2

Attachment and Emotion

It requires no great insight to realize that [some people] are deeply distrustful of close relationships and terrified of allowing themselves to rely on anyone else, in some cases in order to avoid the pain of being rejected and in others to avoid being subjected to pressure to become someone else's caretaker.' (Bowlby, 1979: 138)

Focus points for note taking when reading this chapter:

- How far is any of our relating a result of our previous/early/childhood experiences rather than just to do with the present experiences we are having in the relationship in question?
- What sorts of childhood influences can affect later human relationship in adult life?
- What is the relative effect of our own infancy versus the later experiences that we get as young children or adolescents?
- How much of our relationship skills/tendencies do we learn from what happens to us, what we observe happening to others, or our comparison of our own experiences and those of siblings/other children?
- Where do we learn what 'emotion' is and how to express it? (Remember culture and biology from Chapter 1 and now add 'experiences in early life' as you take notes.)
- Are emotions pure experiences or are they felt in relation to other people/ culture/context?
- What is the role of language in emotional experience and expression?
- How are our emotional experiences influenced by what we do in day-to-day life routines?

Childhood provides us with a variety of experiences, where we learn to read and write, and also to understand other people and ourselves. Nowadays we think of childhood and children warmly and we expect good things to flavour the experience. Yet Tuchman points out that 'Of all the characteristics in which the medieval age differs from the modern, none is so striking as the comparative absence of

interest in children. Emotion in relation to them rarely appears in art or literature or documentary evidence (1978: 49). In those medieval times, Philip of Novara (thirteenth century) regarded children as 'so dirty and annoying in infancy and so naughty and capricious, that it is hardly worth nurturing them through childhood' and Tuchman concludes that

> 'On the whole, babies and young children appear to have been left to survive or died without great concern in the first five or six years. What psychological effect this may have had on character, and possibly on history, can only be conjectured. Possibly the relative emotional blankness of a medieval infancy may account for the casual attitude towards life and suffering of the medieval man'. (1978: 52)

We must recognize, then, that our modern view of childhood and of the parent–child relationship is not an inherent condition of humanity, but one nurtured within a particular cultural, historical, and intellectual context (Duck, in press). The things we attribute to childhood and the results we expect from it (either in terms of parent–child or sibling relationships or longer-term effects of childhood) are relative. In interpreting research on 'the effects' of childhood we must recognize that childhood has been variously understood through history and across cultures.

Even in modern times, we emerge from the long years of childhood and adolescence with mixed experiences. We probably had both fights and alliances/cooperation with brothers and sisters (Nicholson, 2006), went through both put downs and encouragement by (different?) teachers, had varied experiences of parents on good and bad days, observed mixed experiences of our caretakers' long-term partnership, which may have ranged from same-sex parental caring (Suter, 2006) to other configurations including blended families (Baxter, Braithwaile, Bryant & Wagner, 2004), single-parent upbringing or shared custody with one parent absent most of the time (Rollie, 2006), and possibly experience of parental divorce (Barber & Demo, 2006). These mixed observations of long-term partnership and how it 'works', mixed experiences of peers – from bullying to close friendships – doubtless combined with ice cream, birthday parties, and relentless teasing. Childhood experiences can scar us for life or give wonderful opportunities for growth, and we may derive strength, shyness, ambition, depression, hope, enjoyment, despair, and preparation for ultimate success or failure in life. Nobody comes out of childhood without some experiences that they wish had never happened, but much of it can be positive too.

My point? Well, actually I have several. We learn in childhood from experiences which occurred to us directly; we learn also from things that we merely observe; we learn from a multiplicity of sources, whether parents, siblings, teachers, peers, or even the Internet. 'Childhood' is a richly textured, full, and varied experience given these sources and contexts, so it is surprising that much research tends to focus on uniform influences. As you look around the world at the people here, it seems more

likely that there is no universal experience of childhood, and no universal lesson learned there about human relationships nor only one source for the outcomes. But as you read the scientific literature, you will find that this is not the apparently shared perception, and researchers routinely prefer to identify major key persistent themes in childhood experience that have huge influence on later relationships.

So what should we make of childhood from the point of view of human relationships? How might childhood predispose us towards relationships as an adult? There are lots of possibilities here: first, our own direct treatment by other people as infants could 'set' us to expect that treatment from everyone else for evermore; second, our indirect observation of lots of other people's relationships could channel the way we think about relationships of our own; third, the experiences we have of *particular* kinds of people (teachers, parents, men, authority figures, and so on) could influence future experience of, say, powerful women, tall males, or friendship in general; fourth, *broad* motivations could be 'set' in childhood, such as sociability, shyness, tendencies to possessiveness in relationships, or pursuit of intimacy versus other goals like career; fifth, childhood adversity specifically, such as early death of a parent, could affect one's later sense of the reliability of deep attachments (indeed the experience of parental divorce affects the likelihood of one's own divorce although there is substantial variation in responses; Barber & Demo, 2006); sixth, a person's experiences of relationships at school, such as bullying, could form a pattern affecting interpretation of other people's motives or our own skills in relationships. Jones (2005) indicates that individual beliefs about personal relationships may affect the way in which we understand emotional states of other people, especially their emotional states towards us as inferred from their statements and meanings carried by their behaviours towards us.

KEEP A JOURNAL

During one day write down anything that comes up and reminds you of a childhood experience. How often does it happen (of course you were primed to think about it on this occasion)? How often do people treat you in ways that remind you of the treatment that you received (or specifically resisted) when you were a child?

Effects of childhood on later relationships 1: Attachment

One predominant explanation for effects of childhood on other relationships has emerged in the social psychological literature, and is based on people's *relational*

experience of caretaking when they were infants. Bowlby (1969/1982) proposed that patterns in infant behaviour are reflections of infants' treatment by their 'care-takers' – a term covering parents or people primarily responsible for the child's upbringing, although in Bowlby's era, this was normally assumed to be 'the Mother' (hence the following pronouns). Working in children's hospitals, Bowlby noticed different reactions in different infants to both their mother's absence and her return. Some got distressed when she went away and some did not. Equally, some reacted positively to her reappearance and some seemed quite indifferent to it. So Bowlby noticed two infant responses: different kinds of distress when the caretaker went away and different sorts of responses when she returned. This is an important observation, but he had the insight that the infant reactions to the behavior of the caretaker might be connected to her behaviour style. He observed that some mothers responded consistently positively to the infant whether at reconnection or other times (consistently responsive to infant signals, showing warmth), some were indifferent and inconsistent (generally inept and showing broad insensitivity to infants' needs), and some seemed uninvolved and distant ('rejecting' and averse to physical contact, showing emotional distance and general rigidity in care-giving). Bowlby concluded that the way in which the mothers treated their children was connected with the infants' anxiety levels and hence their responses to separation and belief in the likely security/reliability of any reconnection.

Bowlby described the infant responses as *attachment styles* or ways of connecting to other people. Some infants learned to trust their caretaker and some did not; some saw her as reliable and some did not; some acquired a sense of security from her and some learned to be anxious and unsafe in her presence as well as during her absence. Bowlby regarded these styles as enduring 'working models' that the infant developed about relationships on the basis of this first relationship with the caretaker. He did not regard such infant experiences as finally and irrevocably determining later interaction with everyone else as the person matured, but he did raise the possibility that these early experiences were formative and influential. He found such patterns to be stable across infancy (tested up to 3.5 years) and ended up proposing three working model/personality types:

- *securely attached*: an infant who welcomes a caretaker's return and seeks proximity to the caregiver;
- *anxious-resistant/ambivalent* infants are ambivalent at caretaker's return and can't be comforted on reunion after absence;
- *avoidant* infants avoid proximity and show no interest in the returning caretaker; they perform blank stares or body turns or movement away from their caretaker.

For our purposes this idea gains greater importance if early learned behaviours transfer to later life romantic relationships with other adults. Hazan & Shaver

Model of Self	Positive (low dependence)	Negative (high dependence)
Positive (low avoidance)	Secure	Preoccupied
Model of Other		
Negative (high avoidance)	Dismissive	Fearful (torn both ways, towards and away from the other)

Figure 2.1   Styles for adlut attachment

(1987) suggested that adult styles of loving represent processes similar to, and based on, those found in attachments between infants and their parents. *Secure attachment* develops into a general sense of confidence and security in later intimacy. By contrast, *anxious/ambivalent attachment* develops into dependency, lack of confidence in later relationships, and a sense of lack of appreciation by others. Finally, *avoidant attachment* develops into later general lack of acceptance of others, avoidance of closeness and discomfort in intimate situations.

Although such styles may come loosely from memories of childhood social experience, some theories have developed these ideas into a more structured framework, suggesting that there are two major dimensions on which a person's approach to relationships in later life can be mapped. Bartholomew (1990) proposed a four-way model (Figure 2.1) based on two dimensions: in childhood we learn our own social value (*model of self*) and what makes other people tick (*model of others*, broadly speaking, whether they should be approached because they are rewarding or avoided because they are painful to be with).

Bartholomew (1990; 1993) extends Hazan & Shaver's (1987) three-part system to a four-part one by distinguishing 'avoidant' into two: a *fearful avoidant style* when the person feels a desire to obtain social contact but is fearful of its consequences; and a *dismissive avoidant style*, when the person defensively denies the need for social contact. People who are fearfully avoidant regard themselves as undeserving of the love of others, whereas dismissively avoidant people view themselves positively but just do not regard other people as necessary or desirable. Before we get too much further you might like to try a quick and superficial classification of yourself on the basis of the above categories.

Researchers have used the Shaver and Hazan model and the Bartholomew models with equal enthusiasm and the research indicating the effects of early experience on later life, whether on direct relationship experiences or such indirectly relevant variables as alcoholism and violence is one of the impressive growths of the last 20 years. Later work on relationships has found this to be a

very rich source of information about relationships and a single listing of all the relevant articles with 'attachment' in the title would probably fill the rest this book. Some examples are Feeney, Noller & Roberts (2000) who noted that not all people fit an attachment category 'stably' over time, but that there are noticeable connections between attachment style and stress, coping, relationship quality, relationship stability, and emotional experience (especially of anger, sadness, and anxiety and the experience of control of emotion). Broadly speaking, secure attachment style is associated with more positive outcomes in all of these variables than is an anxious style. Rowe & Carnelley (2005) found that attachment networks (i.e. friendship or romantic relationship networks) differed in content and structure in accordance with global attachment style. By using a hierarchical (bull's-eye) mapping method the authors showed that secure individuals included a higher number of secure relationships in their networks and placed them closer to their core sense of self than they did with their insecure relationships. Anders & Tucker (2000) showed that securely attached persons report larger and more satisfying social support networks than anxious or avoidant persons. The authors suggested interpersonal communication competence – something close to social skills discussed in Chapter 1 – as a possible mediator of these associations and found that poor interpersonal communication led to smaller social support networks and also to lower levels of satisfaction especially in the anxious and avoidant people, and especially in those who lacked assertiveness or used lower levels of self-disclosure. Perhaps attachment style is associated with specific forms of instrumental/communication deficit or skill, and that this in turn affects people's relative failure or success at later relationships.

Banse (2004) found that marital satisfaction could be predicted by the individual's attachment, the partner's attachment, and the interaction between them. Once again it is secure attachment that was related to higher, and insecure attachment to lower, marital satisfaction. In an interesting variation on the usual styles of research however, Banse looked at the ways in which the two partners' individual attachment styles interacted with one another, finding that the positive effects of secure and the negative effects of insecure attachment styles are either amplified or attenuated depending on the attachment of the spouse (Secures create better relational environments). Cohen (2004) showed that attachment style even relates to people's reactions if their favourite TV soap characters were taken off the air! Anxious-ambivalents foresaw the most negative personal reactions to such disasters. The author discusses the results as evidence of the similarity between parasocial relationships and close social relationships. It might be worth you thinking a little bit more carefully about why attachment theory would have any connection whatsoever with something like this. Perhaps there's something about the nature of 'relationships' as conceived by attachment theory, which makes these findings understandable.

Effects of childhood on later relationships 2: experiences and observations

Other relevant learning in childhood may affect parenting. Some parents recall their own childhood with strong repugnance (or strong affection) and so avoid (or reproduce) the opportunity for their own children to experience childhood similarly. Some parents believe that experiences that they loathed as children must at all costs be prevented from happening to their own children (Putallaz, Costanzo & Klein, 1993). I even know one couple who between them had two such awful childhoods that they agreed upon marriage never to have children themselves – and Rholes, Simpson & Friedman (2006) found that 'avoidant' attachment style predicts lower willingness to become a parent and more negative expectations of how it will turn out. Other people may believe that one of the best things about their own childhood was (… you name it) and so they want to make very sure indeed that it happens to their own children, too (Putallaz et al., 1993).

In the everyday context of parent–child interaction, parents no doubt communicate ideologies of relating that influence (but do not determine) a child's experiences of relationships and of social reality. For example, Doucet & Aseltine (2003) linked parental disruption and childhood family conflict with the quality of the children's later marriages as adults. Although parental divorce during childhood was not significantly related to the quality of marital relationships in young adulthood, childhood family conflict was strongly related to measures of later marital quality. There are wide ranges of childhood adversities that have persistent effects on emotional development during the rest of the life course, but these derive from the interaction of the parents with one another, rather than with the child alone. Also a person's adolescence may moderate any earlier effects in childhood. Individuals are evidently engaged in lifelong learning about relationships!

Kitzmann & Cohen (2003) likewise indicated that children's *perceptions* of parental conflict showed strong associations with dimensions of their own friendship quality and this suggests that the resolution quality of parents' conflict – rather than conflict intensity, conflict frequency, or children's conflict-related distress – is associated with the quality of the child's close friendships. It is through observation of their parents' conflict resolution that children learn something about 'how to be intimate'.

Children also learn from their experiences with other children, too, and Qualter & Mynn (2005) conclude that children's representations of their social reality are critical features in what they ultimately get out of social life, meaning, in essence that the way a child thinks about other children may be derived from specific behavioural experiences with them and that these get internalized. A child can derive a sense of his or her value from experiences of interaction with other children as well as from their experiences with adults. Hence, we might conclude that

beliefs about value of self to peers might be different from sense of value of self to caretakers/adults.

The force of early learning shapes perception of others and expectancies about emotion, sets various triggers and comfort zones, and leaves a significant amount of imprints that guide us all in later life, but does so in a variety of ways. Whether attachment theory is right in detail, the broad assumption that early life 'sets' the framework for later relationships seems undeniable, though in these broad terms the claim has rarely been denied. The advances made by Attachment Theory come in the form of specific predictions about particular types of personality style and their relationship to later romance and interpersonal dealings, but we should not overlook other influences and possibilities, too.

LOOK FOR THIS IN THE MEDIA

Find news stories about killers that 'explain' their murders in terms of their childhood experiences.

Watch the film '*Shine*' paying particular attention to family dynamics as portrayed there.

Life at home and school

Parental style of control in a family can affect the child directly and also can provide a model for the child's subsequent social relationships. Ladd, Lesieur & Profilet (1993) show that parents often structure their children's play in ways that expose the children selectively to experiences of control over their own relationships: for example some parents forbid a child to play with particular other children, or parents may 'hang around' and make specific suggestions about games or roles when the child plays with others. Pettit & Mize (1993) looked at indirect ways in which parents influence children's styles of relating behaviour. For instance, parents 'teach' children tacitly through their own interaction style as well as explicitly by verbal comments about how to 'do' social relationships. Children learn about relationships from stories in books and on TV as well (Duck, in press).

This approach to parental teaching of relationships is in distinction to old work (Baumrind, 1972) that identified three styles of parental treatment of children and then presumed that such styles 'produced' children with different social characteristics. *Authoritarian parents* control and evaluate the behaviour of a child using absolute standards of behaviour. They stress obedience and punishment – often physical punishment but also withdrawal of love or psychological blackmail.

Secondly, *permissive parents* relate to the child's behaviour in non-punitive and accepting ways, often consulting the child about its behaviour, offering rationales for the standards used, and relying on reason rather than punishment. Finally, an *authoritative style* is based on direction of the child through reason but not on the basis of equality nor, necessarily, of acceptance of what the child is doing. Such a parent exercises firm control, but does so by communication rather than by physical force. This style of parenting is more successful in 'producing' children who are independent, cooperative, friendly and achievement-oriented, and is generally recommended by family therapists.

The idea that there is a direct one-way effect has been challenged (Lollis & Kuczynski, 1997) and relatively recently attention has been paid to broader frames for the experiencing of other people. Kramer & Baron (1995) considered the inter-generational linkages created by parents' experiences with their siblings as frames for the ways in which they evaluate relationships between their own children. If my own experience of 'being an older brother' is that 'younger brothers are favourites' then I may attend more carefully to my elder son in order to ensure that he does not suffer the disadvantages that go with the role. Kramer & Baron (1995) reported that mothers who claimed negative sibling histories were most likely to have children who interacted positively with one another as a result of the mother's selective child-rearing practices, such as less differentiated treatment of siblings. Of course children learn a lot from siblings (Dunn, 1997), not only from interacting with them but also from seeing others interact with them. For instance, a child could acquire a negative view of self from seeing parents consistently treat a sibling in a more favourable manner (Nicholson, 2006).

What is going on here? It should not surprise us that parents use their own past experience in order to structure their approach to parenting. Humans typically use their past interpretation or thoughts about events as guides for the future (Duck, 1994), but this does not mean that they do so without adding their own spin, fantasies, hopes, or good ideas when they can. Furthermore, it should not surprise us to find that the two persons in a relationship influence *each other*, even if one of them (the child) seems on the face of it to have less formal power than the other (the parent). Neither children nor romantic partners simply experience relationships as 'recipients' or as 'creators' but as both, working together interactively to make their relationship work. Children can often control parents (e.g., by being demanding or uncooperative and hence requiring a parent to attend).

Research has moved away from the simple idea that parents just imprint their kids and the kids respond, instead emphasizing the constructive/interpretative role of the child rather that seeing it as a receptacle for parents to put ideas into (Pettit & Clawson, 1996). Children have several different paths to the achievement of peer competence, whether they adapt to parental style (Baumrind, 1972), observe siblings and peers (Dunn, 1996; Nicholson, 2006), follow explicit parental advice (Pettit & Mize, 1993), or experience the benefits (or costs) of parental memories of

childhood (Putallaz et al., 1993), or parental management of the social environment (Pettit & Clawson, 1996). This is an instance of a more general trend to credit all relational partners with their own interpretative frameworks that mean that relating is never just the activity of one person upon another, but instead is two constructive persons working together reciprocally (Carl & Duck, 2004).

Interpreting emotions

Given this background, can we blend a personal style of approach to other people into the social and cultural context for interpreting emotions generally? Are our abilities to feel emotions directed by childhood experience? What other things may (also) come into play in the emotions of relationships? Some researchers have already connected emotion to broader styles and Ryan, La Guardia, Solky-Butzel, Chirtov & Kim (2005) conducted three studies on people's willingness to rely on others for emotional support. Those people who show more emotional reliance generally also experience greater well-being although this varies significantly across different relationships, cultural groups, and sex. People also showed systematic variations in emotional characteristics that were connected to need satisfaction within specific relationships. Feeney (2004) examined a typology of hurtful events in couple relationships and distinguished between hurtful comments and hurt feelings, since previous research has developed a typology of hurtful speech acts, but utterances are only one source of hurt. Some people have argued that the central theme of hurtful events is relational in nature and is specifically derived from a relational devaluation, whereas Feeney talks of a sense of rejection.

   Although we usually think of emotions as feelings that happen to us or which we experience, recent theory is taking the view that many of our feelings in relationships are contextually and situationally driven rather than being 'pure feelings'. For example, Feeney (2005) looked at perceptions of the appraisals specifically involved in hurtful events in couple relationships. She suggested that hurt feelings are elicited by relational transgressions that generally imply relational devaluation and that evoke a sense of personal injury by threatening positive mental models of self and/or others: 'It seems that hurt feelings generally reflect a complex set of perceptions about the value of the self, the partner, and the relationship [and] … [u]npacking the complex experience of "hurt feelings" is thus an important goal for researchers and clinicians' (2005: 270). In short, specific events trigger emotions but do so partly because they imply devaluation of both self and the relationship.

   When events rub up against personal styles of thinking about one's value to another person, then emotions of a very striking quality are created. The emotions, however, come from both the events themselves and the preexistence of a relational context in which to judge them, and so the personal response to such things is guided in part by one's sense of self, but only in part. Feeney's paper

raises the question: what are the major events that count as hurtful in romantic relationships? Such a question of course, conceals some issues about the way in which emotions are understood in a particular culture and the value which is given to certain kinds of relationships. In Britain and Australia it is much more common and acceptable to tease and 'put down' friends as a part of friendship than it is in the USA, for example. Therefore, what may be treated as 'hurtful' in the USA may not be so regarded in the UK or Australia.

The feelings that we have in relationships are partly the result of context in many different ways and particularly as a result of how we feel or expect to be treated in relationships, but a further context for the practical conduct of relationship is the use of language. Metts & Planalp (2002) consider at length the ways in which expression of emotion functions in everyday life not merely as a revelation of an inner state, but as a 'speech act' that is intended to bring about a result or alter something in the social context. Thus, 'I'm very angry with you' is not simply a declaration, but rather it is an accusation that is intended to generate a confession, an apology, or an expression of regret from the other person.

We can recognize the force of language in expression of emotions (e.g., in expression of anger, hurt, or declarations of love), but communication is also something that takes place directly *about* relationships as well as *in* relationships. Not only do people talk about how their relationship is going (Carl, 2006a; Wood, 2006), but they may talk in order to express deeper emotion in a relationship or to start and continue a relationship in the first place (Sprecher & Duck, 1993). Partners also often show relationship awareness and convey their thoughts about the relationship to one another directly in talk (Acitelli, 1988; 1993). Finally emotion may be both generated and discussed during conflict or daily hassles (Alberts et al., 2005), or in confronting various relationship challenges, such as dealing with long-distance relationships or temporary separation (Sahlstein, 2006b).

Sanderson, Rahm & Beigbeder (2005) examined individuals' focus on intimacy and whether that might lead them to interacting in distinct ways that lead to different levels of relationship satisfaction. Patterns of interaction (e.g., time spent, social support exchange, self-disclosure), as well as good perceptions of one's friend's goals connect well to high satisfaction at least in part because people with these characteristics interact in their close friendships in distinct ways. Intimacy is connected to satisfaction through close attention to the 'stuff' that happens in life, and also individuals with a strong focus on intimacy goals handle conflict in more constructive ways in both romance and friendship, a finding similar for both sexes. However, people's willingness to express emotion or to do things, such as comforting someone else, that follow from such emotions, are judged in a social context – as Burleson, Homstrom & Gilstrap (2005) indicate 'Guys can't say that to guys' and some forms of male expression of distress or of comfort and compassion are evidently limited by the masculine roles and whether the emotions are seen as suitable for expression by males.

LISTEN IN ON YOUR OWN LIFE

- Do you talk to other people about the emotional quality of your relationships?
- Are you more likely to talk to women or men about these things?
- Why does it make sense to discuss your own personal feelings with someone else in the first place?
- Discuss these matters in class

Emotions are often represented as the stuff of which the peaks and troughs of life are made, as when, for example, we feel exhilarated, depressed, shy, lonely, jealous or in love. Those selected emotions are particularly powerful (for example, love and jealousy – which some countries accept as legitimate excuses and legal justifications for 'crimes of passion'). However, the emotional experiences that create and sustain relationships are not necessarily so consistently dramatic and are certainly not limited to turbulent emotions, but might be found in social anxiety about a date or in fear of bullying by a boss or in sexual harassment. Clearly in daily relationships we experience regret, disappointment, sadness, guilt, anxiety, contentment, joy, satisfaction, irritation, admiration, disgust – and most important, and most of the time, not very much at all except a sense that things are pretty much where they were last time we checked. What is true of relationships is one simple fact: they are not composed of universally strong or universally positive experiences but are rather humdrum (Wood & Duck, 2006). Most of what we do in daily life is to manage. We manage and balance our own feelings as against those of a partner; we manage the good and the bad things in a relationship that generate positive and negative emotions, we handle daily 'stuff' (Duck, Foley & Kirkpatricks, 2006b). The present chapter next explores some of the emotions that we instantly – and perhaps superficially – think of as 'relational'; the following chapter relates them to actual experiences of living relatively mundane daily life in human relationships. My point is that to focus only on dramatic emotional upheavals and to use them as the focus of research on emotions in relationships is unbalanced. It is important to understand that strong emotions may be relatively rare experiences in the daily conduct of human relationships and that a focus on such things takes our attention away from the huge amount of routine relational and emotional work that we do at other times and in rather trivial ways (Duck, in press).

Secondly, it is important to recognize that the topic of 'emotion' is in any case one surrounded by much controversy. Our automatic approach is to represent emotion as a strong, internal, individual feeling of some kind. We may even think about

how people represent emotions to other people and we may recognize that whatever they are, emotions are not just internal subconscious disturbances that never get out into the real world, but may be revealed in the course of confession about relational transgressions (Afifi, Falato & Weiner, 2001) and in any case are often interpersonal conversational experiences as much as they are internal psychological events. Indeed, as cheating lovers may well find, jealousy can be expressed in some intriguing, and occasionally fatal, ways. All the same, just as we saw in Chapter 1, the feelings about other people occur, or come into being, as part of contexts that are outside of the individual per se, such as the culture, society, family and workplace. Therefore the exploration of emotion in relationships should not stop short at the point where the feeling is felt, nor rest satisfied with explanations in terms of the cognitive or social structures that 'produce' it. Rather, we must understand the ways in which emotions have impact on relationships in their everyday working contexts and vice versa (Dutton & Ragins, 2007 have a book on positive relationships at work; Harden Fritz & Omdahl, 2006, have one on difficult relationships at work, and Kirkpatrick, et al., 2006, have one about relating difficulty anywhere.). Such a goal will entail us understanding the ways in which human beings have been socialized to *express* (or limit their expression of) emotions about relationships and relational partners within a particular social and relational context. Foster & Campbell (2005) discuss the adversity of being in a secret relationship and the problems associated with decisions to reveal or conceal it, finding that secrecy and the desire to maintain secrecy about a relationship tend to increase negative feelings and to decrease satisfaction with the relationship itself. It is evidently a painful thing to feel something strongly, but to be constrained by social norms not to tell people about it. The goal of maintaining social respectability, then, in these cases can conflict with other relational goals and the intensity of a positive feature is balanced by an intense sense of oppression in not being able to declare it openly in a way that is accepted by other people (cf. Lannutti, 2005).

The intention to conduct relationships appropriately will also entail us realizing the extent to which emotions are exacerbated by contexts for expression and the ways in which a culture judges emotions as appropriate to a given context or set of circumstances. For instance, one interesting and recurrent observation in jury trials is that defendants who appear calm and collected when told about a spouse's death are often catapulted into first place as prime suspects because that sort of emotional (non)reaction is not regarded as 'appropriate' to the receiving of tragic news (Searcy et al., 2005).

Labelling and expressing feelings

The emotions that are expressed in a given society are a mixture of apparently universal human feelings and cultural prescriptions that define the form and

appropriateness of the expression of those emotions. For example, we assume that all humans experience fear and joy; indeed Darwin did some work not only suggesting that such emotions are common to all societies and to some animal species also, but that there is a certain amount of 'cross-species' recognition of major emotional expressions (Guerrero & Floyd, 2006). Some societies, however, place very strong emphasis on such emotions as 'shame' while others recognize it but give it little weight. Some societies expect grief to be borne with quiet, stoic dignity and reserve, others expect loud wailing expressions accompanied by energetic physical demonstrations of distress (Duck, in press). There is some discussion by scholars on whether communication of emotion *is* the emotion (for example, some argue that we can never know more than the *expression* of emotion; also some people make themselves feel angry just by shouting), or whether communication is a component of emotion (some people feel worse when they express anxiety than when they do not), or whether emotional expression is simply the externalizing of some inner state that is ascribed as a result of socially accepted labels. For example, Schachter & Singer (1962) showed that people who were emotionally aroused could be enticed to describe their feelings as either anger or joy depending on the label that fitted their social surroundings best (for example, whether people around them were laughing or hostile). In other words, the 'emotion' they were feeling was steered towards the label presented by the behaviour of other people in a social setting and was not simply felt as a pure emotion. This analysis was even applied to the emotion of love by Berscheid & Hatfield (1974) and held some currency for a while as researchers showed that high arousal led to descriptions of 'appropriate' emotions if people were presented with the right cues to pin their feelings upon (arousal in the presence of an attractive person was labelled 'attraction' but without such a stimulus was labelled as 'anxiety', for example, so be careful who you sit next to during an exam). The discussion of emotion is thus complicated by some important cultural contexts for emotion and is not simply a question of looking at the feelings that people 'naturally' have.

First, the strong social imperatives about the need for, and means of, communication of emotion spoil some people's relationships and relationship problems such as shyness often show up as culturally unusual or inappropriate ways of communicating feeling (Bradshaw, 2006). Second, when we report or describe emotions, we frequently edit our accounts of them so that they make sense to other people, not just to ourselves. Therefore we use culturally accepted language, reference points, and narrative form for describing emotions (Acitelli, Duck & West, 2000). Typically these describe emotions and relational behaviours in ways that are accepted in our culture as valid ones (for example, our culture accepts that someone 'falls in love' rather than 'gets bitten by the love god's mosquito').

Usually our language for describing emotions in relationships also means that we summarize them as future-oriented, enduring or continuous states rather than momentary or fleeting micromomentary feelings (Duck & Sants, 1983). For

instance, we are more likely to say 'I am in love with you', or 'I will love you for ever', or 'I am friends with you' rather than 'I felt a twinge of love for you at the particular moment when you looked at me' or 'I felt friendship towards you just for the moment when you shared that secret with me'. This characteristic of language – that it labels and stabilizes or perpetuates an appearance that life is made up of 'states' and transitions between states – is crucial to the conduct of relationships, which we also tend to describe as continuous states rather than turbulent, or at least variable, experiences (Duck, 1994). All the same, much of our emotional life is devoted to the long-term organization of the variabilities and inconsistencies of daily experience or the creation of uniform labels for muddled and diversiform experiences (Duck, 2006).

The summary of emotions and translation of them into state language in this way make it hard to pinpoint the true initial causes of emotions or love and friendship. Perhaps we can explain it as `love at first sight' but usually we prefer to look back over a whole range of experiences and events to 'explain' emotional states. We would feel foolish saying that we loved someone only during a particular few seconds a week or only when we thought of it or merely for the shape of the nose. Our culture prefers to believe that it takes time to fall in love, and that love is a complete emotion constructed from many cues and causes all rolled together over periods of time, particularly due to something uplifting, like expanding one's awareness by including the other's perspectives as part of one's self (Aron & Aron, 1997). Yet considerations of the role of language and communication in relation to love are becoming more common. Beall & Sternberg (1995) noted that the depiction of love draws on a large arsenal of social expectations such as those created in novels concerning the ways in which love should proceed (see Chapter 1 on 'quality' of relationships and emotions). Prusank, Duran & DeLillo (1993) have documented the ways in which popular magazines influence and also reflect people's experiences of romance and marriage in providing guidelines and advice about the ways in which relationships 'should' be conducted. Interestingly, but in line with my arguments here about cultural context, such advice about relationships has changed over the last 50 years, from an assumption that there is only one correct way to do relationships, a way agreed by all experts, to the more recent view that freedom to be oneself, however that works, is most significant and so supersedes joint relational maintenance as the primary concern in life.

Rephrasing the above in a more technical way, statements about social emotions use dispositional or continuous language to provide 'summary affect statements' about our partner and these are socially appropriate to the culture in which we happen to find ourselves. They summarize our feelings about someone using culturally approved terminology and culturally accepted explanations for the basis of relationships, just as the discussion of attachment theory runs the risk of representing a person's approach to all relationships as only one sort of thing. They are

not simple descriptions of short-term personal emotional peaks or troughs; instead they reverberate to social norms. They emphasize implicit continuity in relationships and prepare partners and others to expect a certain shape to the future – a future that still has the relationship in it! In fact, much of the construction of relationships is based on various ways of manipulating our expectations about the future in this way, since relationships involve unfinished business that continues throughout the life of the relationship itself (Duck, 1990; 1994). Much of the basis of emotion is founded in the organization of routines of behaviour that make up the day-to-day conduct of this unfinished business where disruption to routines causes annoyance, change to routines occurs as a result of falling in love, and continuous conduct of routines reassures us about the relationship's significance to our partner as well as to ourselves (Duck, 2006; Wood, 2006). In short, social emotions are not just fleeting physiological experiences but are organized, long-term behavioural creations that find their form and shape in the behaviour and routines of everyday conduct of relationships, expressed in ways that carry symbolic force in a given society (Fitch, 2003).

As a matter of fact there is some evidence that the symbolic values of emotion and relationships have changed somewhat through history, even in our own culture. In a fascinating report, Contarello & Volpato (1991) have explored both the similarities and the differences in literary descriptions of friendship over the last 1000 years. They found that friendship has always involved intimacy, respect, and mutual help, plus the likelihood of the friend confronting one's own weaknesses honestly. By contrast, in the passage from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century, friendship went through a profound change, with conflict emerging as a common element. Also although all the texts examined in this study were written by female authors, female friendship was hardly ever mentioned in the early texts! Werking (2000) gives close discussion to another often overlooked relationship, cross-sex platonic relationships. Although Harry ('*When Harry met Sally*') felt that 'Men and women can never be friends; the sex thing always gets in the way', West, Anderson & Duck (1995) and Werking (2000) discuss at length the fact that such friendships are increasingly commonplace. Yet cross-sex friends always face cultural constraints on the relationship, must contend with disbelief that their friendship is not really a secret sexual one, and have to battle scepticism that there really is 'just' friendship. Indeed for many reasons, cross-sex friendships is one of the hottest understudied relationships in the research literature (Werking, 2000; West, et al., 1995; Wood & Duck, 1995) and has now been extended to 'hook ups' (Paul, 2006) and FWBRs – Friends With Benefits (Hughes, Morrison & Asada, 2005), partly because it points up so clearly the fact that relationships are not the result of pure emotion but take on a life (and form of life) that is shaped by response to the prevailing practices and opinion on the street.

LISTEN TO YOUR OWN CONVERSATIONS

... on hook-ups, FWBRs and the double standard.

Check out what people are saying these days about hookups, friends with benefits, and Internet dating. Listen out for ways in which people describe these relationships as judged differently according to whether men's or women's involvement is being described. Make a note of any differences that you observe, and discuss them with your classmates and friends.

Positive emotion: love

Love is blamed for a lot of things from the Trojan War to various crimes of passion that appear in the tabloid newspapers. It is called 'a temporary insanity' (Bierce, The Devil's Dictionary. He went on to add that it is 'curable by marriage'). So what is it? 'It is difficult, if not impossible, to answer the question "What is love?" because any answer must reflect its time period and place and in particular the functions that romantic love serves there' (Beall & Sternberg, 1995: 417). In attempting to answer the question, however, several lines of work have been developed. Their focus has been almost exclusively on heterosexual romantic love but Huston & Schwartz (1995) and Peplau & Spalding (2000) have extended the discussion to exploration of homosexual love in different compositions of gendered groups. More recently, Lannutti (2005) has placed the issue in the context of legally recognized same-sex marriage and the role of such an institution in the understanding of the possibilities offered by people feeling specific emotions. Clearly the recognition of possible forms of relationship between pairs of people who are in love depends on the norms existing in a particular society and what it assumes may be allowed to matter. All in all, the research suggests the brilliance of James' (1890) observation that the worst thing that can happen to anyone is to go through life without getting noticed by anybody else when you wish to be acknowledged (and in this case without it being possible for your strong emotions for another person to be formally recognize as permissible). Indeed Mak & Marshall (2004) suggest that mattering to other people helps us to locate ourselves and give a sense of purpose. Since love is the ultimate form of mattering, we should attend to it carefully here.

LOOK FOR THIS IN THE MEDIA

Look out for ways in which the media celebrate length of relationship and treat it as 'success'.

Love is a juicier topic than friendship, and could be seen as the primary relational emotion especially given the emphasis that our culture places on long-term partnerships as an ultimate measure of relational 'success'. If we were Contarello & Volpato, mentioned above, we'd immediately note that love was not 'big' in marriages in the twelfth Century. It was not even expected to be there – at least not in the sense that we expect it to be the basis of marriage nowadays. Marriage, especially between noble persons, was politically arranged and served the needs of strengthening the ties between different groups, families, or 'houses'. Tuchman indicates that: 'Although the free consent of marriage partners was theoretically required by the church, and the "I will" declaration was considered to be the doctrinal essence of the marriage contract made before a priest, practical politics overlooked this requirement, sometimes with unhappy results.' (1978: 47) If the partners liked each other then that was a bonus, but all that was *necessary* was loyalty, with fidelity. Nowadays we do things differently, and, in America and the UK, we have a divorce rate at 50 per cent!

Also important is the fact that the 'experience' of love is tied in important ways to the manner in which it may be expressed in a given society. Kovecses (1991) notes that we communicate about love in many different ways, using some very obscure and some very complex metaphors and cultural meaning systems. For example, love is often likened to food or eating ('sugar', 'honey', 'feast your eyes upon…', 'good enough to eat…') but also to consumption of other types ('all aflame with passion…', 'burning desire', 's/he sets my heart on fire'). The extensive system of meaning and communication through metaphors and other linguistic devices shows us, through Kovecses' analysis, the power of the system of description. This perhaps points to common threads of experience for us all in trying to understand and communicate our feelings of love to other people. For instance, we can readily understand and sympathize with someone who claims to be displaced (for example, 'head over heels in love' – rather a curious phrase when you think that the head normally is over the heels anyway or distracted (for example, 'I'm mad with love for you', 'They are nuts about each other').

Does such a finding of regular and systematic use of specifically vivid metaphors about love indicate that we typically experience it in culturally 'agreed' ways? Marston, Hecht & Robers (1987) looked at the subjective experience of love and the ways in which people communicate about it. From interviews and questionnaire data they found that there are essentially six ways in which people communicate about love. The subjective experience of love has at least three components: 1) relational labels/constructs, like commitment and security; 2) physiological labels, such as feelings of nervousness and warmth; 3) behaviour and NVC, such as doing things with the other person or ways of looking at one another (Marston, et al., 1987). Given that love-smitten subjects conceptualized love in terms of *different mixes* of these elements, rather than in terms of different strengths of the same mix, Marston, et al. found evidence for six types of experience of love. These are: *collaborative love* (supportiveness); *active love* (joint activities and 'erratic rhythms' such as changes to

the pace of daily routines); *intuitive love* (NVC ability to communicate feelings); committed love (togetherness); traditional romantic love (future commitment and feeling good); Expressive love (telling the other person about one's feelings). Hecht, Marston & Larkey (1994) found that people experiencing committed love have higher quality relationships. However, the relationship labels themselves are cultural provisions, as are the criteria for deciding whether a relationship is of high quality: cultures have norms that help individuals decide what is a relationship and whether it is 'good', as we saw in Chapter 1.

Are there different types of love?

Several scholarly approaches to understanding love are based on the idea that we can distinguish different sorts of the same basic emotion. For example, there are some differences (though there are also many similarities) between the ways in which women and men respond to love. For one thing, although men and women report experiencing the same levels of intensity of love (Rubin, 1973), men 'fall in love' at an earlier point in a relationship than women do, whereas women fall out of love sooner than men do (Hatfield & Walster, 1978). This has led to men being called 'FILOs' (First In, Last Out) and women 'LIFOs' (Last In, First Out). On the other hand, women say that they have been infatuated more often than men (on average, 5.6 times for women and 4.5 times for men), but both sexes report being in loving relationships about as often – around 1.25 times (Kephart, 1967).

Such findings raise the possibility that love is not a simple single emotion but a complex mix of many different feelings or types of emotion. Maslow, an early theorist, distinguished B (for being) love, which he saw as positive and implying independence, from D (for dependency) love, which he saw as negative and implying neediness. Another distinction is between passionate love and companionate love (Berscheid & Walster, 1974): passionate love is the steamy sort that Casanova and Don Juan specialized in, whilst companionate love is the kind that kin and long-term marriage partners may have. Companionate love is enhanced by an increased sense of commitment whilst passionate love derives primarily from physiological arousal and excitement.

Is love really just either madly passionate or boringly dispassionate? Is this passionate–companionate dichotomy too simple to account for all the feelings that we can have towards a lover? Another proposal suggests that there are six types of love (Lee, 1973) and that persons can mix the types together in various ways. The six types are labelled with various Latin and Greek words for types of love: *eros*, *ludus*, *storge*, *pragma*, *mania* and *agape*. Each has a typical character and a brief explanation may assist us in working out the nature of love.

Eros (romantic love) focuses upon beauty and physical attractiveness; it is a sensual love that expects to be returned. People who score highly on *eros* typically believe in 'love at first sight' and are particularly sensitive to the physical

blemishes of their partner, such as overweight, broken nose, smelly feet or misaligned teeth. They are attracted to partners on the basis of physical attraction, like to kiss and cuddle soon after meeting a new partner, and report a definite genital response (lubrication, erection) to the first kiss.

Ludus (game-playing love) is like a game and is seen as fun, not to be taken seriously. People scoring high on *ludus* typically flirt a lot, keep partners guessing about their level of commitment to them and stop a relationship when it stops being fun. They get over love affairs easily and quickly, enjoy teasing their lovers and will often go out with someone even when they know they do not want to get involved.

Storge (friendship love) is based on caring, not on passion. People scoring high on *Storge* typically believe that love grows from friendship, that lovers must share similar interests and enjoy the same activities. For storgic lovers, love grows with respect and concern for the other person. They can put up with long separations without feeling that the relationship is threatened and are not looking for excitement in the relationship, as ludic lovers are.

Pragma (logical, shopping-list love) is practical and based on the belief that a relationship has to work. People scoring high on *pragma* ask themselves whether their lover would make a good parent and they pay thoughtful attention to such things as their partner's future career prospects. Pragmatic lovers take account of their partner's background and characteristics like attitudes, religion, politics and hobbies. Pragmatic lovers are realistic and relatively unromantic.

Mania (possessive, dependent love) is essentially an uncertain and anxious type of love; it is obsessive and possessive and half expects to be thrown aside. Manic lovers get very jealous. People scoring high on *mania* typically believe in becoming ill or doing stupid things to regain their partner's attention if ever the partner ignores them or takes them for granted. They also claim that when the relationship gets into trouble, they develop illnesses like stomach upsets.

Agape (all-giving, selfless love) is selfless and compassionate and generally loves other human beings in an unqualified way, as preached by Gandhi, Buddha and Jesus. In their close relationships, Agapic lovers would claim that they use their strength to help their partner through difficult times and may say that if their partner had a baby with someone else, they would want to help to care for it as if it were their own. Lee (1973) reports that he did not encounter any persons who were perfect examples of agapic lovers, although many people reported brief agapic episodes.

Do such love styles get communicated differently in speech? What about cultural contexts also and how do they modify expressions of the feelings? If there are these types of love, then do men and women experience them to different extents? Yes. Men are Erotic and ludic in their attitudes to love (Hendrick, Hendrick, Foote & Slapion-Foote, 1984), whilst women are Pragmatic, Manic, and Storgic. In other words, men's love is typically passionate and uncommitted, with

an element of game-playing coupled with romance. Women's love is typically practical and caring, with an element of possessiveness, a view that could be explained in terms of economic factors and the fact that in the past it has paid women to be practical and to think long term when they have had a choice. This is not to say that women do not base their love on passion or that men do not care about their lovers. The sexes mix their experience of love in different blends. However, the broad differences in love style between men and women are very broad assessments that do not do justice to the subtleties of love style and there are now known to be several other levels of difference that moderate or complicate the general rule that men and women are different in their experiences of love. For example there are differences apparent in different types of relationships (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1990) and differences between people in love and those who are not (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1988). Also people report their feelings of love differently in different circumstances or to different audiences (Hendrick & Hendrick, 2000). Thus the broad style of love is a springboard from which a complex, multiform compendium of emotions is expressed in talk.

Developing love?

So far, we have explored love as a state of feeling that is expressed and communicated but we should also look for expressive change as people fall in love. Aron, Dutton, Aran & Iverson (1989) showed that falling in love is characterized by frequent expression of the fact that the other person is like the self, by comment on the other's desirable characteristics, by talk of similarity, and communication of a sense of 'mystery or magic'. By contrast, falling in friendship is reported as due simply to similarity and propinquity, with a little less emphasis on the other's desirable characteristics and practically no mention of any magic or mystery. Aron & Aron (1997) further delineate the ways in which the experience of falling in love is also an experience of self-expansion or enrichment of the sense of self by inclusion of the other. In other words, humans are geared towards the expansion of their self through exploration, development of competence, integration of incoherent experiences, or extension of awareness. The development of a relationship with someone who diversifies the expansion is deeply satisfying and enriches both persons' sense of self.

Another possibility is that falling in love is a transition between different blends of the types of love. For instance, initial attraction to a possible lover might begin as Erotic love, mixed perhaps with mania (desire for possession) and ludus (game-playing). As the relationship develops, the lovers might express greater feelings of storge (friendship) as they develop caring on top of passion. This may lead the partners on to talk about the working of the relationship in the long term, that is, to discuss the partner's potential as a long-term mate, co-parent of the children, and so on – in short, to an assessment of pragmatic concerns. If the partner seems to pass that test, then they might begin to express pragma love. All of this would suggest that married couples would score more highly than other couples on

pragma love, whilst new dates might score more highly on erotic love, that is, views about the 'right type' of love for different sorts of relationship will vary. As the relationship to a partner develops, so the type of love will be communicated differently also (Hendrick & Hendrick, 2000)

All of the above suggests the centrality of the way in which love is communicated. As Marston et al. (1987) found, when I feel love or think about it, I also communicate about it and I may communicate in order to do something about it or to change the relationship (Metts & Planalp, 2002). When I feel it, I may even think of inventive ways to communicate it ('My love is like a red, red rose that's newly sprung in June; My love is like a melody that's sweetly sung in tune…'). But there is something equally important: the way in which we express love may be *coloured by the circumstances of the moment*. If we are on a date then we may be interested in openly conveying lust (if we are feeling lucky) or at least strong positive feelings (something like *eros*). By contrast, if we are discussing marriage, our minds may turn to the roles involved in long-term commitment (something like *pragma*). If we are feeling playful and having a good time, or in a group of friends who can overhear what we are saying, then we may just start teasing (something like *ludus*). These could all be different modes of expression of the same single positive attitude towards a partner rather than different types or styles of emotion. Attitudes do not have a single level of intensity or only one mode of expression. As rhetorical theorists note (Dixson & Duck, 1993), we express our attitudes and make statements in particular forms as a result of the *audience* to whom we are talking and the *situation* where we are speaking. 'The attitude' is thus represented by many different forms of expression and is a somewhat amorphous and protean thing. I suspect that researchers of love ought to look less at the presumed single-minded and enduring aspect of the person who feels the love (as psychologists tend to do when they explore love attitudes or love styles). Instead they should pay more attention to the circumstances and rhetorical/social/interpersonal contexts or situations where love is expressed and communicated in everyday life. Although you can feel love without expressing it to anyone but yourself, the occasions that are most interesting are obviously those where it is not only felt but also expressed. There it carries social and relational consequences and yet is also constrained by social and relational forces without actually changing its nature.

LOOK OUT FOR THIS IN THE MEDIA

Check out recent movies for different types of love style. You can find *eros* in the bar scene in *Top Gun* and *agape* in *The Bodyguard*, for example. See if you can find other more recent examples of all the love styles.

The behaviour of lovers

Aside from the feelings of love which drive us into relationships, there are behavioral and communicative consequences also (Acitelli, 1993; Aron & Aron, 1997). Love is both a felt emotion and an expression of that feeling in the behaviour through which we communicate to partners – and to the outside world – that we love them. Obviously, partners who are married often choose to wear wedding rings to communicate the fact; dates hold hands; partners embrace or put their arms around one another in the street. These NVC indications are slight but well known. They are called 'tie signs' (Goffman, 1959) in that they indicate that two people are 'tied' to one another (like other uses of symbolic spatial, personal, and territorial markers discussed in Chapter 1). Furthermore, lovers sit closer to one another than do 'likers', and they gaze at one another more than do people who are just friends (Rubin, 1973). Obviously also lovers and would-be lovers talk to one another in intimate ways that are 'readable' by outsiders and which occasionally make lovers sensitive about audiences or careful about how they behave in company (Baxter & Widenmann, 1993).

Also Sprecher & Duck (1993) investigated the ways in which first dates are converted into second dates (because at some point they obviously have to be if people continue the relationship, yet this practical aspect of relationship development had almost never been studied before – or, regrettably, since!). As may be expected, talk plays a critical role in the enterprise and is a central mechanism for converting initial attraction into a working form of relationship. Furthermore, as things move even further forward, the partners wind up talking about the relationship itself at some point as it becomes a topic of conversation in its own right (Duck, 1994). Indeed Acitelli (1988, 1993) has shown that such talking is a key way in which people adjust their perceptions of one another, ratify their evaluations, and increase mutual understanding, checking out discrepancies of understanding and generally clearing the way to a better grasp of one another's inner core. The very act of talking about the relationship is a key way in which love is indicated, especially for women (indeed men sometimes assume that something must be *wrong* with the relationship if the partner wants to talk about it!). On the other hand, Caughlin & Afifi (2004: 479) found that 'associations between topic avoidance and relational dissatisfaction were moderated by individuals' motivations for avoidance and by personal and relational characteristics that are conceptually linked to such motivations. These findings are consistent with theoretical arguments that topic avoidance can be benign – and even helpful – in some relational circumstances.' Again, then, we see the connection between the specifics of a relational situation and the particular motivations held by the partners, but the basic message seems to be that *management* of talking about your relationships is important.

One part of love, then, is a direct communicative display of the fact that we love our partner. However, as both Acitelli's and Caughlin & Afifi's work shows in their

different ways, some of the cues that are contained in communication are subtle and indirect, and not only reassure the partner but tell the outside world that the relationship exists and draw subtle boundaries around the relationship, while also being built on the partners' internal working models of what matters. Of course, the sorts of display that we choose on a given occasion are also likely to be influenced by the rhetorical situation, the social context and the interpersonal environments as discussed earlier. Presenting a partner with a ring, doing a really big and inconvenient favour, and disrobing are all, in their own ways, capable of conveying a message of love and fondness through behaviour. Nevertheless, each is appropriate only to a particular set of circumstances or for a particular audience and would be inappropriate in other circumstances or with other audiences, as you can imagine.

For this reason, *loving behaviour* itself develops and changes as love attitudes themselves develop. Developing love is not simply an increasingly powerful attitude but is also a changing constellation of behaviours. As Aron et al. (1989) show, the *experience* of falling in love is usually described in terms only of attitudes and feelings, based on other people's personalities or physical characteristics, similarity to oneself or propinquity. Aron & Aron (1997), however, went on to describe the importance of shared activity – and in particular exciting shared activity – in the process of developing love, especially those that involve high levels of physical activity (dancing, hiking, bicycling) or newness and exoticness (attending concerts or studying nature).

In addition to the feelings associated with falling in love there are some pleasant consequences and some side effects. There is a strongly reported change in behaviour, as well, such as increased eye contact, physical closeness, and self-disclosure (Hendrick & Hendrick, 2000; Rubin, 1973). Beyond this there is a broader change to the structure of everyday life behaviors. For instance, we gradually pay more attention to a new lover and spend less time with old friends; we start to share more activities and adjust our lifestyles as we let our new lover into our lives; we arrange to spend more time with our partner and less with other people (Milardo & Wellman, 1992; Parks & Adelman, 1983). In short, part of falling in love is an increased binding together of the habits of daily life and a developing routine interdependence (Dainton, 2000), and even close friendships have to be maintained by routines like sending holiday greetings cards (Dindia, Timmerman, Langan, Sahlstein & Quandt, 2004). More than this, a big part of it is extending the range of ways in which love can be expressed and communicated. However, such behaviours frequently create stress or difficulty in ways that confirm the point that daily life is about management of conflicting forces (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996). Baxter, Mazanec, Nicholson, Pittman, Smith & West, (1997) show that persons who are withdrawing from interaction with their network of friends in order to facilitate or extend a deep romantic relationship actually experience competing loyalties. The problem is how to distribute a fixed amount of

time when different relationships (friends, family, lover) regard it as part of their relational rights to have access to a person's time.

Perhaps for this reason, *people who fall in love frequently* report that it is highly disruptive and that they develop a high level of nervous disorders and skin problems (Kemper & Bologh, 1981). However, when love is going well, people report feeling good both in mind and body (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1988). Disruption to love is more problematic, however. People who have never been in love claim that they have a high number of minor bodily disorders like colds and, flu, and people who have recently broken up with a partner suffer similar physical disorders too (Kemper & Bologh, 1981). Those whose partners had broken off with them typically report sleep problems, headaches, and loss of control of emotions. Those who caused the break-up suffered less, except that females reported stomach upsets.

Some problematic emotions: jealousy and shyness

Since we have looked at a positive emotion and yet human relationships are made up of negative ones too, I will briefly consider the emotional experiences of jealousy and shyness. These represent negative emotional contrasts to the positivity of love, although in the case of jealousy or relational obsession, they may be prompted by love of some kind in the first place. Love makes us feel valued by someone else, and we feel jealous when we fear that he or she does not value us or that s/he is spending too much time with someone else. (On a technical point of definition, one is jealous of what is one's own, but envious of that which is other people's. Thus one is jealous – or possessive – of one's own partner, but envious of – covetous of – someone else's).

Jealousy

Positive emotions have long been viewed as resulting in feelings of competency and accordingly the negative ones are often explained in terms of inadequacy – that is, inadequacy relative to other people and their feelings for us. The negative emotions in relationships (like jealousy) are often unpleasant precisely because they affect our self-esteem or our sense of competence as a social performer or partner. However, jealousy, obs ession, shyness and loneliness all in their own ways are complex blends of feelings, thoughts and behaviours (in the case of jealousy these are often treated by researchers as if they are coping behaviours).

Jealousy can be broken down into different types. Mazur (1977) distinguished five types:

- *Possessive jealousy* is a response to perceived violation of 'property rights'. For instance, we sometimes feel possessive jealousy if our partner acts in an independent way.

- *Exclusive jealousy* is a response to occasions when we are omitted from a loved one's important experiences or when we are not allowed to share a loved one's private world.
- *Competitive jealousy* is a feeling of inadequacy if our partner is actually better than we are at something where we ourselves wish to excel.
- *Egotistical jealousy* is the feeling that our way is the only way. In short, it is a desire to stay as we are, being uninfluenced to adapt to other people's wishes or needs.
- *Fearful jealousy* is a reaction to the threat of loneliness or rejection.

KEEP A JOURNAL

Record instances of jealousy that you observed in yourself or in other people. What gets said? What kinds of underlying emotions can you now recognize in what you said?

Jealousy can be communicated in different ways and Fleischman, Spitzberg, Andersen & Roesch (2005) even noted that people have a range of different strategies that are used to evoke jealousy in a partner in order to sustain the relationship by regaining the partner's attention and commitment to it, such as appearing to withdraw from the relationship (relational distancing), pretending to flirt with other people (flirtation façade), and discussing the possibilities of relational alternatives. Guerrero, Trost & Yoshimura (2005) looked at the relationship between jealousy-related emotions and communicative responses. Different characteristics of jealousy were considered: anger, fear, sadness, envy, guilt, sexual arousal/ passion, positive affect. Various communication acts were noted ('I yelled at him' 'I gave him guilt trips'). The authors wanted to explore how jealousy is communicated and also to show the varied types of communicative behaviours that follow from the simple experience of this specific emotion. The responses cover quite a range but most often contain strong elements of both anger and fear.

In accordance with the view that I am taking here, then, Guerrero et al.'s (2005) work indicates that a blend of feelings leads to a blend of communicative acts, both of which are given context by particular interpretations or symbolic meanings that we give to the acts that 'cause' jealousy on a given occasion. These will probably direct a person's attention to specific parts of the whole jealousy-evoking event (e.g., to a sense of feeling helpless and fearful and then to angry words). Contexts differ as a result of the degree of relationship intimacy between the relevant parties as well as according to the 'valued resources' that flow through and are controlled by that attachment (i.e., whether the relationship runs through our life fabric or is marginal and peripheral to it); and to the perceived degree of 'intrusion' into that attachment

by the third person (whether he or she really threatens it or just slightly unsettles it). This latter is important because no one expects a relationship with someone else to exclude all outsiders in all respects all of the time. We recognize that our partner will need and want other friends too: we cannot have the partner all to ourselves. Rather, we feel jealous when a third party threatens an area that is seen as central to our attachment to a partner (e.g., we would feel jealous if someone else looked like becoming our best friend's best friend), or else when feelings of discontent are brought about by another's evident superiority.

In our society, we usually have labels – 'friendship', 'marriage' and 'engagement' – that help us to mark out our relationships in ways that delineate their status, nature and importance to us and so warn outsiders that our partner is central to our attachment in this way. The labels indicate where the limits of the attachment lie, and the community helps in various ways to enforce the relationship. Thus, to announce an engagement or a marriage is to use a tie sign to tell the community to act as an extra guardian against intrusion or trespass on the relationship by outsiders. To put this another way, interpretations of situations are made on the basis of knowledge of the systematic behaviour of the partner; and also from social and cultural rules and knowledge from which to infer those interpretations of the person, such that the interpretation is based on normative or cultural expressions of meaning, and these meanings can be used to invoke the aid of others in watching over the proper performance of a relationship. In short, feelings of jealousy are not simply internal experiences of fear or anger, but are shaped 'as' jealousy by the relational frameworks within which the fear and anger arise.

Feelings are shaped partly as a result of social context and partly as a result of general social rules about the appropriateness of expressing certain emotions about relationships (Buunk, 1995). We may feel outrage as well as jealousy if someone infringes cultural rules – for example, by committing adultery with our spouse. In Victorian times, husbands were often encouraged to go and shoot their wife's lover(s) and in some countries the claim to have felt overwhelming jealousy is a permissible legal argument against severe sentences in 'crimes of passion'. However, if the relationship between sexual partners has not been formally agreed by society (e.g., if we are living together but are not married) then no rules govern the expression of feelings about the same sexual transgression. We may feel jealous but we will get no social support for feeling outraged.

Further, personal experience of our partner and the ways our lives are intertwined by routines together provide a basis for interpreting the meaning of certain behaviours that may affect our reactions. For instance, if we both agree that flirting with other people is an acceptable behaviour then we should not feel jealous when we catch a partner doing it (Bringle & Boebinger, 1990). In open marriages, for instance, partners feel jealous of their partner only when his or her behaviour violates the agreed rules about sexual conduct in the relationship and not just because the behaviour occurred (Buunk, 1980). 'Swingers' noted that it is acceptable for their partner to have sex with another person so long as he or she does not 'get emotionally involved'.

Such swingers would not feel jealous because the partner had extramarital sex but they would feel jealous if the partner became emotionally involved. Dijkstra, Groothof, Poel, Laverman, Schrier & Buunk (2001) extended this work to homosexuals, asking them whether emotional or physical infidelity was more upsetting, assuming that the two can be separated psychologically. The findings were that homosexuals tended to resemble heterosexuals of the opposite sex: that is to say, heterosexual women and gay men are more upset by emotional infidelity, whereas heterosexual men and lesbian women are more upset by physical infidelity. On the other hand, it now seems true for 'friends with benefits' relationships (Hughes et al., 2005) and hookups (Paul, 2006) that the implicit rule is that the sexual activity must be construed as physical and not 'relational' or 'emotional'. Such a categorization apparently relieves the sexual activity of any relational threats it would otherwise create.

LISTEN IN YOUR OWN LIFE

When you express jealousy, which of the following things is most likely to be reported as bringing it on:

- A sense of injustice that partly 'legitimates' the feeling?
- A sense that something is wrong with the relationship rather than with just one of the partners?
- Anger and feelings of self-doubt and self-accusation or a feeling of inadequacy?
- A desire to placate or to accommodate to the partner's desires or needs?

Shyness

Shyness is 'a dispositional tendency to experience feelings of anxiety and to exhibit behavioral inhibition in social situations' (Bradshaw, 2006: 17). Shyness is basically therefore embarrassment in advance, created by the belief that our real self will not be able to match up to the image we want to project.

Everyone feels shy from time to time, but some people are likely to feel more shy than others. Also obviously some people feel shy about certain topics (e.g., discussing sex) but not others (e.g., discussing taste in clothes), whereas some people feel shy about speaking in public when they are the focus of social attention, whatever the topic. Some 41 per cent of people believe that they are shy and up to 24 per cent think that it is a serious enough problem for them to do something about it (Duck, 1998). If you are not shy yourself, then two out of the next four people you meet will be and one of them will feel that it requires seeking professional help.

There is one key feature to shyness and it revolves around problems with interpersonal communication (Kelly, 1982). A central problem for many shy people is their unwillingness to communicate (i.e., 'reticence'), characterized by avoidance of, and ineptitude at, social interaction and performance in public or at the centre of attention in a social encounter, whatever the topic. Is the cause deficient communication skills; or anxiety about communication (so-called 'communication apprehension'); or simple avoidance of communication? In other words, is it because the person generally dislikes communication; or becomes paralysingly anxious about it; or just cannot do it well behaviourally? In practical terms there are few differences among the results of these three possible causes (Kelly, 1982), although the first two seem to be attitudinal or cognitive causes whilst the last is a behavioural or communicative problem. Programme that improve (behavioural) performance actually reduce anxiety also, so we cannot distinguish the behavioural and the attitudinal components readily. What is readily distinguishable is that part of shyness is the experience of dyadic communicative difficulties and that part of it is the communicative difficulties themselves. This raises the intriguing question of whether shyness is a particular sort of social interaction rather than a trait of particular people (Bradshaw, 2006).

Whichever of these possibilities is ultimately correct, a serious problem for shy people is that reticence is evaluated by outsiders as if the shy person felt actually hostile and negative towards people rather than being simply reserved or nervous about them (Burgoon & Koper, 1984). When strangers are asked to assess videotapes of reticent persons talking to other people, the strangers rate the reticents quite negatively. They see reticents as expressing too little intimacy/similarity, being detached and uninvolved in the interaction, and showing too much submissiveness and emotional negativity. They also rated reticents as not credible or somewhat 'shifty'. When the shy persons' friends saw the same videotapes, however, they usually rated the behaviour as more positive. In other words, shy persons' behaviour appears negative to strangers, but their friends had already become used to it and do not read it as hostile, merely quiet and reserved. Once shy people get friends they are seen positively; the problem is that their behaviour is such that strangers probably would not want to become their friends in the first place.

Bradshaw's (2006) recent review of shyness points out that it has different elements and affects the formation of relationships, as well as producing difficulties with both relatively distant 'social' relationships (e.g., talking with strangers, shop assistants, neighbours) and relatively close 'personal' relationships (e.g., problems with self-disclosure, intimacy, friendship, feeling nervous around possible romantic partners). Such difficulties are all ultimately overcome by most shy people, such that they enter stable relationships – well, look around! If 41 per cent of the population is shy and not able to get into relationships, where are they all hanging out? However, the common thread identified by Bradshaw (2006) is that shy people feel uncomfortable being 'themselves' and this is because they anticipate rejection or derogation and therefore do best in those situations where a sense of acceptance is readily available or can be created by others in the setting. This may be one reason why shy people do better online (for example, Ward &

Tracey, 2004 demonstrated that individuals who score more highly on shyness and computer confidence tend to get satisfactory involvement in online relationships. Shyness also differentiated relationship involvement across face-to-face and online relationships with shy people doing better online).

You might like to consider as a result of the above discussion in this chapter how shyness and jealousy might map on to an attachment style. Indeed, you might consider more generally, the ways in which attachment style can be represented in the emotions that humans generally seem to experience. If emotions are things which are communicated in the course of relationships and are deeply embedded in them, then they are likely to be affected by attachment processes, but as we will see in the next chapter, many enduring dispositions of personality are modified by the actual routine behaviours of everyday life. We are therefore faced with the question of whether dispositions or actual practices are more influential in generating relational activity … and feelings.

SUMMARY

This chapter has looked at the way in which development of emotional responses and attitudes towards relationships may be traced back to childhood. We have also looked at some powerful relational emotions including love, jealousy and shyness. The emotions that we have looked at here share a number of features:

1   They occur in relationship to other people, involve expressive and communicative behaviour, and are closely connected to the notion of worth and competence in relationships, based on standards set within particular cultures. Each in its own way is a form of expression that communicates our assumed value and worth to other people in that cultural context. The question is whether Attachment Style produces them or culture or …

2   These emotions do not need specific external events to spark them off but can all be rekindled just by thought and by fantasy or imagination about social encounters, past, present, or future. They can be experienced in the absence of other people but are 'about' them, though they take a cultural form of expression.

3   They are sometimes experienced as just hot surges of emotion, but are more often enduring emotional states reported in dispositional *language* (I am in love; I am a shy person) or seen to have possible long-term effects on relationships. They can become ways of social life, enshrined in ways of communicating and expressing ourselves through behaviour, and indeed are sometimes expressed in order to do something to the relationship.

4   They are structured into or impact upon social routines and everyday behaviours. That we feel jealous or shy or in love influences the way we *communicate with other people* in the long term, as well as in the short term. It can affect how we look at them, how we speak to them, and how we deal with them, as well as how we choose to relate to them. In short, personal emotions have dyadic, communicative effects also and are based within the language system with which a person thinks and speaks.

In short, I have been making the case that *social emotions* are essentially dyadic, communicative, and relational ones, and as such occur in a cultural context that adds layers of meaning to them by providing a context in which the 'meanings' of specific behaviours are interpreted and moderated.

You should now be more able to recognize and reflect on the way in which your childhood experiences affect the way in which you experience emotion and you should be more able to understand the ways in which emotion is expressed as part of relational experience. You should also be able to identify ways in which relationships are moderated by emotions but more specifically by the way in which they are articulated and communicated to other people.

SELF QUESTIONS

1 Childhood and relationships

In what ways are our views of childhood like and unlike those of previous generations? That is a broad question, so look at it in these ways:

- Should children be given the vote?
- Would you condemn a parent who took a child on the family holiday without asking the child?
- Do you think children are full of original sin, which has to be ground out them as they become civilized like adults are, or is childhood a natural state of innocence that socialization takes away?
- Do children learn good lessons from trying risky things for themselves?
- Should children call parents by their first names?

When you have completed these exercises, check out the Internet for the reasons given in the 1850s why women and slaves should not be given the vote and see how different or similar are the reasons that you listed in response to the question about children voting above.

2 Advice and cultural exceptions about emotions and relationships

- Have you ever completed a magazine quiz about emotions or relationships, and then compared answers with those given in a key? Do you accept the magazine's assessment?
- What do you think of the primary types of advice that are available in the media concerning emotion and relationships?
- How easily can you find specific advice about handling of emotions in any form of media that you know or have access to? Why is that?
- Take the quiz on jealousy on http://www.romanceclass.com/miscr/ LoveQuiz/QZ247 and notice how the advice on your responses is prescriptive, telling you what you should have said.

Class discussion time!

FURTHER READING

Bradshaw, S. (2006). Shyness and difficult relationships: Formation is just the beginning. In C.D. Kirkpatrick, S.W. Duck, & M.K. Foley (Eds.), Relating difficulty: The processes of constructing and managing difficult interaction (pp. 15–41). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

Brennan, K.A., & Shaver, P.R. (1998). Attachment styles and personality disorders: Their connections to each other and to parental divorce, parental death, and perceptions of parental caregiving. Journal of Personality, 66, 835–878.

Buss, D.M. (2000). The dangerous passion: Why jealousy is as necessary as love and sex. New York: Free Press.

Metts, S. (2000). Face and facework: Implications for the study of personal relationships. In K. Dindia, & S.W. Duck (Eds.), Communication and personal relationships (pp. 72–94). Chichester: Wiley.

Miller, R.S. (1996). Embarrassment: Poise and peril in everyday life. New York: Guilford.

PRACTICAL MATTERS

- Anger management programmes are available these days, but how would they connect with attachment style?
- Relationships are not static but as you read the research you may discover that typical approaches to studying them (correlational studies, or lab surveys about a typified example) often treat them as if they are. What practical implications follow from the fact that studies treat relationships as dispositional?
- What information from the present chapter, would you take forward to a parenting role?