve a man seeking a remarkably physically attractive woman in order to boost his sense of self-importance.

Influenced by Reik, Kast (1986) argued that in order to fall in love, an underlying sense of fantasy is involved. Further, this fantasy must be maintained by each party perceiving the other as behaving in a way that does not violate each other's fantasies. Winch (1967) described deficit needs which lead the individual to seek out someone who can fulfill these needs. Aron and Aron (1986) elaborated on Reik's theory of complementarity attraction suggesting that lovers need not supply a complementary personality trait but could provide other types of expansion such as career opportunities or social mobility.

Reik considered envy to be the predecessor of love, a necessary prerequisite in order for the relationship to develop. After the initial infatuation or the actual "falling" involved in love relationships, other exchanges are necessary in order for the relationship to progress from passionate to companionate love. Winch argued that complementary traits are crucial to falling in love and are vital factors involved in the relationship's progressing from infatuation to marriage. The theories put forth by both Reik and Winch suggest that the search for complementary traits is the sole facilitator for romantic relationships. This study argues that the desire for self-expansion and complementary traits are frequently relevant to facilitation of romantic involvements, but that they are not the sole facilitators. Other factors such as escape from adversity, sexual desire, and aging concerns and social expectations are important facilitators of romantic attraction as well.

The desire for self-expansion scale will include seeking a partner who possesses traits, physical or psychological, that the lover desires for himself/herself. Items are listed in Appendix D.

Revision of Complementarity Theory: A Focus on Perceptions of the Lover

Recent studies (Hill & Stull, 1981; Gonzales, Davis, Loney, Lukens & Junghas, 1983) have argued that the lover's perception of the beloved's traits are more important in understanding interpersonal perception than the experimenter's or any third party's assessment. The lover's perception of the beloved having a particular trait (i.e., confidence) may be the facilitator of romantic attraction whether or not a third party perceives the beloved as possessing this trait. According to Reik and Winch the perception of desired and/or complementary traits is the

essential ingredient of romance. Roscow (1957) criticized complementarity theory on two grounds. First, he argued that some people might seek a partner who has similar needs. Second, Roscow noted that complementarity theory does not offer any guidelines to predict which needs a specific individual might find complementary. More specifically on the first point, for some people similarity is the primary motivator in initiating a relationship and provides the relationship with the same type of gratification as if the personalities were complementary. For example, two lonely people who are socially inhibited might be attracted to each other because their company provides an alternative to loneliness. In a case such as this, the other partner who is not socially outgoing actually has an appealing (though similar) trait, because the partner is less likely to initiate outside relationships which are threatening to their romantic involvement. Roscow's first criticism was not intended to refute the role of complementary traits in attraction, but to narrow the claim that complementary traits are prerequisites for romantic attraction. This study will explore a filtering process whereby prospective partners can only remain eligible providing they have a similar emotional temperament concerning traits related to succorance such as sympathy, tolerance, and a lack of aggression. People seek partners with whom they share some common emotional base regarding nurturance and receptivity but satisfy complementary needs on other traits such as achievement orientation.

The filtering process regarding nurturance and passivity does not apply to a person whose falling in love is facilitated by an intensification of the desire for self-expansion. These individuals are not seeking a common emotional base as much as

a lover who will provide traits which are missing or under-developed in themselves.

The perceiver seeks these lovers precisely because they are unlike him or her.

Roscow's second criticism, as mentioned earlier, is that complementary theory does not offer any guidelines to predict which needs a specific individual might find complementary. This study addresses Roscow's second criticism by arguing that factors facilitating romantic attraction provide a basis for determining the kind of complementary traits a person might search for in a lover. For example, those subjects who are high in adversity prior to becoming romantically involved would probably seek a lover who is practical and achievement oriented in order to assist with their adverse circumstances. Of course, prediction of complementary traits sought in the beloved by those people for whom facilitating factors play no significant role would require a different set of criteria.

Factors Facilitating Romantic Attraction and Their Relationship to Various Aspects of Passionate and Companionate Lovestyles

In the literature on romantic relationships, the most commonly made distinction is the division of love into the categories of passionate love and companionate love (Hatfield and Walster, 1978). Numerous clinical and experimental researchers have used different terms to make a similar distinction between companionate and passionate love both before and after the frequently cited Hatfield and Walster distinction. According to Hatfield and Walster (1978) and Hatfield (1988) passionate love involves three dimensions: erotic desire, idealization of the other, and when the love is not reciprocated, intense feeling of anxiety and

despair. Companionate love also involves three dimensions: emotional support, understanding, and friendship.

Fifty years prior to the Hatfield and Walster studies, Burgess (1926) distinguished between romantic love and conjugal love, whereby the latter is a reliable, emotionally stable relationship based on respect and shared responsibility rather than passion. Romantic love is sexual desire, idealization of the other, emotional dependency and occasional bouts of despair. Approximately 40 years later Knox and Sporkanski (1968) subdivided romantic love into romantic and conjugal forms where the prior form is characterized by erotic desire and idealizations, and the latter by friendship and equity.

In a moralistic vein, Maslow (1962) distinguished between passionate/romantic love and companionate love where the former was labelled "deficiency love" and the latter "being love." Maslow claims that deficiency love involves passionate emotions toward the beloved stemming from deficits in the lover's personality. "Being love" stems from the lover's appreciation of the beloved's personality. Lilar (1965) was also critical of passionate love. He referred to passionate love as unreasonable love and companionate love as reasonable love.

Driscoll, Davis, and Lipetz (1972) hypothesized a distinction between romantic love and conjugal love which also parallels Hatfield and Walster's distinction. For Driscoll et. al, romantic love involves passion, idealization, emotional dependence, feelings of absorption, and exclusiveness. Conjugal love involves trust, acceptance, respect, responsibility for the other partner's well-being,

and self-sacrifice. However, their study failed to validate the hypothesis distinguishing between romantic love and conjugal love.

Some researchers (Lee, 1977; Sternberg, 1988) began taking a multi-dimensional approach to describing love, but these dimensions often parallel the sub-dimensions that Hatfield and Walster argued constitute passionate and companionate love.

Lee (1977) argued that there are six different components of love: erotic love, manic love, game-playing love, friendship love, altruistic love, and pragmatic love. Passionate love involves the erotic and manic dimensions. Companionate love involves the friendship, altruistic, and pragmatic dimensions. In a similar vein, Sternberg (1988) suggested that love has three components: passion, intimacy, and commitment. He perceived passionate love as emphasizing passion and intimacy, while companionate love emphasizes intimacy and commitment/compassion. Both Lee and Sternberg argued that love is best represented by a profile of the numerous dimensions involved in both passionate and companionate love. Many love relationships demonstrate elements of both companionate love and passionate love. A strict division of love into two categories might pigeonhole relationships into an unnecessary and imprecise description.

This study will assess relationships in terms of the six characteristics that Hatfield and Walster (1978) argue are contained in the constructs of passionate love and companionate love rather than simply labelling them passionate and companionate love. Different styles of loving will be assessed by a questionnaire consisting of a combination of six different subscales which represent dimensions of

passionate and companionate love as described by Hatfield and Walster (1978). Passionate love will be represented by eros (Appendix E) and mania (Appendix F) scales taken from the work of Hendricks and Hendricks (1986) derived from Lee's (1977) study on lovestyles. A scale for idealization was developed by the author based on the work of Hatfield and Walster. Companionate love will be represented by a caring scale (Appendix H) developed by Steck, Levithan, McLane, and Kelley (1982) as well as a communicative intimacy (Appendix I) scale developed by Critelli, Myers and Loos (1986) and a friendship (Appendix J) scale developed by Hendricks and Hendricks (1986).

Hypotheses

The first hypothesis presented in this study postulates the emergence of four factors facilitating romantic attraction representing relief from adversity, self-expansion, sexual desire, and aging fears and social expectations. Subjects who report an intensification on any of these four facilitating factors are expected to report more "manic" passionate lovestyle behavior than those who did not report any intensification. Other hypotheses about lovestyles concern differences on caring behavior and erotic behavior involving those subjects experiencing an intensification of relief from adversity and sexual desire, respectively.

Hypotheses regarding descriptions of the type of lover chosen by subjects influenced by specific facilitating factors will be made. Subjects who reported an intensification on any of the facilitating factors are expected to perceive their lover as less neurotic and more achievement oriented than themselves. Subjects

influenced by desires for self-expansion are expected to additionally report their lovers as less nurturing and emotionally receptive than themselves.

Hypotheses will be made predicting differences between subjects reporting an intensification on facilitating factors and those who did not experience intensification on facilitating factors on various dimensions of reported subsequent relationship satisfaction. In the last two sections, hypotheses regarding age and gender differences on facilitating factors, lovestyles, and relationship satisfaction will be made.

Hypotheses Regarding Facilitating Factors

Hypothesis 1 predicts that the factor analysis involving items referring to conditions which facilitate romantic attraction are expected to yield four main factors: (a) relief from adversity, (b) desire for self-expansion, (c) sexual desire, and (d) aging fears and social expectations.

Hypothesis 2 predicts that subjects who score high on relief from adversity will show significantly higher scores on the "manic" dimension of passionate lovestyles.

Subjects will be placed in the "high" group for adversity and the other facilitating factors if their mean score for the relevant factor indicates that these states were present in a greater intensity than usual prior to becoming romantically involved. The remaining subjects will be divided into two groups: a middle group whose scores indicate that the factor was no more relevant than usual, and a low group whose scores indicate that the factor was less relevant than usual. People who form romantic relationships under adverse conditions are expected to be more

inclined to experience the excessive preoccupation and distress represented by the "mania" lovestyle dimension since threat of loss or actual loss of the beloved involves the additional loss of a source of compensation or a diversion from unpleasant feelings.

Hypothesis 3 predicts that subjects in the high desire for self-expansion group will score higher on the "mania" dimensions of lovestyle. Hypothesis 4 is the prediction that the high group on sexual desire will score high on the "mania" dimension of lovestyle. This may occur when these subjects experience a loss or threat of loss in a relationship, they fear not only the loss of the relationship but the additional loss of an outlet for sexual desire which was initially more intense than usual for the subject.

Hypothesis 5 predicts that subjects in the high group on aging fears and social expectations will score significantly higher on the mania/need dimension of lovestyle. These subjects are more likely to experience excessive preoccupation with the beloved and excessive distress at the threat of loss and/or actual loss of the relationship because the relationship serves as a possible answer to aging fears or social expectations.

Hypothesis 6 predicts that subjects in the high adversity group will score significantly higher on the caring dimension of lovestyle than those subjects in the low adversity group. Subjects who start a relationship facilitated by escape from adversity are more likely to emphasize the caring aspects of a relationship since such interactions would provide relief from the adversity which might have been a major motivator in beginning the relationship.

Hypothesis 7 predicts that subjects in the high sexual desire group will score higher on the erotic lovestyle dimension. Subjects in the high group on sexual desire are more likely to score higher on the erotic dimension since sexual interactions are a chief initiator of the relationship.

Hypotheses Regarding Subsequent Relationship Satisfaction

Maslow (1962) and Dion and Dion (1973) argued that the more intensely a lover needs a partner, the greater the strain that exists in the relationship. Romantic involvements facilitated by strong adverse feelings may make the person more demanding and require more attention and effort on the behalf of the partner. This puts an additional strain on the relationship especially in relation to those interactions in which the person feels the most needy. For example, a subject who is experiencing a career crisis may make excessive demands on the lover to assist in resolving the source of stress. In turn, not only is the relationship likely to be strained by these demands but also the person may hold unrealistic expectations about how much support, organization, and general assistance with the crisis the lover can provide. Thus, Hypothesis 8 predicts that those subjects who score high on the relief from adversity facilitating factor will report less subsequent satisfaction with the instrumental dimensions of the relationship. Subjects who are in the high group for adversity will report family, school, and career crises as more intense in their life than usual. Consequently, these subjects will demand and expect more practical assistance from the lover in order to be as satisfied with the instrumental dimension of the relationship as a subject low in adversity.

Hypothesis 9 predicts that the high group on relief from adversity facilitating factor will report less subsequent satisfaction on the affection dimension of the relationship. Subjects who are in the high group for the escape from adversity factor were experiencing distressed emotional states (e.g., depression, loneliness, etc.) which serve as motivators to seek and perhaps make unreasonable and inordinate demands for affection.

Hypothesis 10 predicts that subjects in the high group on the desire for self-expansion facilitating factor will report less subsequent satisfaction on the companionship dimension of relationship satisfaction. These subjects are attracted to their partners in order to discover or expand their sense of self. Since the lover is seen as an access to a new identity, expectations about the shared activities with this lover are bound to be quite high. The lover must not only provide the subject with companionship but also assist in revising their identity.

Hypothesis 11 predicts that subjects who are high on the facilitating factor of aging fears and social expectations will report less subsequent satisfaction on the instrumental dimension of the relationship. These subjects' relationships are facilitated by the pressure to meet social expectations, the fear of a ticking biological clock, and the person's perception that as time elapses initiating a relationship and the subsequent relationship become more difficult and less rewarding.

Hypothesis 12 predicts that those subjects who are in the high group on the facilitating factor of sexual desire will experience less subsequent satisfaction on the instrumental dimension of the relationship. The rationale for hypothesis 12 is that

subjects beginning relationships whose primary motivator is sexual desires will focus their attention and effort on consummating sexual desires and are more likely to neglect the practicalities of everyday life and career, finances, and school performance. Thus, sexual desire as a facilitating factor for initiating relationships also produces a strain on the relationship because the person's emphasis on sexual gratification results in the neglect of the practical aspects of everyday life. Gratifying sexual desire may not conflict with the affection/expressive or companionship dimensions of the relationship, since consummating sexual desire can be a way of gratifying needs for expression of affection and companionship.

Hypotheses Regarding Revising Complementarity Theory and Perception of Lover

This study attempts to revise complementarity theory by offering two possible solutions to the criticism of Reik and Winch concerning complementarity theory's lack of specificity in predicting which traits a lover will seek in the beloved. First, that motivators which facilitate romantic relationships may serve as some type of predictors of the specific type of traits found complementary in the beloved. Hypothesis 13 predicts that subjects who are high on any of the facilitating factors are expected to rate their lovers as less neurotic than themselves. Hypothesis 14 predicts that subjects high on any of the facilitating factors will rate their lovers as less achievement oriented than themselves.

Subjects in the high groups for three of the four facilitating factors (relief from adversity, aging fears and social expectations, and sexual desire) are expected to rate their lovers as similar to themselves on the dimension of emotional

temperament relating to succorance. The lover's search for complementary traits might begin with a filtering process whereby prospective partners are selected as lovers if they are perceived as having a similar emotional temperament concerning traits related to succorance such as sympathy, tolerance, and a lack of aggression.

However, subjects in the high group on the facilitating factor of desire for self-expansion are not looking for relief in areas related to undesirable circumstances and conditions, but rather are attempting to change their identity. Thus, they do not seek lovers who are nurturing, but lovers who represent their unattained ideals and goals. These ideals will be an emotional inhibition or coolness that the subjects lacks, and the ability to manipulate and achieve. Hypothesis 15 predicts that subjects in the high group on expansion will rate their lovers as less sympathetic and succorant than themselves.

Hypotheses Regarding Gender Differences

Hypothesis 16 predicts that females will score higher on the facilitating factor of desire for self-expansion. Socialization and traditional social attitudes stress that marriage and family are prerequisites for self-fulfillment in women. Thus, women may look at romantic involvement as a source of self-discovery.

Hypothesis 17 predicts that females will score higher on the facilitating factor of aging fears and social expectations. As mentioned earlier, females experience more pressure of a "biological clock" because their reproductive capabilities and perceived attractiveness decrease more rapidly with time.

Hypothesis 18 predicts that males will score higher than females on the facilitating factor of sexual desire. Roscoe, Diana, and Brooks (1987) found that

adolescent males more often cited sexual activity as the main reason for initiating romantic relationships than did women of the same age. Further, males are awarded an increase in status by other males by reporting participation in sexual activity. Wilson (1979) and Buss (1987) argued that males are more sexually preoccupied than women and desire more sexual partners. In turn, women are less sexually preoccupied because promiscuity makes them less desirable as a possible parent and, in turn, less likely to receive economic resources from males.

Hypothesis 19 predicts that women will score higher than males on the lovestyle dimension of mania. Women are more likely to experience excessive preoccupation and distress when disappointed in the relationship because of social constraints which force women to need romantic involvements more than men. Women are under pressure to marry earlier than males and are socialized to regard marriage as a prerequisite to self-fulfillment and identity. Thus, if the relationship fails, women then experience not only the loss of the relationship, but have failed to meet social expectations about their role. They have also lost valuable time in relation to an ever ticking "biological clock."

Hypothesis 20 is that women will report less subsequent satisfaction in the affection dimension of the relationship. Hypothesis 21 predicts that women will report less subsequent satisfaction on the companionship dimension than males. Males adhering to traditional sex roles are less emotionally expressive and therefore less likely to satisfy the intimate and companionate needs of their partners. Numerous studies (Hatfield, 1982; Rubin, Hill, Peplau and Dunkel-Schetter (1980) note women's dissatisfactions with the companionate dimension of the relationship

emphasizing male's being more task or activity oriented while women place a greater emphasis on discussing emotions or perceptions of significant others.

Hypothesis Regarding Age Differences

Hypothesis 22 predicts that the older group (ages 25 to 35) will be more likely to begin relationships because of aging fears and social concerns. Hypothesis 23 predicts that the younger group will be more likely to have relationships facilitated by the desire for self-expansion. As both males and females in our society grow older there is an increased pressure to become involved in a romantic relationship. For persons between 17 and 21, social expectations to marry are considerably less intense than for the 25 to 35 group. Thus, romantic involvement for the younger group is probably seen as less marriage oriented and more a process of discovery of self, love, and the kind of lovers and love relationships available.

Hypothesis 24 predicts that the younger group is more "manic" in lovestyle than the older group. Since the younger groups has less experience in relationships than the older group, they are probably more likely to experience distress over possible sources of rejection.

Hypothesis 25 predicts that older males and younger females are likely to be the most satisfied with the instrumental dimension of the subsequent relationship. According to socio-biological theory, men with financial resources and women who match the cultural ideals of physical beauty are the most desirable groups in the mate selection market. Men over 25 are much more likely to accumulate economic resources than those under 21. Similarly, younger women are often valued as more physically attractive than older women. Younger males may view romance as

disruptive to career development and progression. Older women on the other hand, may be threatened by the ticking of the biological clock and will probably be more concerned with and be more demanding about having wants and needs related to the instrumental dimension of the relationship gratified. As noted earlier, need results in strain on a relationship which effects levels of satisfaction.

Method

Subjects

Two hundred and sixty-five students from introductory political science, psychology, and sociology classes at a large publicly supported urban university served as subjects. Respondents who never had been in love or were not strictly heterosexual were excluded from the analyses. The remaining subjects were 129 females and 61 males. Sixty-four percent were under 25 and 36% were over 25. Four percent of the subjects reported themselves as Asian, 19% as Black, 18% as Hispanic, 53% as Caucasian, and 5.3% as other.

Materials

The Romantic Attraction Questionnaire (Appendix L) is composed of several instruments used to measure: 1) factors which facilitate romantic attraction, 2) passionate and companionate lovestyles, 3) subsequent relationship satisfaction, 4) social desirability, 5) self, parental and romantic partner ratings on bi-polar personality traits, 6) length of relationship and likelihood of reinvolvement, 7) demographics, and 8) parents marital history.

Factors which facilitate romantic attraction are measured by items 11 to 41. Subjects responded to each statement that measured the degree of intensity that the

items were then present in their life on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from: (1) much more true than usual, (2) somewhat more true than usual, (3) no more true than usual, (4) somewhat less true than usual, and (5) not true.

Dimensions of passionate and companionate lovestyles, and pragmatism are measured by items 42 through 103. These items are rated on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly agree, (2) slightly agree, (3) slightly disagree to, (4) strongly disagree. Dimensions of passionate love are represented by the eros (Appendix E) and mania (Appendix F) scales derived from the works of Hendricks and Hendricks (1986). Dimensions of companionate love are represented by caring (Appendix H) scale developed by Steck, Levitan, McLane and Kelley (1982), communicative intimacy developed by Critelli, Meyers, Loos (1986), and friendship (Appendix J) scale, and pragmatism (Appendix K) derived from the work of Hendricks and Hendricks.

Subsequent relationship satisfaction was assessed using 20 items (Items 104 through 123) developed by the author from the literature and rated on a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly agree to (4) strongly disagree. These items are positively and negatively worded to limit the effect of response sets.

Social desirability was measured using items 128, 131, 134, 140, 143, 146, and 149 were taken from the Crowne and Marlowe (1964) scale. These items are coded both positively and negatively to limit the effect of response sets. In addition, 12 filler statements are used to mask the experimenter's attempt to measure social desirability.

Personal trait ratings consisted of a series of 14 bi-polar adjectives (Items 152 to 207) rated on a four-point bi-polar scale as they apply to the self, the subject's parents, and the person the subject has been the most romantically involved with. These items were taken from the work of Taylor, Morrison, Morrison, & Rosmoser (1968) and DeRiveria (1984) on emotional relationships.

Items assessing quality or length of the love relationship (items 1 to 10), likelihood of reinvolvement (items 224 and 225), demographics (items 208 to 212) and parents' marital history (items 213 to 223) were developed by this author.

Procedure

This study analyzed the reports of adult heterosexual subjects who were responding in terms of what they consider to be the most important romantic relationship that has occurred in their life. Subjects were asked to recall whether they were in love during this romantic relationship. However, since the meaning of love greatly varies from individual to individual and there is no way to empirically assess whether or not someone is in love, these relationships will be referred to as the subject's most important romantic relationship. Subjects were instructed to respond to all items as they apply to the specific relationship that the subject deemed their most important. Thus, the subject's answers to all the items were in relation to this particularly significant relationship rather than to other romantic relationships that also might have occurred in his/her life.

The sections involving factors which facilitate romantic attraction contained additional instructions which are relevant to the assessment of the hypotheses under study. Subjects were instructed both in writing and verbally by the administrator to

respond to the items as they applied to their life just before becoming romantically involved.

Subjects whose mean score indicated that prior to falling in love a particular factor was present "somewhat more than usual" in their lives were placed in the high group. Those subjects whose mean score indicated that prior to falling in love a particular factor was present "somewhat less than usual" were placed in the medium group. Those subjects whose mean score indicated that prior to falling in love a particular factor was not at all present in their lives were placed in the low group. This method of assignment of subjects into high, medium, and low groups was employed on each of the four scales of facilitating factors.

Results

Factor Analysis: Factors Facilitating Romantic Attraction

Thirty items representing internal states and conditions that might facilitate romantic attraction were submitted to a maximum likelihood factor analysis with a varimax rotation extracting four factors as predicted by Hypothesis 1.

The resulting four factors accounted for 38.6% of the variance. The first factor was called aging fears and social expectations and accounted for 26.5% of variance. The second factor was called relief from adversity and accounted for 4.6% of the variance. The third factor was called desire for self-expansion and accounted for 4.5% of the variance. The fourth factor was called sexual desire and accounted for 3.0% of the variance. The internal consistency for aging fears and social expectations, relief from adversity, desire for self-expansion, and sexual desire

respectively were; .84, .80, .71, and .76. Items constituting these factors and their internal consistency are presented in Table 1

The percentage of subjects who experienced an intensification of any of the facilitating factors prior to falling in love are presented in Table 2. Also, the correlation between each of the facilitating factors and social desirability is presented in Table 3 and Table 4.

Factor Analysis: Subsequent Relationship Satisfaction

The 23 items representing dimensions of subsequent relationship satisfaction were submitted to a principal component factor analysis varimax rotation instead of a maximum-likelihood since prior work suggested these dimension were orthogal (Safilios-Rothschild, 1976). The three factors were extracted and accounted for 40.3% of the variance. Factor 1 was called affection and accounted for 26.3% of the variance. The second factor was called companionship and accounted for 7.3% of the variance. The third factor was called instrumentality and accounted for 6.7% of the variance. Items comprising these factors are listed in Table 5. Each of the three factors were assessed for internal consistency. The alpha coefficients for affection, companionship, and instrumentality respectively were; .74, .72, and .71.

Factor Analysis: Self-Ratings on Personality Traits

Fourteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives rated in terms of self were subjected to a maximum likelihood factor analysis with a varimax rotation limiting the factors to three. The first factor to emerge was called passivity and succorance and accounted for 12.5% of the variance. The second factor to emerge was called achievement and accounted for 10.6% of the variance. The third factor to emerge was called

neuroticism and accounted for 4.8% of the variance. The items constituting these factors are represented in Table 6.

The standardized alpha coefficients for emotional passivity and succorance, achievement, and neuroticism are as follows: .62, .55, and .54.

Reliability: Love Styles Scales

These scales measuring style of interactions within a romantic relationship were assessed for internal consistency for the subject population using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. Used in this study, Hendricks and Hendricks' (1986) scales measuring Lee's descriptions of "erotic" and "manic" lovestyle actions respectively were assessed at .71 and .69. The internal consistency of the Steck, Levitan, McLane, and Kelley (1982) scale measuring "caring" interactions was assessed at .90. Only the erotic, manic, and caring scales were used in the various hypotheses of this study. However, an exploratory analysis was conducted on scales relating to respect and communicative intimacy dimensions by Critelli, Myer, and Loos (1986) and pragmatic and friendship love by Hendricks and Hendricks (1986). The internal consistency of the respect/communicative intimacy scale, pragmatic scale, and friendship scale respectively were assessed at; .87, .71 and .75.

Hypotheses: The Relationship Between Factors Facilitating Romantic Attraction and Various Lovestyles

A repeated measure multivariate analysis of variance was performed to assess significant differences between the high, medium, and low groups on all the hypotheses involving facilitating factors and measures of lovestyles and relationship satisfaction. Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, and 5 were confirmed, predicting that high groups

on each of the four facilitating factors would report more "mania" during the relationship. Levels of significance and descriptive statistics for hypotheses 2 through 5 are presented in Table 7.

Hypothesis 6, predicting that subjects high on adversity would score higher (indicated by a lower mean) on the caring dimensions ($M=1.5$) of relationship style than the low group ($M=1.6$) showed a tendency toward significance at $F(1, 124)=3.2$, $p=.1$. Hypothesis 7, predicting that subjects in the high group on the facilitating factor on sexual desire would score higher on the erotic dimension of lovestyles was not confirmed.

Hypotheses: Subsequent Relationship Satisfaction

Hypothesis 8, predicting that those subjects who score high on the relief from adversity factor will report less subsequent satisfaction ($M=2.3$) than the low group ($M=1.9$) on the instrumental dimension of the relationship was confirmed: $F(1, 124)=9.1$, $p<.001$. Hypothesis 9, predicting that subjects in the high group for relief from adversity would report less subsequent satisfaction with the affection dimension ($M=2.4$) of the relationship than the low group ($M=2.0$) showed a tendency toward significance $F(1,124)=3.9$, $p=.09$. Hypothesis 10, predicting that subjects in the high group on desire for self-expansion would experience less satisfaction on the companionship dimension of the subsequent relationship than the low group was not confirmed. Hypotheses 11 and 12, predicting that subjects in the high groups for aging fears and social expectations and for sexual desire would report less subsequent satisfaction on the instrumental dimension of the relationship was not confirmed.

Hypotheses: Gender Differences

Hypothesis 16, predicting that females would score higher on the facilitating factor of desires for self-expansion than males was confirmed. Hypothesis 17, predicting that females would report more pressure to begin a relationship due to aging fears and social expectations than males was also confirmed. Hypothesis 18, predicting that males are more likely to have their most important romantic relationship facilitated by sexual desire than females was also confirmed.

Hypothesis 19, predicting that females would score higher on the "mania" lovestyle dimension than males was also confirmed. Hypothesis 20, predicting that women would report less subsequent satisfaction on the affection dimension of the relationship was not confirmed. Hypothesis 21, predicting that men would report more subsequent satisfaction with the companionship dimension of the relationship was confirmed. Levels of significance and descriptive statistics for hypotheses 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21 are presented in Table 8.

Hypotheses: Age Differences

Hypothesis 22, predicting that the older group is more likely to have relationships facilitated by aging fears and social expectations than the younger group was confirmed. Hypothesis 23, predicting that the younger group is more likely to have relationships facilitated by self-expansion than the older group was confirmed. Hypothesis 24, predicting that older males and younger females would report the more satisfaction with the instrumental dimension of the relationship was not confirmed.

Hypotheses: Complementarity Theory

Hypothesis 13 predicted that subjects who are high on the factors facilitating romantic attraction would rate will perceive their lovers as less neurotic than themselves. Hypothesis 13 was confirmed on three of the four facilitating factors with the exception of aging fears and social expectations. A matched pairs t-test revealed that subjects in the high group on relief from adversity perceived themselves as more neurotic ($\underline{M}=2.2$) than their lovers ($\underline{M}=2.79$), $t(38)=9.2$, $p < .01$. The subjects in the high group on desire for self-expansion perceived themselves as more neurotic ($M=2.6$) than their lovers ($\underline{M}=2.9$), $t(3.0)=2.6$ $p < .01$. The subjects in the high group on sexual desire perceived themselves as more neurotic ($\underline{M}=2.7$) than their lovers ($\underline{M}=3.0$), $t(47)=9.1$, $p < .01$.

Hypothesis 14, predicting that those subjects in the high group on all the facilitating factors would rate their lovers as significantly more achievement oriented than themselves was not confirmed.

Hypothesis 15 predicted that in contrast to the other three facilitators of romantic relationships, those subjects in the high group on expansion will perceive their lovers as having less passivity and succorance than themselves. Hypothesis 15 was confirmed with subjects in the high group on expansion reporting more passivity and succorance for themselves ($\underline{M}=2.3$) than they attributed to their lovers ($\underline{M}=2.1$), $t(94)=2.2$, $p < .05$.

A further exploratory analysis involved correlations between each of the factors facilitating romantic attraction and ratings of self and lover on the bi-polar adjectives pertaining to personality traits. Falling in love because of an increase in

adversity was significantly correlated with the self being perceived as nervous, depressive, not socially outgoing, hostile, a low achiever, and impractical. Although with lower correlations, the lover was reported as being perceived in terms of similar adjectives: depressive, not socially outgoing, submissive, a low achiever, impractical, timid, dependent and unambitious.

Falling in love because of an increase in aging fears and social expectation significantly correlated with the self being perceived as depressive, not socially outgoing, emotionally inhibited, and a low achiever. Although with lower correlations, the lover was reported in terms of similar adjectives: depressive, submissive, timid and dependent. Falling in love because of an increase in sexual desire was significantly correlated with perceiving the self as depressive, emotionally inhibited, submissive, and (with the highest correlation) impractical. The lover was reported as being perceived in terms of similar adjectives: depressive, submissive, low achiever, impractical, and dependent.

Falling in love, facilitated by a increase in the desire for self-expansion, was significantly correlated with the self perceived as nervous, depressed, not socially outgoing, submissive, timid, unambitious, self disciplined, tolerant, and sympathetic. Unlike the other three facilitating factors, for expansive subjects the lover was reported as perceived as dissimilar to the subject. Expansion significantly correlated with the lovers being perceived as impulsive, high achievers, practical, aggressive, and ambitious. Correlations for each facilitating factor and perception of lover and self are presented in Table 10.

Racial Differences

A repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted in order to test for racial differences on all four of the attraction facilitating factors, the three levels of subsequent relationship satisfaction, and lovestyles such as caring, communicative intimacy, mania, and erotic interactions. Two significant differences were found. Blacks reported less caring behavior and less "manic" symptoms than Asians, Hispanics, and Caucasians at $p < .01$ level.

Currently/Not Currently Involved

A discriminant analysis was conducted in order to explore differences between those subjects who reported currently being involved in the most important romantic relationship of their lives and those no longer involved on the four facilitating factors, the three levels of subsequent relationship satisfaction, all the lovestyles, and social desirability.

Those subjects who were currently in love reported more satisfaction on all three dimensions of relationship satisfaction at $p < .01$ level. Subjects who were currently in love also showed a tendency approaching significance to report more social desirability at $p = .06$ level.

Those subjects who are currently in love also reported more caring, communicative intimacy and erotic behavior than those no longer involved in this most important romantic relationship at $p < .01$ level. However, no significant differences were reported on the lovestyles dimensions of mania, pragmatism and friendship.

Those subjects who reported being currently in love showed a tendency approaching significance to report less desire for self-expansion than those not currently involved at $p = .06$ level and less aging fears and social expectations at $p = .09$ level. Those subjects who are currently in love did not differ on the facilitating factor relief from adversity from those who report no longer being involved in their most important romantic relationships.

Discussion

Facilitators of Romantic Attraction and Complementarity of Personality

The facilitating factors of romantic attraction and relationships as depicted in both the experimental and clinical literature were represented by four internally consistent scales; relief from adversity, aging fears and social expectations, sexual desire, and desire for self-expansion. Each of these factors, with the arguable exception of desire for self-expansion, represent some type of distress as a facilitator in initiating the relationship. Relief from adversity, aging fears and social expectations, and sexual desire each contain items that indicate either internal tension such as depression, unfulfilled sexual desire, loneliness, boredom, or external demands such as having children before the biological clock expires or social expectations to be romantically involved. These three scales show moderate correlations with each other and negative correlations with social desirability. Expansion, in contrast to the other three factors, shows no correlation with social desirability and, although significantly correlated with the other factors, is only correlated with the other three factors at the .3 level.

The factor of desire for self-expansion is probably a combination of various motivations: ambition, alleviation of distress, and the desire to change characterological aspects of the self. Unfortunately, when a maximum likelihood factor analysis with varimax rotations was done only two items loaded on this factor. These items demonstrated internal consistency but provided only marginal assistance in specifying what exactly is meant by a desire for self-expansion. The form of expansion of self may vary from individual to individual with some forms viewed as healthy and others as psychopathological and/or opportunistic. Murstein (1988) suggests that falling in love triggered by a complementary attraction may stem from the subject's characterological deficits or a pathological lack of a sense of self. Eriksonian theorists (e.g., Erikson, 1968; Marica, 1966) might argue that striving for self-expansion in love cannot be solely categorized as psychopathology but is part of a maturation process where intimacy and interpersonal issues are "worked through" in the romantic relationship and crucial choices about identity are made. Thus, a person might fall in love with someone to discover and choose aspects of the beloved that he/she will develop as his/her own or reject. Also, the development of an intimate sexual relationship is seen as both expansive and psychologically healthy, something that is seen more as a sign of ego strength than ego weakness. Aron and Aron (1986) argued that self-expansion in romantic attraction might stem from various types of ambition such as career advancement or intellectual or artistic development, and therefore, represent a completion of self primarily based on ambition and the desire for economic, personal, or professional

advancement rather than necessarily comfort in release from adversity or psychopathology.

There is probably an element of desire for self-expansion in the other facilitating factors. A person starting a relationship to procreate and raise children may well be trying to expand self-concept. A person who begins a relationship to have regular and steady sex might feel this is a form of self-expansion where sexual aspects of the self are now being actualized. In turn, the nervous, timid person who falls in love with the self-assured confident person is both seeking those enviable qualities as well as the decrease in distress which possessing those desired qualities would provide. Expansion is related to the other factors but it is both factorially and conceptually distinguishable. In expansion, the desire to alter self-concept is primary. In the other facilitating factors, the relief from internal distress and/or external situations is primary and changes in self-concept are secondary.

The type of lover chosen by subjects influenced by aging fears and social expectations, relief from adversity, and sexual desire are perceived as similar to themselves in psychological traits such as nervous, depressed, introverted, timid, sympathetic, and tolerant. Their lovers are seen as less neurotic than themselves but similar in emotional temperament related to succorance. Those subjects who initiated a relationship because of aging fears and social expectations, relief from adversity, or sexual desire are probably seeking comfort in someone psychologically similar. These subjects are experiencing an intensification of distress, and therefore, would probably find the challenge of a lover who they perceived as psychologically dissimilar to be more anxiety-provoking than comforting.

Subjects influenced by desire for self-expansion perceived their lovers as possessing traits which are opposite to their perception of themselves. These subjects perceive themselves as self-disciplined, timid, unambitious, and low achievers while their lovers are perceived in contrasting traits such as impulsive, aggressive, ambitious, and high achievers. Those subjects influenced by the other three facilitating factors perceive their lovers in similar terms as themselves. Thus, lovers chosen by subjects desiring self-expansion are not only perceived as different from themselves, but are reported to have qualities quite unlike those subjects influenced by other facilitating factors.

For the subject influenced by desired self-expansion, their lover does not have qualities which assuage painful feelings, but rather, possesses contrasting characteristics that the subject feels he/she lacks. The intensification of the desire for self-expansion prior to romantic involvement may result in the choice of a lover who is complementary in the classic sense of seeking an opposite as described by Reik (1949) and Winch (1967). These subjects fall in love with someone who possesses the traits that they lack and by being romantically involved with them hope to possess these traits, if only vicariously. Reik (1949) writes of the self-expansive lover: "show me who you love, and I'll tell you who you are and more importantly who you want to be." (p. 100).

The role of desired self-expansion in romantic attraction as reported in this study may assist in operationalizing Reik's prediction and help specify complementarity theory. This study evidenced a certain pattern among subjects desiring self-expansion that if they perceived themselves as self-disciplined, timid,

and unambitious, their lovers were seen as having complementary traits such as impulsivity, aggression, and ambition. However, subjects with similar traits to the self expansive subjects, who experienced an intensity in distress chose lovers with a similar emotional temperament to themselves. This study found that an intensification in the desire for self-expansion resulting in complementary attractions are relevant to approximately one-third of the subjects.

"Mania" and Other Lovestyles

Subjects who reported an intensification of any of the attraction facilitating factors prior to becoming romantically involved reported more emotional/physical distress or in Lee's terms "manic symptoms," during the relationship than those subjects who did not experience an intensification or for that matter any presence at all of the facilitating factors prior to becoming romantically involved. Lee described the lover's experience of "mania" as consisting of an obsessive intense preoccupation with the beloved, disproportionate distress with minor conflicts or brief separations, unwarranted distrust of the beloved's sincerity or fidelity, and emotional distress resulting in psychosomatic symptoms such as insomnia, stomach trouble, and dizziness. This emotional/physical malaise may culminate at the end of the relationship when separation is imminent in thoughts of hopelessness and suicidal ideation, and feelings of being an empty, worthless shell without the beloved. All subjects influenced by any of the facilitating factors need not necessarily experience the extreme manic symptoms but they are more likely to experience manic symptoms than do those not influenced by the facilitating factors.

Subjects who reported an intensity of any of the attraction facilitating factors prior to becoming romantically involved are more vulnerable to "mania" because they bring additional needs to the relationship. Consequently, in the case of subjects whose relationships are facilitated by aging fears and social expectations, relief from adversity, and sexual desire, obstacles in the relationship as well as threat of loss of the relationship involve not just the loss of love, but an additional loss of a source of comfort apart from love. For those subjects experiencing an intensification of desire for self-expansion the failure of the relationship means a loss of a vehicle for self-discovery and identity formation as well as a loss of love.

For subjects influenced by any of the facilitating factors the loss of a relationship is not just the loss of a relationship per se, but also is the loss of additional functions that the lover would have provided and had been sought out by the subject. These findings support Reik's contention that extreme behavior in romantic relationships resembling manic like symptoms stems from a complete lack of confidence in one's ability to resolve crises or succeed at challenges. The person's choice of a lover to resolve crises or to expand identity may result in increased dependency on the beloved and reduced confidence and self-assurance. As long as the relationship meets the subject's auxiliary needs he/she becomes more dependent. Thus, accurate or inaccurate perception of signals that the relationship is deteriorating causes the subject extreme distress. The elements of extreme dependency and the painful withdrawn characteristics of the "manic" lovestyle led Peele (1975) to describe the manic experience as addictive and she compares such love to heroin dependency.

Relationships influenced by any of the attraction facilitating factors with the exception of relief from adversity seem to be characterized by only an increase in affective lability. Subjects experiencing an intensification of three of the four facilitating factors: aging fears and social expectations, desire for self-expansion, and sexual desire reported no significant differences on interactions during the relationship involving erotic behavior, caring, or communicative intimacy compared with those not affected by nor experiencing an intensification of any of these facilitating factors. While the relationship is progressing or at least, stabilized, the subject may be having the needs which facilitated the relationship gratified. In turn, subjects influenced by facilitating factors would be concerned with providing those rewards for their partners which the latter would come to expect from any relations. Also, the person influenced by facilitating factors who is also more vulnerable to manic symptoms may be making a deliberate effort to establish and maintain communicative intimacy, caring, and erotic interactions in order to provide a sense of security within the relationship. This security would be desperately desired by someone who so readily experiences intense emotional/physical discomfort at the threat of separation.

Subjects who experienced an intensification in adversity prior to becoming romantically involved reported less subsequent satisfaction on the instrumental dimension of the relationship than those not experiencing an intensification of adversity. For those subjects in the high group on relief from adversity, their romantic relationship seemed to interfere with the practical aspects of living, their financial situations, and school and career development. The subjects influenced by

relief from adversity perceived themselves and their lovers as similarly lacking in traits that assist with practical matters and career advancement. The added strain of an intensification in adverse feelings as well as the demands of a romantic relationship probably detract both time and effort from an area in life where psychologically the subject was poorly equipped to cope. Furthermore, these subjects tended to choose a lover who is psychologically similar. These lovers may want to help each other on the instrumental dimensions of life but lack the needed psychological resources.

This study also showed a tendency approaching significance for those subjects experiencing an intensity in adversity to report more caring interactions in their relationship. If a larger sample of subjects whose relationships were facilitated by relief from adversity had been obtained it may have resulted in the difference between groups reaching significance. Since caring interactions often lessen depression and loneliness, lovers experiencing an intensification of adverse feelings may be more emphatic about these kinds of interactions in a romantic relationship. An intensity or exchange of caring behavior has the additional advantage of heightening the subject's sense of security. This supplements an earlier point that subjects influenced by any facilitating factor are at least equal in activities essential to romantic relationships such as caring, communicative intimacy, or erotic behavior. Thus, the relationship is maintained and protected against profound emotional and physical distress that may be brought about by conflicts within the relationship, brief separations, or actual or perceived threats to the relationship.

Gender Differences and Facilitating Factors

The study found that men and women are more likely to have the most important romantic relationship of their life facilitated by different motivators. This finding suggests that sex roles, traditional socialization, economic disparity, and conservative attitudes about female sexuality still have an impact on the different conditions which facilitate romantic attraction for both genders. The persistent influence created by the above-mentioned conditions is evidenced in gender differences on three of the four facilitating factors. Women reported more often experiencing an intensification of desire for self-expansion as well as an intensification of aging fears and social expectations while men more often reported an intensification in sexual desire.

Women's greater propensity to fall love when experiencing an intensification of desire for self-expansion suggests that romantic involvements are still more often perceived as a source of self-discovery and identity formation for women than for men. Women probably have a better picture of what romantic relationships can provide in terms of identity formation than men do. Women have been consistently shown to be less idealistic and more pragmatic about love than men (Dion and Dion, 1973). Also, women are more likely to end the relationship than men. Women's realism about the romantic involvement may suggest that the process of expansion is directed at a certain type of relationship: one involving a substantial degree of emotional commitment (i.e., marriage). Studies by (Kephart, 1967; Paterson & Pettijohn, 1982), found that women were more marriage directed,

married younger, and were more likely to perceive marriage as a resolution of identity choices faced by people in their twenties.

Women's valuing romantic involvements as a source of identity fulfillment may be attributed to their economic dependence on men. Recent social changes making career opportunities more accessible and changing attitudes making it more acceptable for women to pursue careers have not been as extensive or perhaps as persuasive as needed to reverse the reliance of women on romantic involvement as a source of economic security.

Women receive mixed messages about how involved they should become in careers. Also, women still have more difficult or limited access to certain careers and often are paid less for the same job. Since political and societal changes have yet to provide an egalitarian workplace, women are slower to abandon the traditional role of seeking economic security through romantic involvement. Women were more likely to begin the most important relationship of their life after experiencing an intensification of aging fears and social expectations. Females who realistically are limited in their childbearing years experience greater pressures to begin a romantic relationship than men in their late twenties and thirties. Secondly, the value of females in the mate selection market decreases as they approach thirty and then even more rapidly declines after thirty. Since females usually marry men who are older and men usually marry females who are younger (Patterson & Pettijohn, 1982) the supply of partners decreases with the twenties for females, while the supply increases for males. For males the ratio of possible partners to competitors is greater as they approach thirty than at any prior time in their lives.

Consequently, as females approach thirty and become older, they may have the least favorable ratio of possible partners vs. competitors than at any time prior in their life.

The increasing pressure created by physical aging is intensified by social expectations. Unmarried women are perceived less favorably than unmarried men (Peele, 1975). Women are more likely to be perceived as having "missed the boat," as having failed on the mate selection market while men are more likely to be perceived as still having options. Women's failure to marry (or have a committed secure, monogamous romantic involvement) is viewed as an emotional, characterological disturbance. Men's failure to marry is more frequently attributed to developing a career or as "sowing wild oats" in a struggle against the settling down process which is considered normal and to a large extent even necessary. Thus, the passage of time creates a significant amount of pressure for women in three ways; limitation of child bearing years, decline in the number of potential partners, and a decline in the culturally valued type of physical attractiveness which is the first priority in mate selection on the part of many men.

Men are more likely to begin the most important relationship in their life when experiencing an intensification in sexual desire. This is an important motivator that is more likely to facilitate romantic relationships for men. Over half the men in this study reported an intensification of sexual desire prior to beginning the most important romantic relationship in their life. Finding that sexual desire plays a major role in facilitating important romantic relationships for men supports Blau's (1964) social-exchange perspective that the early stage of romantic

involvements are "bargaining processes" where women exchange sexual services for evidence from men of being committed and their being a dependable source of emotional and financial support. The "exchange" aspects of providing possible sexual services to men in order to secure future commitment from them is evidenced in the dating literature. Studies of Berscheid & Walster (1974); Huston (1969); Melton & Thomas (1976), found that for both adolescent males and females physical attractiveness was the best predictor of dating and relationship satisfaction. However, for adults in their twenties males still value physical attractiveness most in potential partners, however, females value men who demonstrate emotional and economic stability.

The supply and demand of the mate selection market is also evidenced in the different types of behaviors each group finds attractive. Buss and Barnes (1986) found that females are more frequently excited by and choose sexual partners who display economic resources such as treating on dates, gift buying, having an expensive car, and demonstrating access to substantial amounts of money. Women do not value wit and intellectual sophistication any more than men do. Men place emphasis on attractive youthful appearances, clear and smooth skin, and wearing stylish clothes. During the early courtship process men and women deliberately display distinctly different behavior sought by the other gender to be attractive and thus, increase their value on the mate selection market. Men more frequently deliberately attempt to attract a partner by displaying expensive possessions, mentioning income or earning potential, or bragging about accomplishments. Women more frequently resort to playing hard to get, spending a greater amount of

time, effort and money on enhancing appearances, and intentionally seeming more sympathetic to a man's troubles.

Fromm (1956) description of love in modern industrial societies as the exchange of economic resources for sexual gratification creating a supply-demand market for mate selection is still applicable. Males and females distort their personalities and lives in order to match the cultural stereotypes of sexual desirability and market themselves as if they were consumer goods. Engels (1884) argued that the exchange of economic resources for sexual gratification dates from before the industrial revolution back to the beginning of civilization. With the domestication of animals, tribes became less nomadic and settled into communities or villages. The domestication of animals provided a relatively reliable source of food and became with caves and huts, the next source of property. Therefore, men exchanged these sources of capital (the necessities) and their ability to defend them for sexual favors from women. Thus, a supply-demand market for mate-selection has persisted since pre-historic times and civilization with technical knowledge and psychological sophistication has done little to attenuate it.

Women reported more emotional distress and manic symptoms than men during the course of the relationship. Women's perception of romantic involvements as a source of identity formation and economic dependence results in their increased vulnerability to emotional distress in the relationship. Women entering relationships with greater needs than men means that the possible loss of the lover results in something more intense than loss of a sexual partner. Loss of the partner leads to

a loss of family economic stability, the ability to escape from the ever ticking "biological clock," as well as the ever shrinking supply of potential mates.

An exploratory analysis showed that men and women did not report any significant difference in the amount of caring behavior, communicative intimacy, erotic behavior, or friendship displayed in the relationship. Women's greater emotional distress did not interfere with either gender's display of basic lovestyle interactions during the relationship. However, women were less satisfied with the companionship behavior displayed in the relationship as predicted in hypothesis 21. Women's dissatisfaction with the companionate interactions in the relationship has been noted by Munro and Adams (1978); Traupman and Hatfield (1981) and Hatfield (1982).

Women's dissatisfaction may partly result from so-called "leisure" activities entailing more housework, because in traditional sex role orientation housekeeping is not usually shared equally. Hatfield (1982) argued that women value communication more than men, so that during leisure time women desire more sharing of intimate information and feelings while men are less expressive and more often desire a structured activity. Further, Rubin, Hill, Peplau and Dunkel-Schetter (1980) found that women are dissatisfied with the kind of information shared in relationships. Men are more likely to discuss business, politics, or mention their accomplishments. Women are more likely to prefer to discuss emotions and perceptions of significant others. Companionship activities providing additional work for the women and oriented toward men's interests suggests that males

typically exchange economic resources not only for sexual favors and domestic services but expect leisure activities to center on their own interests.

Age Differences

As predicted, this study found that older subjects (25-34) reported that the most important relationship in their life was more likely to be influenced by aging fears and social expectations than subjects in the younger group (17-21). Also, as predicted, younger subjects were more likely to be influenced by desires for self-expansion in beginning romantic relationships. This difference can probably be attributed to younger subjects, whose identities are less formed, being, as Eriksonian theorists suggest, more likely to perceive relationships as part of the maturation process and a forum to work through intimacy issues and make choices about identity and the type of lover and relationship desired. Older subjects who have had more experience with romantic involvement for longer amounts of time are, therefore, further along in the maturation process and are less likely to view relationships as self-discovery. Older subjects reported their relationships as more satisfying on the emotional and companionship dimensions than younger subjects. Also, older subjects reported more caring behavior and communicative intimacy with their partners than did younger subjects. These findings suggest that as people become more mature the amount of satisfaction expressed with relationships increases.

Limitations of This Study

Before concluding this dissertation, I will note that the data in this study were gathered exclusively from a questionnaire. Subjects might report themselves as

behaving differently than they actually did or be unaware of the real determinants of their behavior. Also, the reports of subjects should be assessed both in terms of whether they are currently involved in their most important romantic relationship and in relation to social desirability. Subjects who reported being currently involved in their most important relationship were less likely to report their relationships being facilitated by three of the four facilitating factors. This difference may be attributed to a combination of an intensification of needs and response style. Surplus needs brought to a relationship might result in additional strain that contributes to its dissolution.

However, subjects who are currently in love are less likely to report an intensification of needs prior to their most important romantic relationship and are also more likely to score higher on the social desirability scale. Thus, differences on the facilitating factors might be attributed to their tendency not to acknowledge needs or to make any other type of disclosure that they feel is threatening to a socially approved perception of themselves. Social desirability shows a strong negative correlation with the facilitating factors, relief from adversity, sexual desire, and aging fears and social expectations for the entire sample population. Furthermore, social desirability has been empirically shown (Dion & Dion, 1988) to be correlated with a lack of personal and intimate disclosures. Therefore, it is suggested that an intensification of needs prior to a relationship beginning is probably underreported. Secondly, a different type of limitation of the study is that the sample consisted solely of New York City college students. Both a non-student population or a population from another area other than a large northeastern city

might have reported behaving differently during their most important romantic relationship. For example, the disproportionate number of females to males in New York in general and at Hunter College in particular might have affected the findings since this sample of heterosexual women probably experiences more competition for desirable male partners. Secondly, college students in the eighties have been reporting more concern with their partner's physical attractiveness and ability to succeed than in past generations. (O'Brien, McCabe, & Quinter, 1985). Also, college students in the eighties place greater value on prestige and financial success than in past decades (Conger, 1988) and report less severe moral judgments about others who obtain financial rewards by opportunistic or illegal means. The gender emphasis on wealth and prestige and the decline of social concerns about means of self-gratification may have aggravated long-standing gender differences which make mate selection resemble a marketplace.

Further research might allow the subjects to present their own constructs about what factors may have facilitated romantic attraction or what specific traits they were most drawn to in the beloved. Also, that relationship's other than the most important in their life might be studied in terms of factors which both facilitate and complicate relationships and lovestyles. Facilitating factors such as sexual desire and relief from adversity might be more influential in more superficial relationships while aging fears and social expectations are less influential.

Summary

Both experimental studies and clinical speculation have described internal states and external conditions which facilitate romantic attraction. A scale

comprising items which were noted as facilitators of romantic attraction resulted in four main factors: aging fears and social expectations, desire for self-expansion, relief from adversity and sexual desire. Approximately half of the sample reported experiencing an intensification of at least one of these facilitating factors prior to beginning the most important romantic relationship in their life. Subjects who report an intensification of desired self-expansion, unlike subjects reporting an intensification of the other three facilitating factors, reported to having chosen partners who were perceived as having complementary traits to themselves. The choice of a complementary lover was shown not to be characteristic of all relationships but only those where the subject was seeking self-expansion. These subjects reported lovers who contrasted with themselves on traits such as ambition and emotional distance supporting Reik's (1949) contention that these relationships are attempts to possess, if only vicariously, desired traits perceived as lacking in oneself and as possessed by the beloved. Subjects influenced by the other three facilitating factors chose lovers who were psychologically similar and emotionally receptive suggesting that these subjects seek comfort in romantic relationships.

Future research might consist in a comparison of the facilitating factors of romantic relationships with a measure which allows the subject to provide constructs for aspects or traits that he/she finds attractive in their partner and in what intensity these are present in themselves. This might reveal additional traits and qualities which the subject, influenced by self-expansion, finds complementary. Also, subjects influenced by the other three facilitating factors may perceive

complementary traits in their lover which were not assessed in this study but could be measured by a study where the subject determines the constructs.

Subjects experiencing an intensification on any of the facilitating factors uniformly reported having experienced more emotional/physical distress during the relationship suggesting that the greater a person's needs prior to entering the relationship, the more vulnerable he/she is to subsequent affective lability.

Women reported more manic symptoms during the relationship as well as being more influenced by the desire for self-expansion and aging fears and social expectations in beginning the relationship. Men reported themselves as more likely to begin romantic relationships after experiencing an intensification of sexual desire. Gender difference found in this study supported Blau's (1964) social exchange theory and sociobiological theorists such as Buss and Barnes (1986) who argued that romantic involvements involve women exchanging sexual services in exchange for evidence of emotional and economic commitment. This exchange between genders has resulted in a mate selection market which probably dates from ancient times and is maintained by a disparity in social and economic conditions which have only been marginally improved in recent years.

Table 1

Factors Facilitating Romantic Attraction: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis
Varimax Rotation

	Factors			
	1	2	3	4
<u>Factor 1: Aging Fears and Social Expectations</u>				
35) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that if I waited until later in life that finding a romantic partner might be more difficult.	.68	.21	.10	.23
15) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that because I was getting older I should become involved in a serious relationship.	.64	.18	.07	.01
40) Prior to becoming romantically involved I wanted to get married in order to make my life more secure and stable.	.60	.38	.14	.16
13) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt I was getting older and wanted to have a romantic relationship in order to have a spouse and children.	.55	.14	.07	.01
20) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt pressured by societal expectations to become involved in a romantic relationship.	.54	.08	.49	.25
26) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt some pressure from my family to become involved in a romantic relationship.	.51	.07	.28	.21
27) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that having a romantic relationship would make people think of me as an adult.	.49	.13	.23	.32
30) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that if I waited until later in life the romantic relations I would have then would not be as rewarding.	.46	.14	.08	.16

Cronbach Alpha Coefficient = .84

Table 1 (continued)

	Factors			
	1	2	3	4
<u>Factor 2: Relief from Adversity</u>				
14) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was depressed	.11	.65	.39	.02
18) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was experiencing more stress than usual.	.15	.61	.29	.06
21) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was experiencing a family crisis.	.18	.60	.11	.16
39) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was dissatisfied with school and/or career matters.	.24	.59	.03	.21
Cronbach Alpha Coefficient = .81				
<u>Factor 3: Self-Expansion</u>				
28) Prior to becoming romantically involved I had a strong desire to expand my sense of self.	.05	.15	.48	.27
12) Prior to becoming romantically involved I wanted to discover myself.	.03	.24	.40	.19
Cronbach Alpha Coefficient = .71				
<u>Factor 4: Sexual Desire</u>				
33) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was looking for someone whom I would find particularly physically attractive.	.13	.05	.04	.59
36) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was going to clubs, dances, parties or seeking other situations where potential sexual partners may be found.	.08	.01	.04	.53

Table 1 (continued)

	Factors			
	1	2	3	4
<u>Factor 2: Sexual Desire (continued)</u>				
29) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was evaluating men or women in terms of physical attractiveness.	.02	.12	.14	.53
25) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was fantasizing about sex and sex-related matters in general.	.22	.28	.32	.45
16) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was talking with my friends about sex and sex-related matters.	.12	.14	.31	.43
31) Prior to becoming romantically involved I wanted regular and steady sex.	.28	.11	.12	.39
Cronbach Alpha Coefficient = .76				

Table 2

Percentages for Subjects Reporting Intensification of the Various Facilitating Factors

	<u>n</u>	<u>Aging F and Social E</u>	<u>Self Expand</u>	<u>Relief from Adversity</u>	<u>Sexual Desire</u>
General	190	7.4	39.5	14.5	25.8
Male	61	6.6	32.8	9.8	50.8
Female	129	7.8	42.6	16.7	17.1

Table 3

Intercorrelations Among Scales for Facilitating Factors

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Aging F and Social E</u>	<u>Self Expand</u>	<u>Relief from Adversity</u>	<u>Sexual Desire</u>
Aging fears and Social Expectations	--	.31	.47	.44
Expansion	--	--	.35	.31
Relief From Adversity	--	--	--	.47
Sexual Desire	--	--	--	--

Table 4

Correlations of Facilitating Factors with Social Desirability

<u>Scale</u>	<u>General</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Aging Fears and Social Expectations	*-.21	*-.24	**-.16
Self-Expansion	.05	-.15	.02
Relief from Adversity	*-.35	*-.45	*-.32
Sexual Desire	*-.35	*-.30	*-.33

Note. *Indicates statistical significance at $p < .01$ level.

Note. **Indicates statistical significance at $p < .05$ level.

Table 5

Subsequent Relationship Satisfaction: Factor Analysis

	<u>Factors</u>		
	1	2	3
<u>Factor 1: Affection</u>			
109) In the relationship I am/was dissatisfied with the degree of commitment to each other.	-.79	.15	.01
108) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with how much I needed him/her and with how much I was needed.	.70	.00	.11
118) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with how rarely we hurt or disappointed each other.	.64	.15	.19
106) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with the lack of impulsive and sudden changes in the status of the relationship.	.53	.26	.14
113) In the relationship I am/was dissatisfied with my and my partner's ability to express strong emotions (either positive or negative).	-.51	.41	.03
111) In the relationship I am/was dissatisfied with the amount of affection and caring that we expressed to one another.	-.49	.42	.06
Cronbach Alpha Coefficient = .74			
<u>Factor 2: Companionship</u>			
124) In the relationship I am/was dissatisfied with our becoming bored with each other.	.07	.60	.06
121) In the relationship I am/was dissatisfied with the amount and quality of time spent just "hanging around" with each other.	.14	.59	.15
123) In the relationship I am/was dissatisfied with how the relationship affected my prestige with friends or work-related acquaintances.	-.04	.56	-.29

Table 5 (Continued)

	Factors		
	1	2	3
<u>Factor 2: Companionship (continued)</u>			
117) In the relationship I am/was dissatisfied with the relationship's effect on advancing my career plans.	.04	.56	-.10
125) In the relationship I am/was dissatisfied with how the relationship affected my relationship with my parents and siblings.	-.03	.53	-.04
119) In the relationship I am/was dissatisfied with its role in affecting activities detrimental to my health (skipping meals, not getting enough sleep, drinking alcohol, and other health-related matters).	-.10	.48	-.09
104) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with the degree of comfort I had in sharing deeply personal information about myself.	.40	-.48	.04

Cronbach Alpha Coefficient = .72

Factor 3: Instrumentality

110) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with its effect on my becoming more competitive with others in similar life situations.	-.07	-.04	.65
120) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with its role in increasing my social network (meeting new people and having them become my friends).	.12	-.11	.58
122) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with its role in making me healthier and less susceptible to physical illness.	.32	-.17	.56
126) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with our doing favors for each other or, if applicable, sharing housekeeping and child raising tasks.	.32	-.17	.51
116) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with the sexual interactions.	.05	-.36	.50

Table 5 (Continued)

	<u>Factors</u>		
	1	2	3
<u>Factor 3: Instrumentality (continued)</u>			
114) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with the relationship's effect on realizing and achieving my goals.	.32	-.10	.49
112) In the relationship I am/was satisfied with our pursuit of common intellectual or artistic interests.	.10	-.19	.40

Cronbach Alpha Coefficient = .71

Table 6

Factor Analysis of Self-Ratings on Personality Traits

1	<u>Factors</u>		
	1	2	3
<u>Factor 1: Passivity and Succorance</u>			
<u>Trait</u>	<u>Loading</u>		
Timid	.66	-.13	.17
Tolerant	.55	.09	-.22
Submissive	.54	-.33	.03
Sympathetic	.40	.00	.01

Cronbach Alpha Coefficient = .62

Factor 2: Achievement

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Loading</u>		
High Achiever	.01	.76	-.13
Ambition	-.01	.47	.14
Practical	.34	.39	-.01
Independent	.00	.37	-.07

Cronbach Alpha Coefficient = .55

Factor 3: Neuroticism

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Loading</u>		
Depressed	-.09	-.10	.69
Nervous	-.22	.06	.45
Not Socially Outgoing	-.09	-.36	.40

Cronbach Alpha Coefficient = .54

Table 7

Tests of Hypotheses 2-5: The Relationship of Factors Facilitating Romantic Attraction to Mania: Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance

	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean Score Mania</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>	<u>Hypothesis</u>
*Relief from Adversity				
high group	23	2.1	.01	#2
medium	62	2.2		
low	105	2.6		
*Desire for Self-Expansion				
high group	75	1.9	.01	#3
medium	70	2.2		
low	45	2.5		
*Sexual Desire				
high group	49	2.2	.01	#4
medium	82	2.5		
low	59	2.5		
*Aging Fears and Social Expectations				
high group	9	2.0	.01	#5
medium	38	2.1		
low	143	2.5		

Note. *Lower means indicate that the factor is more prevalent.

Table 8

Gender Differences

	<u>Males =61</u>	<u>Females=129</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>	<u>Hypothesis</u>
*Desire for Expansion	3.1	2.9	.05	#16
*Aging Fears and Social Expectations	4.2	3.9	.01	#17
*Sexual Desire	2.7	3.3	.01	#18
*Mania	2.5	2.3	.01	#19
Companionship	1.9	1.7	.05	#21

Note. *Lower means indicate that the factor is more prevalent.

Table 9

Age Differences

	<u>Young=79</u>	<u>Old=44</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>	<u>Hypothesis</u>
*Aging Fears and Social Expectations	4.2	3.8	.01	#22
*Desire for Self-Expansion	2.8	3.0	.01	#23

Note. *Lower means indicate that the factor is more prevalent.

Table 10

Significant Correlations Between Factors Facilitating Romantic Attractions and Self and Lover Personality Trait Ratings

Relief from Adversity

<u>Self</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>Lover</u>	<u>r</u>
Nervous	.31	Nervous	.16
Depressive	.48	Depressive	.22
Not Socially Outgoing	.20	Not Socially Outgoing	*.12
Hostile	*.12	Hostile	ns
Low Achiever	.21	Low Achiever	ns
Impractical	*.14	Impractical	.24
Timid	ns	Timid	.14
Dependent	ns	Dependent	.12
Unambitious	.22	Unambitious	*.11

Aging Fears and Social Expectations

Depressive	.25	Nervous	.22
Not Socially Outgoing	.20	Depressed	*.13
Emotionally Inhibited	*.12	Emotionally Inhibited	ns
Low Achiever	.17	Low Achiever	ns
Submissive	ns	Submissive	.18
Timid	ns	Timid	.20
Dependent	*.13	Dependent	.18
Unambitious	.18	Unambitious	.19

Sexual Desire

Nervous	ns	Nervous	.21
Depressive	*.12	Depressive	*.12
Emotionally Inhibited	*.14	Emotionally Inhibited	ns
Submissive	.16	Submissive	.24
Impractical	.33	Impractical	.23
Dependent	ns	Dependent	.22
Unambitious	ns	Unambitious	*.14

Table 10 (continued)

<u>Self</u>	r	<u>Lover</u>	r
<u>Desire for Self-Expansion</u>			
Interested in arts	.20		
Nervous	.14		
Depressed	.19		
Not socially outgoing	*.12		
Submissive	.19		
Self-disciplined	.16	Impulsive	*.13
Sympathetic	.14		
Tolerant	*.12		
Timid	*.12	Aggressive	*.12
		Ambitious	.17
		Practical	*.14
		High Achiever	.16

Note. $p < .01$ for all traits except where * indicated.

* $p < .05$.

Appendix AFacilitating Factor: Relief from Adversity

- 14) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was depressed.
- 17) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was dissatisfied with my relationship with my family.
- 18) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was experiencing more stress than usual.
- 19) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was bored.
- 21) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was experiencing a family crisis.
- 22) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was feeling lonely.
- 38) Prior to becoming romantically involved I had doubts about whether or not I would ever find the right person to settle down with.
- 39) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was dissatisfied with school and/or career matters.
- 41) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that I needed a steady companion.

Appendix BFacilitating Factor: Sexual desire

- 11) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was more aware of my physical appearance and/or was making an effort to look attractive.
- 16) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was talking with my friends about sex and sex-related matters.
- 25) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was fantasizing about sex and sex-related matters in general.
- 29) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was evaluating men or women in terms of physical attractiveness.
- 31) Prior to becoming romantically involved I wanted regular and steady sex.
- 33) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was looking for someone whom I would find particularly physically attractive.
- 36) Prior to becoming romantically involved I was going to clubs, dances, parties or seeking other situations where potential sexual partners might be found.

Appendix CFacilitating Factor: Aging Fears and Social Expectations

- 13) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt I was getting older and wanted to have a romantic relationship in order to have a spouse and children.
- 15) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that because I was getting older I should become involved in a serious relationship.
- 20) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt pressured by societal expectations to become involved in a romantic relationship.
- 23) Prior to becoming romantically involved most of my friends were getting married or were involved in a committed relationship.
- 26) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt some pressure from my family to become involved in a romantic relationship.
- 30) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that if I waited until later in life the romantic relationship I would have then would not be as rewarding.
- 35) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that if I waited until later in life that finding a romantic partner might be more difficult.
- 38) Prior to becoming romantically involved I had doubts about whether or not I would ever find the right person to settle down with.

Appendix DFacilitating Factor: Self-Expansion Wishes

- 11) Prior to becoming romantically involved I wanted to discover myself.
- 24) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that having a romantic relationship would improve my social life.
- 27) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that having a romantic relationship would make people think of me as an adult.
- 28) Prior to becoming romantically involved I had a strong desire to expand my sense of self.
- 32) I became romantically involved with this person because they had traits and characteristics that I wanted and that were underdeveloped or lacking in myself.
- 34) I became romantically involved with this person because having a relationship with them was very flattering to my self-concept.
- 37) Prior to becoming romantically involved I felt that a romantic relationship was a good way to discover things about myself that might not otherwise be so readily accessible.

Appendix E

Love Style:Eros (Passionate love)

- 43) With this partner I feel/felt uninhibited sexually.
- 49) My partner and I were sexually attracted to each other immediately after we first met.
- 55) My partner and I have/had the right physical "chemistry" between us.
- 61) Our lovemaking is/was very intense and satisfying.
- 67) I feel/felt that my partner and I are/were meant for each other.
- 73) My partner and I really know/knew how to physically excite each other.
- 78) I feel that this relationship is/was the most physically passionate that I will ever have.
- 79) My partner fits/fit my ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.

Appendix FLove Style:Mania (Passionate love)

- 45) When things aren't/weren't right with my partner and I, it hurt physically.
- 51) If/when my relationship ended I would feel/felt my life was hopeless.
- 57) I get/got so excited about being romantically involved that I can't//couldn't sleep.
- 63) When my partner doesn't/didn't pay attention to me I feel/felt sick all over.
- 69) In the relationship I have/had trouble concentrating on anything else.
- 75) I can't/couldn't relax if I suspect/suspected that my partner is/was being unfaithful.
- 80) If my partner ignores/ignored me for a while, I sometimes do/did stupid things to get his/her attention back.
- 88) It is/was hard for me to get along without my partner.
- 94) I need/needed my partner.

Appendix GLove Style: Idealization (Passionate love)

- 42) When things are/were going well with my partner, I feel/felt that I am/was becoming the person I want/wanted to be.
- 48) There are things about myself that I learned from my partner that nobody else in this world could have ever shown me.
- 54) Small things (a walk, a gesture, a way of phrasing words, some physical characteristic, etc.) about my partner often fascinates/fascinated me.
- 60) I feel/felt my partner has/had a rare, almost magical understanding of me.
- 66) When things are/were going well with my partner I am/was more sensitive to beauty and often sought out aesthetically pleasing activities (art, music, poetry, drama, nature, etc.)
- 72) I feel/felt that my partner can/did reach parts of me that no one will ever reach again.
- 83) My partner is/was the most important person in the world to me.

Appendix HLove Style:Caring (Companionate Love)

- 84) If my partner was feeling bad, my first duty would be to cheer him/her up.
- 85) My relationship with my partner is/was more important than anything to me.
- 87) I am/was willing to do almost anything for my partner.
- 90) I try/tried to anticipate my partner's needs.
- 93) If my partner is/was feeling bad, I really want/wanted to make him/her feel better.
- 96) I feel/felt responsible for my partner's well-being.
- 99) Taking care of my partner is/was very important to me.
- 102) I would be especially kind to my partner if he/she was going through difficult times.

Appendix ILove Style: Respect and Communicative Intimacy (Companionate Love)

- 46) My partner and I have/had very similar values.
- 52) My partner understands/understood me well.
- 58) We have/had a very solid relationship.
- 64) We can/could really communicate with each other.
- 70) I find/found my partner very easy to get along with.
- 76) If I had a problem, my partner is/was the person I most likely would turn to.
- 81) I feel/felt that I can confide in my partner about virtually everything.
- 89) I think that my partner is/was unusually well-adjusted.
- 95) I have/had great confidence in my partner's good judgement.
- 98) I know/knew I could count on my partner for anything if I needed help.
- 101) I think that my partner is/was one of those people who quickly wins respect.

Appendix JLove Style: Friendship (Companionate Love)

- 47) It is/was more important to feel calm and relaxed with my partner, than excited and romantic.
- 53) The most important aspect of this relationship is/was feeling warm and close, but not necessarily sexually excited.
- 59) If/even though our romantic relationship ended, we still would be/are friends.
- 71) This relationship was something we both carefully considered before becoming very involved.
- 77) This relationship is/was best described as a deep friendship.
- 82) This romantic relationship developed from a good friendship.
- 97) My friendship with my partner is/was more important to me than anything else.

Appendix K

Love Style:Pragmatism

- 44) I considered what this person was going to become professionally before I committed myself to him/her.
- 50) A main consideration in choosing this partner was how he/she reflects/reflected on my family.
- 56) My partner and I carefully planned and organized our lives.
- 62) An important factor in choosing this partner was whether or not he/she would be a good parent.
- 68) A main consideration in choosing this partner was how he/she would reflect on my career.
- 74) Before getting very involved with my partner I tried to figure out how compatible his/her heredity was with mine in case we ever had children.

REFERENCES

- Alberoni, F. (1983). Falling in love. New York: Random House.
- Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1986). Love and the expansion of self: Understanding attraction and satisfaction. New York: Hemisphere.
- Berscheid, E. & Hatfield (Walster), E. (1969 and 1978). Interpersonal attraction. Eds. 1 and 2. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1974). Physical attractiveness. In L. Berowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 7). New York: Academic Press.
- Berscheid, E. (1988). Some comments on love's anatomy. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), The psychology of love. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Burgess, E. W. (1926). The romantic impulse and family disorganization. Survey, 57, 290-294.
- Buss, D. M. (1987). Sex differences in human mate selection criteria: An evolutionary perspective. In C. Crawford, M. Smith, & D. Krevs (Eds.), Sociobiology and psychology: Issues, ideas, and findings. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Buss, D. M. & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(3), 559-570.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., & Rodgers, W.L. (1976). The quality of American life. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Clark, M. S. (1982). A role for arousal in the link between feelings states, judgments and behavior. In M. S. Clark & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), Affect and cognition: The 17th annual Carnegie Symposium on cognition. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Critelli, J. W., Myers, E. J., & Loos, V. E. (1986). The components of love: Romantic attraction and sex role orientation. Journal of Personality, 54(2), 354-369.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive. New York: Wiley.

- DeLucia, J. L. (1987). Gender role identity and dating behavior: What is the relationship? Sex Roles, 17, 153-161.
- De Riveria, J. (1984). The structure of emotional relationships. In P. Shaver (Ed.), Review of personality and social psychology: Emotions, relationships, and health (pp. 116-145). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Dion, K. L. & Dion, K. K. (1973). Correlates of romantic love. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41(1), 51-56.
- Dion, K. L. & Dion, K. K. (1988). Romantic love: Individual and cultural perspectives. In R. J. Sternberg and M. L. Barnes (Eds.), The psychology of love. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Driscoll, R., Davis, K. & Lipetz, M. (1972). Parental interference and romantic love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24, 1-10.
- Dutton, D. G. & Aron, A. P. (1974). Some evidence for heightened sexual attraction under conditions of high anxiety. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 510-517.
- Engels, F. (1884). Origin of property, family and the state. London: Penguin Press.
- Erickson, E. (1968). Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton.
- Flaubert, G. (1941). Sentimental education. (A. Goldsmith, Trans.). Everyman's Library, no. 969. London: J.M. Dent & Sons.
- Freud, S. (1905). Three essays on sexuality. In J. Strachey (Ed.), The standard edition of the complete works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 7). London: Hogarth.
- Fromm, E. (1956). The art of loving. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gonzales, M. H., Davis, J. M., Loney, G. L., Lukens, C. K., & Junghans, C. M. (1983). Interactional approach to interpersonal attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 1192-1197.
- Greenfield, S. M. (1965). Love and marriage in modern America: A functional analysis. Sociological Quarterly, 6, 361-377.
- Harlow, H. F. (1958). The nature of love. American Psychologist, 13, 673-685.

- Hatfield, E. (1965). The effect of self-esteem on romantic liking. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1, 184-197.
- Hatfield, E. (1982). Passionate love, companionate love, and intimacy. In M. Fisher & G. Stricker (Eds.), Intimacy. New York: Plenum Press.
- Hatfield, E. (1988). Passionate and companionate love. In R. J. Sternberg and M. L. Barnes (Eds.), The psychology of love. New Haven: Yale University.
- Hatfield, E., & Walster, G. W. (1978). A new look at love. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hatkoff, T. S., & Lasswell, T. E. (1979). Male-female similarities and differences in conceptualizing love. In M. Cook & G. Wilson (Eds.), Love and attraction. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 392-402.
- Hill, C. T., Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. A. (1976). Break-ups before marriage: The end of 103 affairs. Journal of Social Issues, 32(1), 147-167.
- Hill, C. T. & Stull, D. E. (1981). Sex differences and effects of social and value similarity in same-sex friendships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 488-502.
- Huston, T. L. (1973). Ambiguity of acceptance, social desirability and dating choice. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9, 32-42.
- Kast, V. (1986). The nature of loving: Patterns of human relationships. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.
- Kanin, E. F., Davidson, D. K. D., & Scheck, S. R. (1970). A research note on male-female differentials in the experience of heterosexual love. The Journal of Sex Research, 6, 64-72.
- Kelley, H. H. (1983). Love and commitment. In H. H. Kelley et al. (Eds.), Close relationships (pp. 265-314). New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Kenrick, D. T., & Cialdini, R. B. (1977). Romantic attraction: Misattribution versus reinforcement explanations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 381-391.
- Kephart, W. M. (1967). Some correlates of romantic love. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29(3), 470-474.

- Kerckhoff, A.C., & Davis, K. E. (1962). Value consensus and need complementarity in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 27, 295-303.
- Knox, D., & Sporakowski, M. (1968). Attitudes of college students toward love. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30, 638-642.
- Lee, J. A. (1977). A typology of styles of loving. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3, 173-182.
- Lilar, S. (1965). Aspects of love in Western society. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lynch, J. J. (1977). The broken heart: The medical consequences of loneliness. New York: Basic Books.
- Maricia, J. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 551-558.
- Martinson, E. W. (1980). Nine "colors" or types of romantic love? Psychological Reports, 47.
- Maslow, A. H. (1962). Toward a psychology of being. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Mathes, E. W. (1968). Nine colours of romantic love. Psychological Reports, 47, 371-376.
- Melton, W. & Thomas, D. L. (1976). Instrumental and expressive values in mate selection of black and white college students. Journal of Marriage of the Family, 38, (3), 509-517.
- Mathes, E. W., & Moore, C. L. (1984). Reik's complementarity theory of romantic love, 12 5(3), 321-327.
- Munro, B. & Adams, G. R. (1978). Love American style: A test of role structure theory on changes in attitudes toward love. Human Relations, 31, 215-228.
- Murstein, B. I. (1976). Who will marry whom? Theories and research in marital choice. New York: Springer.
- Murstein, B. I. (1980). Mate selection in the 1970's. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 777-792.
- Neugarten, B. (1968). Adult personality: Toward a psychology of the life cycle. In B. Neugarten (Ed.) Middle Age and Aging. Chicago, IL: Chicago Press.

- O'Brien, H. D., McCabe, K. F., Quinter, U. E. (1985). Values in mate selection: A 1984 campus survey. College Student Journal, 19, 44-50.
- Paterson, C. E. & Pettjohn, T. F. (1962). Age and human mate selection. Psychological Reports, 51, 70.
- Peele, S. (1975). Love and addiction. New York: Meridian Books.
- Prentice, D.S., Briggs, N. E., and Bradley, D. W. (1983). Romantic attitudes of American university students. Psychological Reports, 53, 815-822.
- Rathus, S. A. (1983). Human sexuality, New York: CBS College publishing, 320-322.
- Reik, T. (1949). Of love and lust: On the psychoanalysis of romantic and sexual emotions. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Riordan, C. A., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1983). Attraction in aversive environments: Some evidence for classical conditioning and negative reinforcement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 683-692.
- Roscoe, B., Diana, M. S., and Brooks, R. H. (1987). Early, middle and late adolescents' views on dating and factors influencing partner selection. Adolescence, 22(85), 59-67).
- Roscow, I. (1957). Issues in the concept of need-complementarity. Sociometry, 20, 216-233.
- Rubin, Z. (1970). The measurement of romantic love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 265-273.
- Rubin, Z. (1973). Liking and loving: An invitation to social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Rubin, Z. (1988). Introduction. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.). The psychology of love. New Haven: Yale University.
- Rubin, Z., Hill, C. T., Peplau, L. A., & Dunkel-Schetter, C. (1980). Self-disclosure in dating couples: Sex role and the ethic of openness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 305-318.
- Safilios-Rothschild, C. (1976). A macro- and micro-examination of family power and love: An exchange model. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 355-362.

- Steck, L., Levitan, D., McLane, D., & Kelley, H. H. (1982). Care, need, and conceptions of love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 481-491.
- Stendahl (Beyle, M.) (1927). On love. (C. K. Scott-Moncrieff Trans.) New York: Boni & Liveright.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. Psychological Review, 93, 119-135.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1988). Triangulating love. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), The psychology of love. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Symons, D. (1979). The evolution of human sexuality. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, R., Morrison, L., Morrison, W., & Romoser, R. (1968). Taylor-Johnson temperament analysis manual. Los Angeles: Psychological Publications.
- Thornton, A., & Freedman, D. (1983). The changing American family. Population Bulletin, 38(4), 1-44.
- Traubmann, J., & Hatfield, E. (1981). Love and its effect on mental and physical health. In J. March, S. Kiesler, R. Fogel, I. Hatfield, & E. Shanas (Eds.), Aging: Stability and change in the family. New York: Academic Press.
- Walster, E. (1965). The effect of self-esteem on romantic liking. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1, 184-197.
- Walster, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., & Rottman, L. (1966). The importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 508-516.
- White, G. L. (1980). Physical attractiveness and courtship progress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 56-62.
- Wilson, E. O. (1979). Sociobiology: The new synthesis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Winch, R. F. (1967). Another look at the theory of complementary needs on mate-selection. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 756-761.
- Zillman, D. (1984). Connections between sex and aggression. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.