

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN RETROSPECTIVE  
MEMORY OF RELATIONSHIPS

By

ANN L. CARTER

Bachelor of Science in Psychology  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1986

Master of Science in Psychology  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1988

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
July, 1991

Thesis  
1991D  
C323g  
cop. 2

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN RETROSPECTIVE  
MEMORY OF RELATIONSHIPS

Thesis Approved:

James L. Phillips  
Thesis Adviser

William H. Rambo

J. S. [unclear]

Joseph Pearl

Norma N. [unclear]  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. James Phillips for his guidance, humor, and extreme patience. In addition, I am grateful to the undergraduate students enrolled in Dr. Phillip's section of PSYCH 4990 for their tremendous help.

I am also thankful to the other committee members, Dr. William Rambo, Dr. Robert Schlottmann, and Dr. Joseph Pearl, for their advisement in the course of this work.

My deepest gratitude is held for my husband Eric who has spent much of the past year without me and my friends who have encouraged me.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	3
Recall of Satisfaction . . . . .	3
Recall of Specific Events . . . . .	4
Responsibility Attributions . . . . .	10
METHOD . . . . .	20
Subjects . . . . .	20
Materials . . . . .	21
Procedure . . . . .	26
RESULTS . . . . .	29
Initial Satisfaction Ratings . . . . .	29
Recall of Satisfaction . . . . .	30
Memory Questionnaires . . . . .	32
Attribution Questionnaire . . . . .	35
DISCUSSION . . . . .	40
REFERENCES . . . . .	48
APPENDIXES . . . . .	52
APPENDIX A - INFORMATION SHEET . . . . .	53
APPENDIX B - DAVID'S FEELINGS . . . . .	54
APPENDIX C - LISA'S FEELINGS . . . . .	55
APPENDIX D - QUESTIONNAIRE A-1 . . . . .	56
APPENDIX E - QUESTIONNAIRE B-1 . . . . .	59
APPENDIX F - DAVID'S FEELINGS - MEMORY TASK . . . . .	62

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX G - LISA'S FEELINGS - MEMORY TASK . .	63
APPENDIX H - QUESTIONNAIRE A-1HTH . . . . .	64
APPENDIX I - QUESTIONNAIRE B-1YYY . . . . .	67
APPENDIX J - ATTRIBUTION QUESTIONNAIRE . . . .	70
APPENDIX K - SCENARIO 1 . . . . .	74
APPENDIX L - BREAK-UP SCENARIO . . . . .	89
APPENDIX M - STAY-TOGETHER SCENARIO . . . . .	96

Gender Differences in Retrospective  
Memory of Relationships  
Ann L. Carter  
Oklahoma State University

Running head: RETROSPECTIVE MEMORY OF RELATIONSHIPS

## Abstract

This study investigated how gender differences in recall of satisfaction, memory for specific details, and assignment of responsibility are mediated by self-esteem, relationship outcome, and time. Other factors considered were the valence (positive or negative), type of information (fact or feeling), and character (male or female). One hundred and twenty-eight subjects, 64 males and 64 females, read stories about a couple in a dating relationship. They were then asked to rate the male's and female's satisfaction, recall levels of satisfaction, remember specific details about the relationship, and assign responsibility for positive and negative events in the relationship to the male, female, or circumstances. Results indicated that subjects remembered the female character as less satisfied in the relationship while they remembered the male character as more satisfied. Both males and females saw the male character as responsible for positive and negative affective events and the female character as responsible for nonaffective events.



## Gender Differences in Retrospective Memory of Relationships

Are relationships less satisfying for females than they are for males? If one were to believe popular psychology books, it would seem so. A number of books depicting females as "loving too much," "making foolish choices," etc, supports the concept that women are unhappy in their relationships. Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers (1976) provided some support for this view of differential gender satisfaction. They concluded that males are likely to be more satisfied with their marriages than females are.

### Recall of Satisfaction

To systematically explore this question, Carter and Phillips (1987) conducted a study with male and female college students who were either currently in, or had previously been in, monogamous relationships. If the relationship was current, both partners participated in the study and rated their satisfaction levels. The data from ongoing relationships suggested that males and females were about equally satisfied. However, female subjects reporting on past relationships gave much lower satisfaction ratings than males did. Therefore, females in current relationships may be as satisfied as their

partners, but when the relationship ends, females may remember being much less satisfied than they were.

Females' current attitudes about past relationships may affect what they remember and how they recall previous levels of satisfaction. In 1981, Ross, McFarland, and Fletcher concluded that a subject's attitudes have a direct influence on his or her recall of personal histories. Again in 1987, McFarland and Ross found that subjects tended to distort memories of past ratings so that they were more similar to present ratings. Therefore, the subjects were assuming that their views, attitudes, or attributions in the past were consistent with present views. If females feel more negatively toward their ex-partners after relationships end than males do, the females may be more likely to attribute current dissatisfaction to their past relationships.

#### Recall of Specific Events

In addition to causing distortion of global satisfaction, a negative current attitude may also affect recall for specific events that occurred in the relationship. Conway and Ross (1984) found that under some circumstances, subjects revised or distorted memories of past events in order to make past attitudes or behaviors consistent with present attitude. The subjects

that inaccurately reported past attitudes were members of an experimental group that had participated in activities to improve certain skills. These subjects, then, recalled their previous skills as being worse than they actually were. Control subjects, however, reported with no systematic biases. The authors concluded that their subjects claimed support for invalid ideas of change by inaccurately recalling their pasts.

In one study (Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978), the researchers directly questioned the effect of attitude change on memories involving a person. Subjects were given information regarding a woman's activities. After a variable length of time, additional information about the woman's sexual preference was given to some subjects. Those subjects that received the new "facts" selectively remembered events that supported their revised impressions of the woman. Subjects' recall of previous impressions was changed as a function of their new attitudes.

Therefore, recall of past events or experiences are subject to a person's current attitudes. In addition, some types of information are recalled more accurately than others. According to Holmes (1970), people differentially remember experiences depending on the affective intensity of each specific event. If the

experience's affective intensity had decreased over time, the subject was less likely to accurately recall the experience. Experiences that maintained their affective intensity were more likely to be recalled. Holmes (1970) author found that the affective intensity of unpleasant experiences decreases more than the affective intensity of pleasant experiences; therefore, memories of unpleasant experiences are more likely to be distorted. Conflict in and termination of romantic relationships may constitute unpleasant, affectively intense experiences. People, therefore, may less accurately recall specific events and overall judgments of relationships that ended.

According to Goethals and Reckman (1973), memory distortions serve to decrease cognitive dissonance between past and current attitudes. The distortion lets the person feel as though his or her attitudes have not changed. Ross and Shulman (1973) also stated that dissonance reduction was the most reasonable explanation for inaccurate recall of past attitudes when the attitudes had changed. If a person's attitude about a relationship changes after the relationship ends, memories of satisfaction and specific events may be distorted.

One might assume that subjects who currently feel negatively about previous partners might distort memories

in a negative direction and report being dissatisfied with past relationships even if they were satisfied while in these relationships. If a female experiences more emotional distress following a break-up than a male, she may be more likely to negatively distort memories. Carter and Phillips (1987) found that male satisfaction positively correlated with relationship length while female satisfaction positively correlated with relationship outcome. In extending the implications of these results, one might argue that males define a successful relationship as one in which they had pleasurable experiences for a longer period of time, regardless of the relationship's outcome. Females, however, may focus on the relationship's outcome to determine its success or failure, regardless of its length. A positive outcome, establishing a committed relationship, may be more important to college females than to college males. Males might focus on dating in general and feel less of a need to establish committed relationships while in college.

A study by Cockrum and White (1985) supported the idea that relationships are more important for women than they are for men. They found that a woman's life satisfaction was determined to a greater extent by the

presence or absence of emotional attachments. Men, however, were more likely to be satisfied to interact with a group of people who shared their interests. Women may be socialized in a way that their self-esteem is closely tied to dating, marriage, and family life while men can achieve success, and increased self-esteem, through their careers.

If relationships are more important to women than men, women may invest more time and effort to maintain them. Conversely, the relationship may be more important to the person that works harder to maintain it. In 1988, Hendrick, Hendrick, and Adler concluded that female subjects' satisfaction was positively correlated with their partners' self-esteem. Males' satisfaction was positively correlated with the partner's level of commitment, investment in the relationship, and expressions of altruistic love. If Hendrick et al. are correct, male satisfaction can be achieved by female effort while female satisfaction is achieved by the male's view of himself, not his effort. Major stated that women may over benefit their partners at their own expense because they have a lower sense of entitlement than do men. In other words, a female puts more time and effort

into the relationship and receives less satisfaction from it while the male puts in less and benefits more.

If the female invests more time and effort in the relationship because it is important for her self-esteem to be in a relationship, she is likely to react differently to signs of distress. One study (Rusbult, Zembrodt, & Iwanizek, 1986) found four general responses to distress on two dimensions: active/passive, constructive/destructive. The responses were exit (active, destructive), neglect (passive, destructive), voice (active, constructive), and loyalty (passive, constructive). The authors found that psychological femininity was associated with voice and loyalty and psychological masculinity was associated with exit and neglect. These results suggest that females engage in constructive activities, those that help the relationship to continue, but males react destructively, in ways that help the relationship to end. It seems that females are more interested than males in continuing their relationships. Again, perhaps this is related to their greater investments.

If females are more invested in continuing their relationships, it seems likely that they would experience a greater sense of loss when the relationships end.

However, if females negatively distort memories of relationships, they may be less distressed after their relationships end than males who remember being satisfied. According to Rubin, Peplau, and Hill (1981), out of a sample of 15 couples, men experienced more drastic consequences after being involved in failed relationships than women did. The consequences for the men included feelings of depression and loneliness. The men's reports indicated that, in comparison to their former girlfriends, they felt less happy and less free. Zeiss, Zeiss, and Johnson (1980) also stated that women adjust better emotionally, as measured by a mood state and an adjustment scale, after a divorce. Therefore, females may feel less distressed than males following terminated relationships because females remember relationships as dissatisfying. In addition, females may be less distressed by a break-up because they assign responsibility for the break-up to their ex-partners.

#### Responsibility Attributions

Research in the area of responsibility attributions with couples has shown that distress, gender, and type of event (negative or positive) interact with the kind of attribution made, internal (to self) or external (to other). Thompson and Kelley (1981) found that people in



satisfying relationships attributed more responsibility for positive events to their partners.

However, Kelley (1979) and Fincham (1985) both found that distressed spouses attributed their partners' negative behaviors to internal factors or personality characteristics of their partners. Nondistressed spouses, on the other hand, attributed negative spousal behavior to factors external to their partners. Distressed spouses tended to blame their partners and their relationships for their distress.

There also seems to be a gender difference as to whether distress is related to external attributions. Holtzworth-Munroe and Jacobson (1985) compared the husbands' and wives' attributions, and they concluded that the presence of distress in a relationship was related to whether or not the husband had attributional thoughts. Husbands in distressed or dissatisfying relationships made more causal attributions than husbands in nondistressed relationships. The presence or absence of distress was not related to the number of causal attributions made by the wives; they made attributions even in satisfying relationships. Distressed couples, however, were more likely to report making distress-maintaining attributions. In addition, negative behaviors or events resulted in more

attributions than did positive behaviors. The subjects were more likely to blame their partners for negative events, but not give them credit for positive events. If a positive event occurred, the partners were more likely to take responsibility themselves. The authors stated that perhaps women are more likely to make external attributions because they are socialized to be more cognizant of conflict within relationships.

Madden and Janoff-Bulman (1981) looked at attributions made specifically by married women. They found that women who assumed more blame or responsibility tended to be more satisfied than those women who blamed their husbands. Therefore, blaming the husband was negatively associated with marital satisfaction while satisfaction was positively related to the wives' perceptions of control over events. The authors concluded that the wives saw their husbands as being the partner who determined how bad the marital conflicts were. The wives, however, saw themselves as responsible for the more positive aspects of the marriage.

Lloyd and Cate (1985) examined the types of attributions that were made in conjunction with the stage of the relationship. They found that in the beginning of a relationship, more dyadic (self and other), as opposed

to individual (self or other), network (combination of factors), or circumstantial (not related to self or other) attributions were made. Dyadic attributions, however, decreased over the courses of the relationships while the number of individual attributions increased significantly during the unstable stages. Near the ends of the relationships, almost half of the attributions were individual ones. The other two types, circumstantial and network, remained constant. The authors also found a gender difference; males tended to make slightly more dyadic attributions for turning points while females made more individual attributions. In addition, females gave fewer dyadic and circumstantial and more individual attributions for negative changes in the possibility that they and their partners would marry. These results were affected by the gender of the partner who initiated the breakup. If a female initiated it, the male gave network and circumstantial (external) reasons. If a male initiated it, the female made more internal, individual attributions.

It seems that the process of making attributions does not end when the relationship does. Harvey, Wells, and Alvarez (1978) concluded that people continue to make attributions even after the relationship has ended. The

subjects gave responsibility to their partners, and this process seemed to lower the subject's opinion and decrease the importance of the partner.

The effect of a depressed mood on attributional activity was investigated by Tennen, Herzberger, and Nelson (1987). They found that the level of self-esteem was a better predictor of attributional style for negative events than was depression. More specifically, low scores on measures of self-esteem were correlated with internal, stable, and global attributions for negative or unpleasant events. Consequently, individuals with relatively low levels of self-esteem may be more likely to make internal attributions.

Of course, it is difficult to determine whether distress in a relationship leads to external attributions or whether making external attributions causes distress. However, according to Holtworth-Munroe and Jacobson (1985), distress is unrelated to whether wives attribute negative events to their husbands. Why do women make more external attributions? Two possible explanations are: 1) Women feel less in control of their relationships than men do. 2) Women experience more cognitive dissonance following a break-up because the relationship was more important to them and they invested more effort to

continue them. Seeing the man as being responsible for ending the relationship decreases the woman's level of cognitive dissonance and distress.

McRae and Kohen (1988) said that women make more external attributions because of the relatively greater investments they had. The authors also stated that because women spend more time and effort engaged in family roles they were less exposed to secular forces. Exposure to these secular forces were thought to increase the likelihood of a person making attributions to circumstances, instead of personality characteristics.

In summary, if one is to believe the view presented by popular books, it seems that women are less satisfied in relationships than men. This concept may be inaccurate; women may remember being less satisfied in relationships than they actually were at the time. Their retrospective views may be distorted as a result of the relationships' negative outcome. Therefore, while in a relationship, a woman might give one satisfaction rating, but following a break-up, she might report having been much less satisfied than she initially reported. Her retrospective memories of feelings and events may be distorted in a way to make them more similar to her current thoughts and feelings about the relationship.

Although women may be more invested in continuing their relationships, it seems that men are more distressed when relationships end. Perhaps women are less distressed than men because women remember the relationships as dissatisfying and they assign responsibility for the break-up to their partners.

I devised four specific questions to test these explanations. First, do males and females rate satisfaction in a relationship differently? Second, how well do people remember feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction they had during relationships, and are their memories affected by the relationship's outcome? Third, does the relationship's outcome affect recall of positive and negative events and feelings? Fourth, do males and females attribute responsibility for positive and negative events and feelings differently depending on the outcome of the relationship and the individual's level of self-esteem?

In order to answer the first question, I conducted an experiment in which an equal number of males and females responded to a questionnaire based on a story of a romantic relationship between two fictional characters. The story had two alternate ending scenarios, stay-together or break-up. The extent to which males and

females differentially rate satisfaction in a relationship, if indeed they do, was assessed by asking subjects to rate the characters' levels of satisfaction with the relationship. It was hypothesized that males and females would rate David's and Lisa's satisfaction as approximately equal.

The second question, whether one gender more accurately recalls judgments of satisfaction, was answered by instructing subjects to recall, after 1 week, the satisfaction ratings they gave initially. It was then possible to determine whether the outcome of the relationship affected recall of satisfaction ratings. It was predicted that females who read the break-up scenario would recall their initial satisfaction ratings as lower than they actually were. Females reading the stay-together scenario were expected to recall their initial ratings as higher than they were. It was predicted that males would accurately recall satisfaction ratings, regardless of which scenario they received.

To answer the third question about retrospective memory for events, subjects answered a series of questions, some of which were presented immediately after Scenario 1 and some that were given 1 week later, after the ending scenario. The purpose of this questionnaire

was to assess whether one gender group recalled more information about the relationship and whether the amount and type of information recalled was affected by the relationship's outcome. It was expected that females receiving the break-up scenario would remember more negative than positive facts and feelings and females reading the stay-together scenario would remember more positive than negative information.

To answer the fourth question, subjects completed an attribution questionnaire. I hoped to see whether males and females differentially attributed responsibility for positive and negative events to the male, the female, or external circumstances. It was expected that females who received the break-up scenario would attribute a higher percentage of responsibility for negative than positive events to the male character. Females who received the stay together scenario were expected to attribute more responsibility for positive events to the male while attributing less responsibility for negative events to him. Males were expected to attribute equal amounts of responsibility to the male and female characters, regardless of the relationship's outcome. The effect of self-esteem was not predicted on any of the questionnaires because the literature is inconsistent regarding its



influence on recall and attribution. To assess the degree of correlation between performance in this experiment and the subject's satisfaction with his or her own current or past monogamous relationship, a personal history questionnaire was administered.

## Method

Subjects

One hundred and seventy-eight subjects, 89 males and 89 females, recruited from introductory psychology classes participated in this experiment. Fifty of these 178 subjects, 25 males and 25 females, participated in a preliminary part of the study while the other 128 subjects participated in the main experiment.

Approximately 300 introductory psychology students were screened using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and selected for participation based on their gender and scores. The maximum possible score was 50; the minimum possible score was 10. All scores were arranged in descending order, and 100 female subjects, achieving extreme scores, the 50 highest and 50 lowest, were chosen. Females with the fifty highest scores were placed in the high self-esteem group, and females with the 50 lowest scores were put in the low self-esteem group. Then, approximately 100 males, whose scores matched those of the female group, were selected from the subject pool. Because males tend to have higher self-esteem scores, females were chosen first to maximize the probability of equivalence. If the male group had been chosen first, the means for the groups would have been disparate. Subjects

from each self-esteem group were selected at random and asked to participate in the study. The process continued until 178 subjects, 89 males and 89 females, had been tested. Scores for the low self-esteem group ( $\bar{M}$  male=34.2,  $\bar{M}$  female=34.3) ranged from 25 to 37, and scores for the high self-esteem group ( $\bar{M}$  male=41.7,  $\bar{M}$  female=42.6) ranged from 39 to 48. Some subjects, approximately 30, elected to not participate or complete all phases of the experiment.

### Materials

The subjects were asked to respond to a total of nine different questionnaires. First, each subjects completed the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). This scale provides a general measure of esteem. Subjects also completed a personal history questionnaire on which they rated their feelings about a current or past monogamous relationship. This questionnaire consisted of five semantic differential items, each on a 7-point scale.

The remaining questionnaires were based on a story presented to each subject that provided information about two main characters, David and Lisa, and their relationship as it developed over a 2-year period. A story, as opposed to real events, was used because of the greater ease of manipulation. Of course, the assumption

made with using this technique is that subjects will identify with the characters, particularly of the same gender, experience thoughts and feelings as if they were in the story, a process similar to the one expressed through projective story telling. Fincham and Beach (1988) stated that the pattern of responses made by distressed and nondistressed groups did not differ according to whether the scenarios were real or hypothetical.

The entire story consisted of three parts. Scenario 1 included both positive and negative aspects of the romantic relationship between David and Lisa during the first year. The break-up and stay-together scenarios were continuations of scenario 1. At the end of the break-up scenario, David and Lisa mutually agreed to end the relationship the day before they both graduated from college. The intention of the author was to present the relationship in a way that did not give responsibility for the outcome to either partner. The stay-together scenario provided the same information as the break-up scenario except that David and Lisa decided to continue their relationship after graduation. Again, responsibility for the outcome was not given exclusively to either partner.

The third and fourth questionnaires centered around the partners' satisfaction in the relationship as assessed

by their feelings on 14 scales. The scales were presented as semantic differential items based on aspects of a romantic relationship. The overall score was calculated by summing the values of the 14 7-point scales. The subjects were instructed to judge how Lisa and David saw themselves in the relationship. The "good" and "bad" extremes were alternated, so that the "good" side was sometimes on the right end of the scale and sometimes on the left end. The subjects rated David and Lisa's viewpoints on separate forms. The presentation of the questionnaires were alternated so that Lisa's feelings were rated first by half of the subjects.

Next, there were two questionnaires on which subjects answered specific questions about feelings and events that occurred during the first year of the relationship. These questions were divided into five categories: positive, negative, and neutral facts and positive and negative feelings. A positive feeling question asked about emotions such as love, joy, happiness, etc., for example, "How did Lisa feel about David's Christmas gift to her?" A negative feeling question asked for a response of hate, anger, jealousy, etc, "How did Lisa feel about David's job?" A positive fact was one that might increase the probability that the relationship would continue, and a

negative fact was one that might decrease this possibility. The questions presented on these questionnaires were selected on the basis of independent ratings of five naive clinical psychology graduate students. They decided in which category a question best fit.

From a pool of 98 questions that were designed by the researcher, these raters agreed, with an accordance rate between 80 and 100%, on the placement of 66 questions into the five categories: positive feeling, negative feeling, positive fact, negative fact, neutral fact. Of these 66 questions, seven were placed in each of the following categories: positive feeling, negative feeling, positive fact, negative fact. The remaining 38 questions were judged to best fit the neutral fact category. Questions not receiving an 80-100% agreement rate were not used.

To control for a questionnaire effect, difficulty scores were obtained from the responses of the 50 subjects who participated in the preliminary study. All 66 questions were presented on three forms; the questions were in a different random order on each form. The score was calculated by determining how many subjects were able to answer a question correctly. A difficult question was one which few subjects answered correctly, with either the

accurate fact or feeling as presented in the story. Naive assistants, undergraduate psychology students, scored the questionnaires.

After obtaining a level of difficulty score for each question, the group of questions were divided into two separate questionnaires, A-1 and B-1, which had 33 questions each and equivalent overall levels of difficulty. To control for a possible question order effect, three additional versions of A-1 and B-1 were constructed, A-2, A-3, A-4, B-2, B-3, B-4. The questions were in a different random order on each version of these two questionnaires. Instructions on these eight questionnaires were altered somewhat to create the questionnaires used to assess memory for details: A-1HTH, A-2XYZ, A-3TED, A-4MNK, B-1YYY, B-2VMK, B-3OPD, B-4RST. For ease of explanation, the questionnaires will be referred to as A-1 and B-1.

On the seventh and eighth questionnaires, subjects recalled David's and Lisa's satisfaction during the first year of the relationship. Again, recall of David's satisfaction was assessed on one questionnaire, and recall of Lisa's satisfaction was assessed on a separate questionnaire. The order of presentation was alternated to control for a possible order effect.

On the ninth questionnaire, the subjects assigned responsibility for three negative feelings, three positive feelings, three negative facts, and three positive facts. The attribution questionnaire contained 15 items in all. The subject decided how much responsibility, on a scale from 0 to 100%, to assign to David, Lisa, and/or other circumstances. The subjects attributed responsibility to one, two, or three of the choices in equal or unequal amounts. Regardless of how the responsibility was divided, the total amount for each item equaled 100%.

#### Procedure

Difficulty scores for each of the 66 questions were calculated using responses from subjects in the preliminary study. Fifty subjects read the first part of the story and responded to the questions. After the questions were scored by blind assistants and placed on A-1 and B-1, the rest of the subjects, 64 males and 64 females, participated in the main experiment.

In the main experiment, each subject completed the personal history questionnaire. He or she then read scenario 1 of the story about David and Lisa's relationship. After reading this scenario, the subject responded to the questionnaires about David's and Lisa's feelings in the relationship during the first year. The



order of presentation of the forms was alternated so that half of the subjects judged Lisa's feelings first, and half of the subjects judged David's feelings first.

After completing the feeling questionnaires, the subject then completed A-1 or B-1. Half of the subjects received A-1, and half received B-1. An equal number of males and females responded to each of the two questionnaires. Completion of one of these questionnaires marked the end of the initial session for the subject.

Each subject returned approximately 1 week later to finish the experiment. Again, he or she was placed in a room by himself or herself. Next, half of the subjects read the stay-together scenario, and half read the break-up scenario. Each scenario was presented to an equal number of males and females. After reading one of these scenarios, the subject recalled how satisfied David and Lisa were during the first year of their relationship. The subject then answered questions on A-1HTH or B-1YYY, or an equivalent form, depending upon which questionnaire he or she received during the first session of the experiment. If a subject responded to A-1 in the first session, he or she now received B-1YYY. Likewise, if he or she received B-1 initially, he or she was presented

with A-1HTH. Lastly, each subject completed the attribution questionnaire.

## Results

Initial Satisfaction Ratings

This analysis included scores on three questionnaires, personal history, David's satisfaction, and Lisa's satisfaction. Subjects completed the personal history questionnaire at the beginning of the experiment and the satisfaction questionnaires immediately after reading Scenario 1. The personal history questionnaire asked gender, monogamous relationship status (none, current, past), and satisfaction with most recent monogamous relationship, as rated on five semantic differential items, each on a 7-point scale. The minimum score was 5; the maximum score was 35. Four subjects who had never been in monogamous relationships were given median scores.

Correlations were computed between scores on the personal history questionnaire, gender, relationship status, relationship satisfaction, and scores on all other questionnaires. The personal satisfaction score was negatively correlated with the initial ( $r(255) = -.179$ ,  $p < .004$ ) and recalled ( $r(255) = -.233$ ,  $p < .0001$ ) satisfaction ratings. The more satisfied a person was with his or her own current or past relationship, the less satisfied he or she saw David and Lisa.

Subjects were also instructed to judge the characters' satisfaction with their relationship during the first year. A 2 (subject's gender) X 2 (character) X 2 (self-esteem) ANCOVA was used to analyze the data from the initial satisfaction questionnaires in order to remove the effect of personal history on David's and Lisa's satisfaction ratings. The only variable that significantly affected initial satisfaction ratings was that of the character,  $F(1,124)=172.15$ ,  $p<.001$ . The mean rating of Lisa's satisfaction ( $M=38.34$ ) was significantly higher than the mean rating of David's satisfaction ( $M=31.27$ ).

#### Recall of Satisfaction

Subjects rated David's and Lisa's satisfaction with their relationship at the 1-year anniversary again after reading the final scenario, one in which the characters either broke up or stayed together. A 2 (self-esteem) X 2 (character) X 2 (outcome) X 2 (time) X 2 (subject's gender) ANCOVA showed three significant effects, one main effect and two interactions. The character effect was again significant,  $F(1,120)=83.21$ ,  $p<.0001$ . Lisa's satisfaction ( $M=36.87$ ) was judged to be higher than David's satisfaction ( $M=32.88$ ).

In addition, there was a character by time effect that was significant at the .0001 level,  $F(1,120)=51.59$ . According to the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test, subjects remembered Lisa as being less satisfied ( $M=35.40$ ) at Time 2 than they had judged her at Time 1 ( $M=38.34$ ),  $p<.01$ . At Time 2, David was remembered as more satisfied ( $M=34.48$ ), than he was seen as being at Time 1 ( $M=31.27$ ),  $p<.01$ . The subjects judged Lisa as more satisfied in the relationship,  $p<.01$ , at Time 1 ( $M=38.34$ ) than David was ( $M=31.27$ ). There was no significant difference, however, between David's and Lisa's satisfaction at Time 2.

The interaction between the subject's gender and time was significant,  $F(1,120)=6.47$ ,  $p<.012$ . Males remembered giving higher ratings ( $M=35.92$ ) than females remembered giving ( $M=33.95$ ). Although the means were not significantly different, males tended to over-estimate their previous ratings ( $M T1=34.16$ ,  $M T2=35.92$ ); females tended to under-estimate prior ratings of satisfaction ( $M T1=35.45$ ,  $M T2=33.95$ ). The hypothesized interaction between subject's gender, outcome, and time was not significant. Although the interaction between subject's gender and time was significant, outcome had little effect on memory of satisfaction.

Memory Questionnaires

Each subject completed two memory questionnaires, one during the initial experimental session and another 1 week later. Each questionnaire was scored for accuracy by two blind graders. There were six graders, advanced undergraduate psychology students, that paired up in different combinations to comprise 11 teams. Some pairs agreed on scoring more often than other pairs. Percent agreement scores ranged from 82% to 100%. The average interrater agreement was 95% across all graders. The minimum team mean was 92%, and the maximum team mean was 98%.

On each questionnaire, the subject received a score for the percentage of items he or she answered correctly in the following categories: positive feeling, positive fact, negative feeling, negative fact. There were seven items per category with an additional five neutral items per questionnaire. Because the scores were in percentage form, an arcsine transformation was performed to decrease the correlation between means and variances. These transformed scores will be referred to as AT scores. The satisfaction ratings given on the personal history questionnaire did not significantly correlate with scores on the memory questionnaires; therefore, scores on the

memory questionnaires were analyzed using a 2 (subject's gender) X 2 (time) X 2 (self-esteem) X 2 (outcome) X 2 (kind of item) X 2 (affective tone) ANOVA.

There was a significant main effect for time,  $F(1,120)=481.95$ ,  $p<.0001$ . The subjects remembered more information about the story at Time 1 ( $M=1.03$ ) than at Time 2 ( $M=.44$ ). The kind of information requested, either fact or feeling, also had a significant effect on the number of correctly answered questions,  $F(1,120)=134.56$ ,  $p<.0001$ . Overall, questions asking about feelings that someone in the story experienced were answered correctly ( $M=.86$ ) more often than questions asking for factual information ( $M=.60$ ),  $p<.01$ .

The time effect significantly interacted with the kind of item, either fact or feeling,  $F(1,120)=7.96$ ,  $p<.009$ . At Time 1, subjects remembered more feelings ( $M=1.13$ ) than facts ( $M=.93$ ),  $p<.01$ . Recall was better for feelings ( $M=.59$ ) than facts ( $M=.28$ ) at Time 2 as well,  $p<.01$ . More information was recalled at Time 1 ( $M$  feelings=1.13,  $M$  facts=.93) than at Time 2 ( $M$  feelings=.59,  $M$  facts=.28),  $p<.01$ . A t-test showed that subjects forgot more factual information from Time 1 ( $M=.93$ ) to Time 2 ( $M=.28$ ) than affective information ( $M$  T1=1.13;  $M$  T2=.59),  $t=7.73$ ,  $p<.01$ .

The affective quality, whether information was positive or negative, interacted with the kind of question, fact or feeling, at the .011 level,  $F(1,120)=6.67$ . Subjects remembered more positive ( $M=.90$ ) than negative feelings ( $M=.82$ ),  $p<.01$ , and more positive feelings ( $M=.90$ ) than positive facts ( $M=.59$ ),  $p<.01$ . Subjects remembered more information regarding negative feelings ( $M=.82$ ) than negative facts ( $M=.62$ ),  $p<.01$ . However, there was no significant difference between the AT percentage of recalled positive ( $M=.59$ ) versus negative facts ( $M=.62$ ).

There was a significant interaction between subject's gender, time, and outcome, stay-together (ST) or break-up (BU),  $F(1,120)=11.02$ ,  $p<.001$ . Males ( $M$  BU=1.03,  $M$  ST=.99) remembered more items at Time 1 than at Time 2 ( $M$  BU=.40,  $M$  ST=.45),  $p<.01$ , regardless of outcome. Females also remembered more at Time 1 ( $M$  BU=.96,  $M$  ST=1.14) than at Time 2 ( $M$  BU=.50,  $M$  ST=.39),  $p<.01$ . There was one significant difference between means for males and females at Time 2. Females who received the stay-together scenario recalled more information about the story ( $M=1.14$ ) than males who received the same scenario ( $M=.99$ ),  $p<.01$ .



Attribution Questionnaire

All subjects completed the attribution questionnaire at the end of Phase II. A 2 (self-esteem) X 2 (outcome) X 2 (subject's gender) X 2 (kind of item) X 2 (affective valence) X 3 (responsible party) ANOVA showed a significant difference in the percentage of responsibility attributed to David, Lisa, and circumstances,  $F(2,240)=521.40$ ,  $p<.0001$ . Subjects judged David ( $M=.75$ ) as generally more responsible for events in the relationship than Lisa ( $M=.69$ ) or circumstances ( $M=.31$ ),  $p<.01$ . Lisa, however, was seen as having a greater impact on events than circumstances,  $p<.01$ .

The subject's gender significantly interacted with how the responsibility was divided between the three choices,  $F(2,240)=4.02$ ,  $p<.019$ . Females and males attributed more responsibility to David ( $M$  males=.73,  $M$  females=.76) than to Lisa ( $M$  males=.68,  $M$  females=.69) or circumstances ( $M$  males=.34,  $M$  females=.28),  $p<.01$ , and more to Lisa than to circumstances,  $p<.01$ . Males, however, attributed more responsibility to circumstances ( $M=.34$ ) than females did ( $M=.28$ ),  $p<.05$ .

The AT percentage of responsibility assigned to the three choices differed according to the subject's gender and the outcome of the story they received,  $F(2,240)=5.11$ ,

$p < .007$ . Males who received the outcome depicting a break-up between David and Lisa attributed more responsibility to circumstances ( $M = .38$ ) than males who received the scenario where they stayed together ( $M = .30$ ),  $p < .01$ . They also attributed more responsibility to David ( $M = .73$ ) than to Lisa ( $M = .66$ ),  $p < .05$ , or circumstances ( $M = .38$ ),  $p < .01$ . Males, however, who received the version where David and Lisa stayed together did not significantly assign more responsibility to David ( $M = .74$ ) than to Lisa ( $M = .71$ ), but both David and Lisa were judged as more responsible than circumstances ( $M = .30$ ),  $p < .01$ . Males who received the break-up scenario, however, assigned more responsibility to circumstances ( $M = .38$ ) than females who received the same scenario ( $M = .26$ ),  $p < .01$ . Males who read the break-up scenario attributed more responsibility to David ( $M = .73$ ) than to Lisa ( $M = .66$ ),  $p < .05$ , or to circumstances ( $M = .38$ ),  $p < .01$ . Females, on the other hand, attributed more responsibility to David ( $M_{BU} = .77$ ,  $M_{ST} = .76$ ) than to Lisa ( $M_{BU} = .69$ ,  $M_{ST} = .68$ ) or circumstances ( $M_{BU} = .26$ ,  $M_{ST} = .31$ ), regardless of the relationship's outcome.

There was a significant interaction between the type of event, affective or nonaffective, and the responsible force, David, Lisa, or circumstances,  $F(2, 240) = 41.26$ ,

$p < .0001$ . Subjects saw David as being more responsible for emotions in the relationship ( $M = .79$ ) than Lisa ( $M = .64$ ) or circumstances ( $M = .31$ ),  $p < .01$ . They saw Lisa, however, as more responsible for nonaffective events ( $M = .73$ ) than David ( $M = .70$ ) or circumstances ( $M = .31$ ),  $p < .05$ . Likewise, Lisa was assigned more responsibility for events ( $M = .73$ ) than feelings ( $M = .64$ ),  $p < .01$ . David, on the other hand, was seen as more responsible for feelings ( $M = .79$ ) than events ( $M = .70$ ),  $p < .01$ .

The affective quality, either positive or negative, of the fact or feeling had an effect on the percentage of responsibility attributed to David, Lisa, or circumstances,  $F(2, 240) = 61.52$ ,  $p < .0001$ . More positive ( $M = .73$ ) than negative ( $M = .64$ ) facts or feelings were assigned to Lisa,  $p < .01$ . Subjects saw David as more responsible for negative facts or feelings ( $M = .75$ ) than Lisa ( $M = .64$ ),  $p < .01$ . When responsibility was given to circumstances, it was more likely to be for negative ( $M = .39$ ) rather than positive ( $M = .23$ ) events,  $p < .01$ .

There was also a significant interaction between the choices (David, Lisa, circumstances), the affective quality of the events (positive or negative), and the type of item (fact or feeling),  $F(2, 240) = 16.94$ ,  $p < .0001$ . David was seen as more responsible for positive feelings ( $M = .76$ )

in the relationship than Lisa ( $\underline{M}=.70$ ),  $p<.01$ , but he was also seen as more responsible for negative feelings ( $\underline{M}=.82$ ) than Lisa ( $\underline{M}=.58$ ),  $p<.01$ . More responsibility was assigned to David for positive feelings ( $\underline{M}=.76$ ) than positive facts ( $\underline{M}=.73$ ),  $p<.05$ , and also for negative feelings ( $\underline{M}=.82$ ) than negative facts ( $\underline{M}=.68$ ),  $p<.01$ . David was given more responsibility for negative ( $\underline{M}=.82$ ) than positive feelings ( $\underline{M}=.76$ ),  $p<.01$ , but he was given more responsibility for positive ( $\underline{M}=.73$ ) rather than negative facts ( $\underline{M}=.68$ ),  $p<.01$ .

Lisa was seen as more responsible for positive facts ( $\underline{M}=.76$ ) than David ( $\underline{M}=.73$ ),  $p<.05$ . She was assigned a much higher percentage of responsibility for positive ( $\underline{M}=.70$ ) than negative ( $\underline{M}=.58$ ) feelings,  $p<.01$ . The subjects rated her as more responsible for negative facts ( $\underline{M}=.71$ ) than negative feelings ( $\underline{M}=.58$ ),  $p<.01$ . Lisa was judged as more responsible for positive facts ( $\underline{M}=.76$ ) than positive feelings ( $\underline{M}=.70$ ),  $p<.01$ , and she was also seen as more responsible for positive facts ( $\underline{M}=.76$ ) than negative facts ( $\underline{M}=.71$ ),  $p<.01$ .

The amount of responsibility assigned to uncontrollable circumstances was higher for affectively negative facts ( $\underline{M}=.41$ ) than positive facts ( $\underline{M}=.31$ ),  $p<.01$ . Circumstances were also seen as more of a force in

determining negative ( $\underline{M}=.37$ ) rather than positive ( $\underline{M}=.26$ ) feelings,  $p<.01$ . More positive feelings ( $\underline{M}=.26$ ) were attributed to circumstances than were positive facts ( $\underline{M}=.21$ ),  $p<.05$ , and more negative facts ( $\underline{M}=.41$ ) were attributed to circumstances than were negative feelings ( $\underline{M}=.37$ ),  $p<.05$ .

## Discussion

It was hypothesized that the relationship's outcome would significantly affect subjects' performance, especially females' performance, on questionnaires measuring recall of satisfaction, memory for details, and assignment of responsibility. More specifically, females who read the break-up scenario were expected to remember Lisa as being less satisfied that they had originally seen her and to recall fewer positive and more negative details about the relationship. In addition, it was predicted that these females would attribute more responsibility for negative events to David than Lisa. These hypotheses, however, were only partially supported.

On the attribution questionnaire, character's gender influenced the way responsibility was assigned to David, Lisa, or circumstances. Both males and females saw David as being more responsible for positive and negative emotions than Lisa or external circumstances. There are two possible explanations for this result. First, David may have inadvertently been presented as more responsible. Second, the subjects may have differentially assigned responsibility to David and Lisa depending upon stereotypic views of gender roles in relationships. Women may attribute more responsibility to their partners than

to themselves because they are conditioned to be less assertive. They do not see themselves as guiding their relationships. Although females would influence events in their relationships by acting passively, the influence may be harder to detect than the more direct male route. Males, however, may be willing to accept more responsibility than is necessary because it is socially acceptable for them to be assertive and influence relationships.

Relationship outcome interacted with subject's gender and character on this questionnaire. In the stay-together condition, males saw David and Lisa as being about equally responsible for events, but in the break-up condition, they gave David and circumstances more responsibility. Males may have been willing to accept responsibility when the relationship continued, but when it ended, they looked for other forces with which to share responsibility. They did not, however, turn to Lisa. Instead, they attributed more responsibility to circumstances than males who read the stay-together scenario. Male subjects did not assign responsibility for the break up to David or Lisa. In general, they saw Lisa as having little emotional impact, either positive or negative, on the relationship. Perhaps assigning responsibility for the break up to circumstances

poses less of a threat to male self-esteem than taking responsibility or giving it to the female.

Females did not increase the amount of responsibility given to circumstances when the relationship ended. Perhaps the females who read the break-up scenario did not need to find an alternate source of responsibility. Seeing David as the cause of the relationship's outcome was probably less threatening to female self-esteem because a female's stereotypic social role is to be passive. Therefore, when a female assigns responsibility to a male, she is acting in accordance with gender role expectations, but when a male gives responsibility to a female, he is acting against social roles.

The only other instance of relationship outcome affecting the dependent variable occurred on the memory for details questionnaire where it interacted with subjects' gender and time. The effect, however, occurred for scores at Time 1, before subjects read the last installment of the story. Therefore, this result only signifies that subjects in one group remembered more accurately than subjects in the other group, but not as a result of independent variable manipulation.

Again, it was predicted that relationship outcome, character, and subject gender would interact with time so



that subjects would recall David's and Lisa's satisfaction at Time 2 as a greater or lesser than at Time 1, depending upon which scenario they received. Females were expected to remember Lisa as being less satisfied than she had initially been seen if they read the break-up scenario. If they received the stay-together scenario, it was predicted that they would recall her initial satisfaction as being higher.

When asked to recall the characters' initial satisfaction, subjects remembered Lisa as being less satisfied than they had seen her initially, and they remembered David as being more satisfied than they had originally judged him to be. It seems that either the results is a function of regression to the mean or subjects relied heavily on stereotypic views of men and women when recalling satisfaction. The more interesting and complicated explanation, differential recall, will be discussed in greater detail here. The female was remembered as being less satisfied, and the male was remembered as more satisfied. On the surface, these results appear to coincide with the basic premise presented in many popular psychology books, that women are less satisfied in relationships. However, it may be more

accurate to say that women are remembered as being less satisfied than they were seen at the time.

Although subjects' recall of character satisfaction seemed to be a function of stereotypy, real gender differences emerged on the recall of satisfaction questionnaires as well. Males remembered giving higher ratings for both David and Lisa than females remembered giving. Males tended to over-estimate their previous ratings, and females tended to under-estimate prior satisfaction ratings. In real life, males may remember themselves and their partners as being happier in relationships than they really were at the time. Females, conversely, might remember themselves and their partners as being less satisfied than they really were. Therefore, the stereotype may have a basis in reality, and women's retrospective accounts of their own satisfaction may be negatively distorted, regardless of the relationship's outcome.

Why do females distort in a negative direction while males distort in a positive direction? One possible explanation is that males and females rely on different aspects of the relationship to make judgments. Both males and females remembered affective information more often than they remembered factual information, and information

was more likely to be recalled if it were positive, rather than negative, in valence. If females are truly more attentive to conflict within relationships as a result of the relationships' relatively greater importance, they may focus on negative or unpleasant memories more than males do. Their memories, therefore, may be more negative.

Time also affected the AT scores subjects received on the memory for details questionnaires. Overall, subjects remembered more emotional than factual information, and they remembered more information at Time 1 than they did 1 week later. Time interacted with the kind of information requested, either fact or feeling; subjects forgot more factual than emotional information from Time 1 to Time 2.

The character effect was evident on the initial satisfaction rating questionnaire as well. At Time 1, both males and females saw Lisa as being more satisfied in the relationship. This effect can be explained in two ways. First, people may inaccurately view women as generally more satisfied in relationships than men are. Subjects may have assumed that a relationship was relatively more important to Lisa because of societal demands placed on college females to be in monogamous relationships. They may have then judged her to be more satisfied, even if she were not, just because she was in a

relationship at all. A second explanation is that Lisa was inadvertently presented as more satisfied in the first part of the story. Although the scenario was constructed in a way to avoid such an interpretation, the attempt may have failed.

David was seen as having a greater emotional impact on the relationship. Although this interpretation is consistent with the idea that males are culturally encouraged to initiate relationships, it is incongruent with the concept that females invest more time, energy, and emotion. It is possible that the investment made by females is much more subtle and harder to identify than the male's influence. Lisa's contribution was seen as being greater than David's in the arena of practical, nonaffective events, such as arranging dates, instead of emotions. This result adds support to the idea that Lisa's contribution to the relationship was less obvious and perhaps less memorable than David's.

The kind of information and its valence interacted with character choice on the attribution questionnaire. The subjects did not see Lisa as having much of an impact on emotions, but they did see her influence as being more positive than negative. In fact, she was judged to have very little responsibility for negative feelings in the

relationship. She seemed to be a less significant force than David, but, conversely, she was not "blamed" either. This concept is congruent with the stereotypic view of women as ineffectual victims who are not responsible for finding or making satisfying relationships. It is this stereotype that is portrayed in popular psychology literature.

It was predicted that level of self-esteem would affect female subjects' performance, but no effect was found. An assessment measure more sensitive than the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale may have been needed. In addition, the difference between the high and low self-esteem groups may not have been discrepant enough, thus resulting in decreased power of the experiment to show self-esteem effects. Future research might use stricter methods of measuring self-esteem and grouping subjects based on the assessment. Furthermore, assessment of males' and females' views of themselves and others in relationships would help determine the existence of stereotypic gender roles.

## References

- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., & Rodgers, W. L. (1976). The quality of American life. New York: Sage Russell Foundation.
- Cockrum, J., & White, P. (1985). Influences on the life satisfaction of never-married men and women. Family Relations, 34, 551-556.
- Conway, M., & Ross, M. (1984). Getting what you want by revising what you had. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 738-748.
- Fincham, F. D. (1985). Attribution processes in distressed and nondistressed couples: 2. Responsibility for marital problems. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 94, 183-190.
- Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (1988). Attributional processes in distressed and nondistressed couples: 5. Real versus hypothetical events. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 12, 505-514.
- Goethals, G. R., & Reckman, R. F. (1973). The perception of consistency in attitudes. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9, 491-501.
- Harvey, J. H., Well, G. L., & Alvarez, M. D. (1978). Attribution in the context of conflict and separation in close relationships. In J. H. Harvey, W. Ickes, &

- R. F. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attributional research: Vol. 2. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Hendrick, S. S., Hendrick, C., & Adler, N. L. (1988). Romantic relationships: Love, satisfaction, and staying together. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 980-988.
- Holmes, D. S. (1970). Differential change in affective intensity and the forgetting of unpleasant personal experiences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15, 234-239.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, M., Jacobson, N. S. (1985). Causal attributions of married couples: When do they search for causes? What do they conclude when they do? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1398-1412.
- Kelley, H. H. (1979). Personal relationships: Their structures and processes. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Lloyd, S. A., & Cate, R. M. (1985). Attributions associated with significant turning points in premarital relationship development and dissolution. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2, 419-436.

- Madden, M. E., & Janoff-Bulman, R. (1981). Blame, control, and marital satisfaction: Wives' attributions for conflict in marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 663-674.
- Major, B. (1987). Gender, justice, and the psychology of entitlement. In P. Shaver & C. Hendrick (Eds.), Sex and gender. Review of personality and social psychology research: 7. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McFarland, C., & Ross, M. (1987). The relation between current impressions and memories of self and dating partners. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 13, 228-238.
- McRae, J. A., & Kohen, J. A. (1988). Changes in attributions of marital problems. Social Psychology Quarterly, 51, 74-80.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Ross, M., McFarland, C., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (1981). The effect of attitude on the recall of personal histories. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 627-634.
- Ross, M. R., & Shulman, R. F. (1973). Increasing the salience of initial attitudes: Dissonance versus



- self-perception theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 28, 138-144.
- Rubin, Z., Peplau, L. A., & Hill, C. T. (1981). Loving and leaving: Sex differences in romantic attachments. Sex Roles, 7, 821-835.
- Rusbult, C. E., Zembrodt, I. M., & Iwaniszek, J. (1986). The impact of gender and sex-role orientation on responses to dissatisfaction in close relationships. Sex Roles, 15, 1-20.
- Snyder, M., & Uranowitz, S. W. (1978). Reconstructing the past: Some cognitive consequences of person perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 941-950.
- Tennen, H., Herzberger, S., & Nelson, H. F. (1987). Depressive attributional style: The role of self-esteem. Journal of Personality, 55, 631-660.
- Thompson, S. C., & Kelley, H. H. (1981). Judgments of responsibility for activities in close relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 469-477.
- Zeiss, A. M., Zeiss, R. A., & Johnson, S. M. (1980). Sex differences in initiation of and adjustment to divorce. Journal of Divorce, 4, 21-33.

APPENDIXES







## APPENDIX D

## QUESTIONNAIRE A-1

Please answer each of the following questions. The information was given in the story about David and Lisa.

- A16. What sport did David play in high school?
- A43. How much money did David win playing poker?
- A49. How did Lisa feel about watching sports on TV?
- A39. What did Lisa do for David for Valentine's Day?
- A51. How did David feel about the outcome of the poker game?
- A36. What was David's roommate's name?
- B45. What was the name of the doctor who called Lisa about the pregnancy test?
- A14. Why was Lisa reluctant to agree not to date anybody else?
- A48. How did Lisa's parents feel about David?
- A21. What instrument did Lisa play when she was younger?
- A33. What was Lisa's sister's name?
- A25. What month was it that they had their worst fight?
- A15. What kind of medal did David win in high school?
- B36. What time of year did Lisa hike into the Grand Canyon?
- A26. What was the name of the band that played on their second date?

- B32. At whose apartment did David and Lisa first spend the night together?
- A31. What were things like for David and Lisa after Christmas break?
- A8. What was Lisa's first roommate's name?
- B16. How did David like the poetry reading?
- A6. What park did David and Lisa go to during the summer when he came to visit?
- B39. Is David's brother older or younger than David?
- B44. How did David feel when Lisa first told him that she might be pregnant?
- A2. What kind of movie was the 2nd movie they saw together?
- A1. What kind of dinner did David's parents take them out for?
- A24. When did David tell Lisa that he loved her?
- A20. When did Lisa want to go to Europe?
- A17. What did Lisa make for their summer picnics?
- B8. What was Lisa's favorite drink?
- A27. What was the name of Lisa's friend that she came to the first Halloween party with?
- A3. What kind of bracelet did David give Lisa?
- B29. What was Lisa's former boyfriend's name?

- A11. What kind of test did David have the day that he met Lisa?
- A52. How did David feel when he and Lisa had picnics in the park?



## APPENDIX E

## QUESTIONNAIRE B-1

Please answer each of the following questions. The information was given in the story about David and Lisa.

41. How did Lisa know the guy who had the Halloween party?
24. Was Lisa renting or returning a video when she ran into David?
- A50. How did Lisa feel about David after the 1st time they had sex?
- B14. What was the name of Lisa's second roommate?
- B22. When was the first time they had sex (what month)?
- A42. During the summer, how did Lisa and her old boyfriend feel about each other?
- B13. What night of the week did Lisa think about canceling their first date?
- B9. What kind of animal did Lisa see in the Grand Canyon?
- B25. What kind of pet did David's roommate have?
- A32. How did Lisa feel about David's Christmas gift to her?
- A38. When did David accuse Lisa of still seeing her old boyfriend?
- B20. How was David dressed at the first Halloween party?

- B7. What did Lisa eat the first time they went to TCBY together?
- A23. Did David leave a message for Lisa with her roommate when he first called her?
- B33. Which friends did David go out with the week after his first date with Lisa?
- B34. Where did David and Lisa go on their date right after spring break?
- A22. At whose apartment was the party where David and Lisa met?
- B38. What was the name of the campus hangout they went to?
- B30. How did Lisa feel about David's job?
- B18. Where did David work?
- B37. What subjects did David and Lisa disagree about?
- A18. Describe how Lisa felt about David after their first date?
- A28. What color was Lisa's Halloween costume?
- B17. How did Lisa feel about David's mother (be specific)?
- A9. What did David give Lisa for Valentine's Day?
- B15. Where was David from?
- B40. What happened to Lisa when she was in the 2nd grade?

- B42. What was the name of the waitress who had a crush on David?
- B21. Who called whom on Christmas Eve?
- A35. What did David give Lisa for Christmas?
- B27. What did Lisa think about the first time she went home to Tulsa after going out with David?
- B5. What state did Lisa visit over Thanksgiving break?
- B19. What did David watch most on TV?





## APPENDIX H

## QUESTIONNAIRE A-1HTH

Please answer each of the following questions. All of the information was provided in the first part of the story that you read about David and Lisa (prior to completing the first questionnaire). The time period to which you should refer is the first year that David and Lisa dated.

- A16. What sport did David play in high school?
- A43. How much money did David win playing poker?
- A49. How did Lisa feel about watching sports on TV?
- A39. What did Lisa do for David for Valentine's Day?
- A51. How did David feel about the outcome of the poker game?
- A36. What was David's roommate's name?
- B45. What was the name of the doctor who called Lisa about the pregnancy test?
- A14. Why was Lisa reluctant to agree not to date anybody else?
- A48. How did Lisa's parents feel about David?
- A21. What instrument did Lisa play when she was younger?
- A33. What was Lisa's sister's name?
- A25. What month was it that they had their worst fight?
- A15. What kind of medal did David win in high school?

- B36. What time of year did Lisa hike into the Grand Canyon?
- A26. What was the name of the band that played on their second date?
- B32. At whose apartment did David and Lisa first spend the night together?
- A31. What were things like for David and Lisa after Christmas break?
- A8. What was Lisa's first roommate's name?
- B16. How did David like the poetry reading?
- A6. What park did David and Lisa go to during the summer when he came to visit?
- B39. Is David's brother older or younger than David?
- B44. How did David feel when Lisa first told him that she might be pregnant?
- A2. What kind of movie was the 2nd movie they saw together?
- A1. What kind of dinner did David's parents take them out for?
- A24. When did David tell Lisa that he loved her?
- A20. When did Lisa want to go to Europe?
- A17. What did Lisa make for their summer picnics?
- B8. What was Lisa's favorite drink?

- A27. What was the name of Lisa's friend that she came to the first Halloween party with?
- A3. What kind of bracelet did David give Lisa?
- B29. What was Lisa's former boyfriend's name?
- A11. What kind of test did David have the day that he met Lisa?
- A52. How did David feel when he and Lisa had picnics in the park?



## APPENDIX I

## QUESTIONNAIRE B-1YYY

Please answer each of the following questions. All of the information was provided in the first part of the story that you read about David and Lisa (prior to completing the first questionnaire). The time period to which you should refer is the first year that David and Lisa dated.

- B41. How did Lisa know the guy who had the Halloween party?
- B24. Was Lisa renting or returning a video when she ran into David?
- A50. How did Lisa feel about David after the 1st time they had sex?
- B14. What was the name of Lisa's second roommate?
- B22. When was the first time they had sex (what month)?
- A42. During the summer, how did Lisa and her old boyfriend feel about each other?
- B13. What night of the week did Lisa think about canceling their first date?
- B9. What kind of animal did Lisa see in the Grand Canyon?
- B25. What kind of pet did David's roommate have?

- A32. How did Lisa feel about David's Christmas gift to her?
- A38. When did David accuse Lisa of still seeing her old boyfriend?
- B20. How was David dressed at the first Halloween party?
- B7. What did Lisa eat the first time they went to TCBY together?
- A23. Did David leave a message for Lisa with her roommate when he first called her?
- B33. Which friends did David go out with the week after his first date with Lisa?
- B34. Where did David and Lisa go on their date right after spring break?
- A22. At whose apartment was the party where David and Lisa met?
- B38. What was the name of the campus hangout they went to?
- B30. How did Lisa feel about David's job?
- B18. Where did David work?
- B37. What subjects did David and Lisa disagree about?
- A18. Describe how Lisa felt about David after their first date?
- A28. What color was Lisa's Halloween costume?

- B17. How did Lisa feel about David's mother (be specific)?
- A9. What did David give Lisa for Valentine's Day?
- B15. Where was David from?
- B40. What happened to Lisa when she was in the 2nd grade?
- B42. What was the name of the waitress who had a crush on David?
- B21. Who called whom on Christmas Eve?
- A35. What did David give Lisa for Christmas?
- B27. What did Lisa think about the first time she went home to Tulsa after going out with David?
- B5. What state did Lisa visit over Thanksgiving break?
- B19. What did David watch most on TV?

## APPENDIX J

## ATTRIBUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this task is to assign responsibility for events in the story that you read. All of these events occurred in the first year of the relationship. The events were caused by David, by Lisa, or by other circumstances not directly related to them. Your job is to decide how much of the responsibility, on a scale from 0 to 100%, to assign to these three possible causes. If more than one of the choices were responsible, then write the portion of 100% for which each was responsible. It is possible that only one factor is responsible, and it is possible that two or three of the factors were responsible. Regardless of how you assign the responsibility, the total amount should equal 100% for each event.

Here are some examples:

David	100%	50%	0%
Lisa	0%	40%	0%
Circumstances	+ 0%	+ 10%	+ 100%
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100%	100%	100%

1. The positive feelings after their first sexual experience together.

DAVID		_____ %
LISA		_____ %
CIRCUMSTANCES	+	_____ %
		<hr/>
		100%

2. The Christmas Eve telephone call that they both enjoyed.

DAVID		_____ %
LISA		_____ %
CIRCUMSTANCES	+	_____ %
		<hr/>
		100%

3. Their sexual relationship in general.

DAVID		_____ %
LISA		_____ %
CIRCUMSTANCES	+	_____ %
		<hr/>
		100%

4. The good time they had on Valentine's Day.

DAVID		_____ %
LISA		_____ %
CIRCUMSTANCES	+	_____ %
		<hr/>
		100%

5. The problems caused by their disagreement about what to watch on TV.

DAVID		_____ %
LISA		_____ %
CIRCUMSTANCES	+	_____ %
		<hr/>
		100%

6. The positive feelings they had for each other after their first date.

DAVID	_____	%
LISA	_____	%
CIRCUMSTANCES	+ _____	%
	<hr/>	
	100%	

7. The problems caused by Lisa's relationship with her old boyfriend.

DAVID	_____	%
LISA	_____	%
CIRCUMSTANCES	+ _____	%
	<hr/>	
	100%	

8. The anger they both experienced after the poetry reading.

DAVID	_____	%
LISA	_____	%
CIRCUMSTANCES	+ _____	%
	<hr/>	
	100%	

9. The good times they had on their picnics.

DAVID	_____	%
LISA	_____	%
CIRCUMSTANCES	+ _____	%
	<hr/>	
	100%	

10. The problems caused by David's job.

DAVID	_____	%
LISA	_____	%
CIRCUMSTANCES	+ _____	%
	<hr/>	
	100%	

11. The negative state of the relationship after  
Christmas break.

DAVID	_____	%
LISA	_____	%
CIRCUMSTANCES	+ _____	%
	<hr/>	
	100%	

12. The unpleasantness in the relationship after Lisa  
told David that she might be pregnant.

DAVID	_____	%
LISA	_____	%
CIRCUMSTANCES	+ _____	%
	<hr/>	
	100%	

## APPENDIX K

## SCENARIO 1

David and Lisa first met at their mutual friend Kent's Halloween party. Lisa had gone to high school with Kent, and David and Kent had lived in the same dorm when they were freshmen. David, dressed as a vampire, had gone to the party by himself because he really wasn't dating anyone at the time. He had been there for about an hour or so when Lisa and Debbie came in together. Lisa was wearing a blue twenties-style flapper dress, and David was attracted to her immediately. Kent seemed to know both of these strangers, so David asked him who they were. Kent told him that their names were Lisa and Debbie. By this time, Lisa had noticed David too. She thought that he might be kind of cute without his makeup and stuff on. Later in the evening, David got a chance to talk to Lisa, and he thought that she seemed very outgoing and interesting. Lisa told David about the spring that she had hiked down into the Grand Canyon with some friends, about seeing some elk, and about how tired she had been climbing out. David talked mostly about the new album by his favorite rock group Thrash, his roommate's parrot, and the statistics test he had taken that day. Lisa was pretty impressed with David's sense of humor. They talked



for a while, but then Lisa's friend Debbie wanted to go to another party. They left, and David talked to some other friends.

Sunday evening, Lisa was returning a video to the video store when she ran into David who was renting a movie. He recognized her almost immediately, but she wasn't quite sure if this was the same guy from the party. He said "Hi," and they talked about the party for a couple of minutes. Then, David suggested that they go get yogurt, so they did. They spent the next 30 minutes eating yogurt and talking. She had an Oreo shake, and he had a banana split. When they were finished, David asked Lisa for her phone number. She wrote it down on the movie rental slip and acted as if she would welcome a call from him. Although David was tempted to call Lisa very soon, he decided that she might think that he was coming on too strong, so he waited and called her on Friday afternoon. Her roommate, Melissa, told him that she had gone home to Tulsa for the weekend, but that she would be back late Sunday night. She asked if he wanted to leave a message, but he didn't.

David had a very long weekend, waiting for Sunday night. He spent Saturday night at Robert's house playing poker. He won 23 dollars, which made him feel pretty

lucky. He decided to use the money for a date with Lisa, if she accepted. He called her again about 9 pm on Sunday, but she hadn't returned yet. Her roommate asked if he were the same person who had called before. Again, he worried about seeming too eager, so he didn't try again until the next day. When Lisa got home, she was kind of surprised to find out that "the guy from the party" had called twice over the weekend. Although he was really funny, Lisa wasn't sure if she wanted to see him again or go out or anything. First dates always made her so nervous. Getting yogurt hadn't really been a date. She talked it over with her roommate who told her to stop being such a wimp and to go out with him if he called back. When David called that day around 5 pm, Lisa was home. He asked her if she would like to go out for a quick meal and an early movie. She told him that she had already eaten, but that the movie sounded fine.

David picked Lisa up about 6:30, and the two of them had a really good time at the movie. They saw a comedy, and Lisa really seemed to enjoy it. Afterward, they went to TCBY and had yogurt again. David asked Lisa if she would go out dancing with him that weekend, and she said yes.

The rest of the week was very strange. Lisa was on David's mind a lot, and it was hard for him to study or even to pay much attention in class. On Thursday night, he went out for a beer with his roommate Kirk and his friend Jerry. He didn't have a very good time, so he went home early. He kept expecting to bump into Lisa somewhere on campus, but he never did, even when on Friday he walked out of his way in the hopes of intercepting her on her way to class.

The week was strange for Lisa too, but in a different way. She couldn't decide if she really liked David or not. He was cute and funny, but she didn't know if she wanted to get into anything with anybody right then. She had made some pretty bad grades the past semester, and her previous 3.2 grade point had dropped. Her parents weren't happy, and they told her that she'd have to work hard this semester. She was especially worried about her class on Milton. Lisa even thought about calling David on Wednesday night and getting out of the date, but she figured that it'd be easier to just go out with him.

That night David picked Lisa up about 7, and they went to a club. There was a band called the Rye Potato that was very loud, but not very good. Since the place was crowded and neither one of them was having fun, they

left and went to a campus hangout called Just Us. David had a few beers while Lisa drank a strawberry wine cooler (her favorite kind), and they talked for a long time. David found out that Lisa was majoring in English, that her parents had been divorced for quite a while, that her mother had remarried, and that Lisa liked her mom's new husband. Lisa's father had moved to Alabama, and she doesn't get to see him much anymore, which makes her sad. Until recently, Lisa had been dating a guy named Brian in Tulsa, and it had been pretty serious. They had broken up because he had been "messing around with another girl" while Lisa was away in college. She was pretty sure that it was over for good, although she still had feelings for him. David learned that Lisa had taken violin lessons when she was younger, but that she didn't play anymore, that she wanted to go to Europe after she graduated, that she had broken her arm when she was in the second grade, and that she had one younger sister, whose name was Terri.

Lisa found out a lot of stuff about David too. He was an accounting major, and he had an older sister and a younger brother. Also, he told Lisa that he liked to compete in triathelons with two of his friends; his event was swimming. She also found out that he had been on the swim team in high school and even got a silver medal at

the state meet. David told her that he hadn't been involved in any very serious relationships, but he seemed to be sensitive and understanding. By the end of the evening, Lisa had decided that she liked David quite a bit, but she wanted to take things slowly.

When David took Lisa home, she invited him into her apartment, and they sat on her couch and kissed for a while. She objected when he tried to take matters further. She told him that she was still getting over her last relationship and that she didn't want things to go too fast. David asked her for a date the following weekend, but she said that she was going home. The two of them decided to go to a movie the next night.

They saw a science fiction movie and had a good time. There was more kissing afterward, but Lisa was pretty reserved in that department. The next week, David saw Lisa several times, and he really missed her when she was gone that weekend. While Lisa was at home, she thought about David a few times. He worked part-time in a bar near campus, and she knew that he had to work one night that weekend. She also thought about all the females that would be at that bar. She wished that David didn't work at a bar.

David and Lisa saw each other frequently over the next several weeks. They went to a few movies and a concert, and they started eating together almost every night. Since Lisa spent quite a bit of time studying, they began to study together. They went to a football game together, but most of the time, they watched TV at Lisa's apartment. Her roommate had a color TV, and they got cable. David discovered that they liked the same movies and TV shows, but they disagreed about politics and sports. They didn't really fight about these things, but they did have several animated discussions. David also discovered that he really disliked Lisa's roommate because she was very opinionated and a real slob. Lisa discovered that David liked to spend a lot of time watching sports on TV. She didn't really mind. It was kind of boring, but she figured she could live with it.

Since Lisa occasionally "put up with" watching sports on TV, she figured that David could go to a poetry reading with her. This particular poet had recently published some poems, and Lisa was looking forward to the reading. She didn't want to go by herself, so she talked David into going with her. He absolutely hated it, and he wanted to leave half way through the presentation. Lisa felt a bit angry and hurt because of David's insensitivity. On the

way home, he kept complaining about this "artsy" nonsense and how boring it all was. Their discussion turned into a small fight with Lisa defending art and literature while David took the side of more practical areas, such as business. The fight didn't last long, and they made up that night.

Lisa went to visit her father over Thanksgiving break, and David went home to Norman to see his family. When they both got back, they started seeing each other again. David was beginning to feel really close to Lisa. They were together almost every evening and spent lots of time together on the weekends when she didn't go home and he didn't have to work. Lisa fixed dinner for David several times, and he learned that she was a very good cook. She was particularly good at making Italian food. Lisa found out that David was good in math, and he helped her out a lot with her college algebra class. Her parents were going to be pleased with her grades this semester. When Christmas vacation came, David missed Lisa very much. It really turned him on when she called him at home on Christmas Eve just to say hello, wish him a Merry Christmas, and to tell him that she missed him too. Neither of their parents wanted them to make many long distance calls, so they didn't talk again. Lisa was still

pretty excited about the book of Shakespeare that David had given her for Christmas. She thought that he was pretty romantic.

David was really looking forward to going back to school after the Christmas break, but he found things a little distant. He wondered if he had done something wrong. He also wondered if Lisa had been seeing her old boyfriend over the break. She never said, and he felt uncomfortable asking. Lisa, on the other hand, was a little jealous of the attention David seemed to get from girls whenever they walked around on campus together. He told her that he met a lot of girls at the bar where he worked, but he didn't ever really talk to anyone in particular. By the end of January, things were back to normal, and David and Lisa were pretty happy. For Valentine's Day, David bought Lisa three red roses, and she fixed a really nice pasta dinner for him. However, David wanted to be with Lisa more than he was able, and she still didn't want to be sexually involved. But, they saw a lot of each other and had great times together.

About this time, David told Lisa that he loved her, and she told him that she loved him too. David also said that he hadn't been seeing anybody else and that he had no desire to do so. Lisa said that she wasn't seeing anybody



else either, but that it was probably a little too soon to make that kind of commitment. David felt kind of rejected since he'd made the first move toward commitment. He figured that Lisa was worth waiting for, so he didn't push her. On the other hand, Lisa was feeling pretty scared. She liked David a lot, but she didn't want to get hurt again. David brought the subject up again early in March before spring break, and this time Lisa agreed that she wouldn't see anybody else either.

Both of them came back to campus a little early from the break because they had missed each other. They went, that weekend, to a friend's party and had the best time they had ever had. David's roommate had not yet returned, so they had his apartment all to themselves that weekend. They went there after a date (this was the first time that Lisa and David had been alone in his apartment). Things got far along, but Lisa backed down at the last moment, and they didn't have sex. David tried to be understanding, and he told Lisa that it was okay that they weren't having sex. After he took her home, though, he began to wonder how long it was going to take Lisa to get over her last relationship. He decided that he wasn't going to wait much longer. The next weekend, however, her roommate was out of town, and they spent the night

together at her apartment. Afterward, David was so sweet, and Lisa loved him more than ever.

For the rest of the semester, David and Lisa were virtually inseparable. They spent a lot of time at her apartment, and on those all too rare weekends when David's roommates were out of town, Lisa stayed with him. Lisa was too embarrassed to spend the night when his roommates were there, and she knew that her roommate wouldn't approve. At the end of March, David bought Lisa a water pearl bracelet. He wrapped it up in white paper with little red hearts on it. She was so excited when she opened it up; she decided to wear it every day.

David's parents came up to visit him in April. He had told them a little bit about Lisa. He made sure to keep it light because he didn't want his mother to think that he was ready to get married. Well, his parents took David and Lisa out for a steak dinner, and everything went okay. Lisa hadn't been too excited about meeting David's parents, but she certainly didn't tell him that. From what David had told her, they were pretty old-fashioned. When she did meet them, though, their old-fashioned attitudes didn't really bother her, but she didn't like the way his mother gossiped about all of David's relatives

and their children, etc. Lisa didn't even know these people, and she was hearing about all their problems.

After the visit, David's mother told him that she thought that he could do much better than Lisa. She said that she was concerned about the religious differences between the two families. David listened patiently and then told his mom that they weren't engaged or anything, so the religious stuff was irrelevant.

About 2 weeks after David's parents visited, Lisa began to think that she might be pregnant. She told David, and he got kind of angry. He told her that if she'd gone on the pill in the first place, they wouldn't be having this problem. She didn't think he was being very supportive, so they didn't talk about it again for a few days. By this time, they were both pretty scared. They talked about the options they'd have if she were pregnant, but things didn't seem real for either of them. It was a tense two weeks. They got together from time to time, but things just weren't the same. They were both extremely relieved when Dr. Johnson called and told Lisa that she wasn't pregnant. She and David went out that night to the Alley and celebrated. They laughed and had a good time. David apologized for not having been more supportive about the whole thing.

When the semester was over, Lisa went back to her parent's house in Tulsa for the summer, and David stayed in Stillwater for summer school. She worked a few hours a week in her stepfather's pharmacy, but she spent most of her time helping her cousin Sara plan her wedding. The wedding was in August, and Lisa was the maid of honor. David took 3 classes and worked a lot at the bar. His roommate was gone for the summer, and he was pretty lonely. Sometimes the waitresses at the bar asked him to go dancing or to the movies, and he went a few times. Jessica, one of the waitresses, seemed to have a crush on him, but he made it a point to talk to her about Lisa. Lisa's old boyfriend stopped by the pharmacy a few times, and they talked quite a bit. She found out that he had broken up with that other girl. They talked about their relationship and decided that they still liked each other as friends.

Lisa invited David to spend a weekend in May with her and her parents. They camped out at the lake, and she taught David how to sail. They had a really good time, but they wished that her parents weren't with them. This was the first time that Lisa's parents had met David. They liked him right away because he seemed so responsible. They thought her old boyfriend Brian had

been irresponsible. Over the summer, David and Lisa managed to find ways to get together. A couple of times when David came up, they went to Woodward park for picnics. Lisa made chicken salad sandwiches, and they sat under the trees, listened to the radio, and talked until dusk. David felt so relaxed and comfortable when they were in the park together. They were both so busy that the summer seemed to fly by.

Things resumed in the fall. Lisa had a new roommate, Amanda, who David liked much better than the old roommate. David found it particularly nice that the new roommate liked to go home every weekend. Lisa was glad too. Things were pretty good with them, but certainly not perfect. There were quite a few disagreements, more than the year before, and even a few fights. The worst one came in September. Lisa stopped talking to David for a few days, and it wasn't patched up until she came back that weekend. Once again, David worried that Lisa might have been seeing her former boyfriend. Since this thought continued to bother him, he asked her about it late in September. She denied it rather vehemently and was pretty indignant about David's accusation. She thought that he had a lot of nerve questioning her loyalty considering all the girls that he saw at work. This led to another period

of separation, but this lasted for only a couple of days. Lisa called David, apologized for "acting stupid", and told him that she really loved him and only him. She said that she was still "friends" with her former boyfriend, that she had talked to him over the weekend, but there had been no date. She said that there was nothing between them at all.

In October, David and Lisa celebrated their one year anniversary. They went out to dinner in Tulsa and then went to a Halloween party at Lisa's friend's house. This time, they dressed up as Jim and Tammy Baker. They laughed and talked about how they both felt the first time they went out together. After that, things were pretty good for a while.

## APPENDIX L

## BREAK-UP SCENARIO

David and Lisa's relationship kept going on as usual during the rest of the semester. They spent a lot of time studying together at Lisa's apartment. They went to a few movies, and there were only a few minor disagreements. One occurred just before Christmas break. David wanted to go skiing with three of his friends, Mark, Todd, and Joe. Lisa knew that these friends were real partiers; they spent a lot of time at the bar where David worked. She was worried that they'd get to Colorado and that David might meet somebody else. She cried for about an hour when he told her, so he decided not to go. He felt kind of resentful toward Lisa all during the break, though, when he thought about the fun his friends were probably having. Needless to say, David was distant from Lisa for a while. She, on the other hand, felt that if David really loved her, he would've wanted to spend New Year's Eve with her instead of his friends.

The spring semester was going to be really tough for David. he had three senior-level accounting courses to take. he knew that he would have to study all the time. Lisa, though, was all set for a pretty easy semester. She had taken most of her harder classes in the fall, so she

was looking forward to taking it easy her last semester. Unfortunately, David had to study most of the time. So, Lisa stayed home with him while he studied. Since she didn't have as much to do, she always finished early. Sometimes she watched TV, but David complained about the noise. Every once in a while, Lisa told David that she was bored. David, however, had other things to worry about. He knew that if he didn't do well this semester, he'd never get that job in Atlanta. His uncle worked for a large accounting firm there, and if David did well, he could probably get a job.

Well, Lisa got tired of sitting around all the time while David studied. She felt like life was passing her by. A lot of her friends went out on Thursday nights, and she really wanted to go with them. She talked to David about it, and he said that he didn't care if she went. Inside, David resented it that Lisa's parents paid for her education, so she didn't have to go to school and work too. Lisa went out with her friends almost every week. She had a good time. She liked it that guys asked her to dance more often than they asked her friends. Her Thursday nights out gave David a good reason for going out with his co-workers at the bar. When the bar closed on



the weekends, he usually went to someone's house for a few beers.

When David and Lisa did go out together, things were still pretty good. Although the initial excitement had kind of worn off, they both usually had fun. Their sexual relationship wasn't quite as exciting as it had been in the beginning either, but it was still pretty good. Lisa felt that David had stopped being as romantic, and David didn't think that Lisa was as interested in him as she had been before.

Over spring break, David got an interview with his uncle's company in Atlanta. He thought about asking Lisa to go with him, but he didn't want to talk about this job with her. He had mentioned the possibility several times, and Lisa said she thought it sounded like a great opportunity. Lately, though, she hadn't been so enthusiastic. Once she had even said how backward people were in the South. She said that she wanted to live in a much more liberal place, maybe New York or California. Well, they hadn't really talked about any definite plans. Neither one of them wanted to get married yet, but they didn't want to break up either. So, David went to Atlanta and had a good interview. He really liked the city, and his uncle told him that things looked promising. Lisa

went home over the break and visited some of her friends from high school that had gone to different colleges. One of her friends, Angie, already had a job offer to work as a fashion merchandiser in San Francisco. Angie was so excited about moving to the coast in May, and her excitement was catching. Lisa actually went to the library and looked at the want ads in a San Francisco newspaper. One job sounded really challenging. Angie talked her into writing a resume, but Lisa changed her mind at the last minute and didn't mail it.

When David and Lisa got back from break, David was more determined than ever to study hard. Lisa, however, was trying to decide what she wanted to do with the rest of her life. She knew that she wanted some excitement; that was for sure. One Friday night, David decided to stay home and work on a big project. Since he had to work on Saturday night, Lisa got mad that they wouldn't be going anywhere. They got into a fight, and David told Lisa that her degree was easy to get which was why she didn't have to study as hard as he did. This really made Lisa mad, so she mailed her resume the next day and went out with some friends while he was at work. She and David kind of made up two days later, but things weren't very

good for a while. Both thought they were being misunderstood.

In the first part of April, David's grandfather had a heart attack and died. David had been especially close to him, and he was really upset about his death. He had to miss classes for a few days to go to Texas for the funeral, but Lisa went with him. She felt so sorry for him because she knew how much he'd loved his grandfather. She was really supportive and a big comfort to David. They both felt closer to each other than they had in a long time.

When they got back, though, some of the same problems were there. David resented the fact that Lisa rarely had to study, and Lisa got tired of waiting for him. They still went out whenever they had the chance, but it was really wasn't as much fun anymore. They didn't have a whole lot to talk about. They kept hoping that things would get better, more like they were in the beginning. They talked about their relationship, and they decided that things would be better if they had more time to spend together. They decided to see what happened with their jobs before making any plans for the future. In April, they both heard from their prospective employers. Lisa

got an interview for the job in San Francisco, but David didn't get the job in Atlanta.

He was really disappointed, and he had a hard time being happy for Lisa. On the other hand, Lisa had a hard time being sympathetic with David since she was so excited about her interview. Lisa went to San Francisco, interviewed, and got the job. David had to make a major decision now. Lisa asked him to move to California with her, and he didn't know for sure what he wanted to do. Although Lisa hadn't been real pleased with the relationship lately, she was a bit scared about moving off all alone. Her friend Angie had gotten engaged to a guy who had a job in Kansas City and decided not to go to San Francisco after all. Actually, David was kind of apprehensive about the future too. He had pretty much counted on getting the job, and now he didn't know what to do.

Well, they got together at Lisa's apartment to talk things over. David said that he'd be sacrificing a lot by going to California. After all, he didn't know anyone out there, and it wasn't a place where he really wanted to live. Lisa said that she didn't realize that going away with her would be such a sacrifice for him. They got into a pretty big fight. David blamed Lisa for all the

problems they'd had in their relationship, and Lisa blamed David. After saying some really hateful things to each other, they decided to end their relationship right then.

## APPENDIX M

## STAY-TOGETHER SCENARIO

David and Lisa's relationship kept going on as usual during the rest of the semester. They spent a lot of time studying together at Lisa's apartment. They went to a few movies, and there were only a few minor disagreements. One occurred just before Christmas break. David wanted to go skiing with three of his friends, Mark, Todd, and Joe. Lisa knew that these friends were real partiers; they spent a lot of time at the bar where David worked. She was worried that they'd get to Colorado and that David might meet somebody else. She cried for about an hour when he told her, so he decided not to go. He felt kind of resentful toward Lisa all during the break, though, when he thought about the fun his friends were probably having. Needless to say, David was distant from Lisa for a while. She, on the other hand, felt that if David really loved her, he would've wanted to spend New Year's Eve with her instead of his friends.

The spring semester was going to be really tough for David. he had three senior-level accounting courses to take. he knew that he would have to study all the time. Lisa, though, was all set for a pretty easy semester. She had taken most of her harder classes in the fall, so she

was looking forward to taking it easy her last semester. Unfortunately, David had to study most of the time. So, Lisa stayed home with him while he studied. Since she didn't have as much to do, she always finished early. Sometimes she watched TV, but David complained about the noise. Every once in a while, Lisa told David that she was bored. David, however, had other things to worry about. He knew that if he didn't do well this semester, he'd never get that job in Atlanta. His uncle worked for a large accounting firm there, and if David did well, he could probably get a job.

Well, Lisa got tired of sitting around all the time while David studied. She felt like life was passing her by. A lot of her friends went out on Thursday nights, and she really wanted to go with them. She talked to David about it, and he said that he didn't care if she went. Inside, David resented it that Lisa's parents paid for her education, so she didn't have to go to school and work too. Lisa went out with her friends almost every week. She had a good time. She liked it that guys asked her to dance more often than they asked her friends. Her Thursday nights out gave David a good reason for going out with his co-workers at the bar. When the bar closed on

the weekends, he usually went to someone's house for a few beers.

When David and Lisa did go out together, things were still pretty good. Although the initial excitement had kind of worn off, they both usually had fun. Their sexual relationship wasn't quite as exciting as it had been in the beginning either, but it was still pretty good. Lisa felt that David had stopped being as romantic, and David didn't think that Lisa was as interested in him as she had been before.

Over spring break, David got an interview with his uncle's company in Atlanta. He thought about asking Lisa to go with him, but he didn't want to talk about this job with her. He had mentioned the possibility several times, and Lisa said she thought it sounded like a great opportunity. Lately, though, she hadn't been so enthusiastic. Once she had even said how backward people were in the South. She said that she wanted to live in a much more liberal place, maybe New York or California. Well, they hadn't really talked about any definite plans. Neither one of them wanted to get married yet, but they didn't want to break up either. So, David went to Atlanta and had a good interview. He really liked the city, and his uncle told him that things looked promising. Lisa



went home over the break and visited some of her friends from high school that had gone to different colleges. One of her friends, Angie, already had a job offer to work as a fashion merchandiser in San Francisco. Angie was so excited about moving to the coast in May, and her excitement was catching. Lisa actually went to the library and looked at the want ads in a San Francisco newspaper. One job sounded really challenging. Angie talked her into writing a resume, but Lisa changed her mind at the last minute and didn't mail it.

When David and Lisa got back from break, David was more determined than ever to study hard. Lisa, however, was trying to decide what she wanted to do with the rest of her life. She knew that she wanted some excitement; that was for sure. One Friday night, David decided to stay home and work on a big project. Since he had to work on Saturday night, Lisa got mad that they wouldn't be going anywhere. They got into a fight, and David told Lisa that her degree was easy to get which was why she didn't have to study as hard as he did. This really made Lisa mad, so she mailed her resume the next day and went out with some friends while he was at work. She and David kind of made up two days later, but things weren't very

good for a while. Both thought they were being misunderstood.

In the first part of April, David's grandfather had a heart attack and died. David had been especially close to him, and he was really upset about his death. He had to miss classes for a few days to go to Texas for the funeral, but Lisa went with him. She felt so sorry for him because she knew how much he'd loved his grandfather. She was really supportive and a big comfort to David. They both felt closer to each other than they had in a long time.

When they got back, though, some of the same problems were there. David resented the fact that Lisa rarely had to study, and Lisa got tired of waiting for him. They still went out whenever they had the chance, but it was really wasn't as much fun anymore. They didn't have a whole lot to talk about. They kept hoping that things would get better, more like they were in the beginning. They talked about their relationship, and they decided that things would be better if they had more time to spend together. They decided to see what happened with their jobs before making any plans for the future. In April, they both heard from their prospective employers. Lisa

got an interview for the job in San Francisco, but David didn't get the job in Atlanta.

He was really disappointed, and he had a hard time being happy for Lisa. On the other hand, Lisa had a hard time being sympathetic with David since she was so excited about her interview. Lisa went to San Francisco, interviewed, and got the job. David had to make a major decision now. Lisa asked him to move to California with her, and he didn't know for sure what he wanted to do. Although Lisa hadn't been real pleased with the relationship lately, she was a bit scared about moving off all alone. Her friend Angie had gotten engaged to a guy who had a job in Kansas City, so she wasn't going to San Francisco after all. Actually, David was kind of apprehensive about the future too. He had pretty much counted on getting the job, and now he didn't know what to do.

Well, David thought it over for a few days. He knew that things had been rocky lately, but he figured that most of their problems were related to the stress that he was under. He knew that the relationship could be like it was in the beginning if they worked harder at it, so he decided to go. He told Lisa, and she was really happy about his decision. They were both excited about moving

to a new place, even though it was kind of scary. They spent a lot of time together planning their trip out there and talking about all the fun things they'd be able to do on the coast. They got even closer during this time, and they both felt really good about their future together. The day before they were going to leave, David asked Lisa to marry him, and she said yes. They knew this was a great beginning for them.

VITA

Ann L. Carter

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: GENDER DIFFERENCES IN RETROSPECTIVE MEMORY OF  
RELATIONSHIPS

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, August 23,  
the daughter of LaVaughn Carter.

Education: Graduated from Charles Page High School,  
Sand Springs, Oklahoma, in May 1982; received  
Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from  
Oklahoma State University in May, 1986;  
received Master of Science degree in Psychology  
from Oklahoma State University in May, 1988;  
completed requirements for the Doctor of  
Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University  
in July, 1991.

Professional Experience: Intern, Eastern State  
Hospital, Williamsburg, Virginia, January,  
1991 to July, 1991; Intern, Barry Robinson  
Center, Norfolk, Virginia, July, 1990 to  
January, 1991; Intern, EVMS Residents' Clinic,  
Norfolk, Virginia, July, 1990 to July, 1991;  
Practicum Student, Tulsa Psychiatric Center,  
Tulsa, Oklahoma, September, 1989 to June, 1990;  
Practicum Student, OSU Marriage and Family  
Clinic, Stillwater, Oklahoma, August, 1988  
to May, 1990; Practicum Student, Payne County  
Guidance Center, Stillwater, Oklahoma, September,  
1988 to June, 1989; Practicum Student,  
Psychological Services Center, Stillwater,

Oklahoma, August, 1987 to August, 1988; Teaching Assistant, Department of Psychology, Oklahoma State University, August, 1987 to May, 1988.

Professional Organizations: American Psychological Association, Student Affiliate.