2010

Accommodation in romantic relationships: The role of self-construal, attachment style, commitment levels, and ego-depletion

Faiza Furqan

ACCOMMODATION IN ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS: THE ROLE OF SELF-CONSTRUAL, ATTACHMENT STYLE, COMMITMENT LEVELS, AND EGO-DEPLETION

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

Psychology:

General-Experimental

---

by

Faiza Furqan

December 2010

ACCOMMODATION IN ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS: THE ROLE OF SELF-CONSTRUAL, ATTACHMENT STYLE, COMMITMENT LEVELS, AND EGO-DEPLETION

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

by

Faiza Furqan

December 2010

Approved by:

[redacted]

Dr. Michael Lewin, Chair, Psychology — 11/17/10 Date

[redacted]

Dr. Kelly Campbell

[redacted]

Dr. Matt Riggs

ABSTRACT

The current research sought to further understand the process of accommodation in romantic relationships by integrating the self-construals, attachment styles, commitment, and ego-depletion literature. One hundred and eigthy six undergraduate students (6.5% African/ African-American/ Black, 2.2% Arab/Arab-American/ Middle-Eastern, 8.6% Asian/ Asian-American/ Pacific Islander/ Indian, 32.8% Caucasian/ European-American/ White, 40.9% Latino/ Hispanic/ Chicano, 7% Multiethnic or "Other") took a part in an online study which measured the responses to accommodative dilemmas. Participants first completed the self-Construal Scale (SCS) which measured self-construals (independent and interdependent), the Relationship Questionaire (RQ) which measured attachment styles (secure, fearful, preoccupied, and dismissing), and the Investment Model Scale (IMS) which measured commitment, satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment in regards to the romantic partner and relationship. Participants also were assigned to either one of the two groups; an ego-depleted group and non-ego-depleted group. Participants in the ego-depleted group typed sentences with various restrictions while the participants in the non-ego-depleting had no typing

restrictions. Finally participants completed the Exit-Voice-Loyalty-Neglect-Forgiveness Scale (EVLNF) to measure their reactions to accommodative dilemmas. Results revealed that both independent and interdependent self-construals were associated with constructive efforts at accommodation. Additionally, fearful and preoccupied attachment styles were associated with destructive accommodation. Higher commitment and satisfaction levels along with lower quality of alternatives were associated with constructive accommodative behavior. Surprisingly, a higher level of investment in a relationship was associated with destructive accommodative behavior. We particularly focused on the effect of ego-depletion as it hinders the ability to strategically and effectively accommodate. The present study suggests that ego-depletion had no effect on how one accommodates. As an exploratory factor, we added on the element of forgiveness to the original Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect (EVLN) model of accommodation. Discussion centered on limitations and implications of the current research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

There are numerous negative consequences of relationship dissolution that include but are not limited to increased risk for psychopathology, suicide, violence, physical illness, and potential death from various diseases (Koball, Moiduddin, Henderson, et al., 2010). Moreover, a significant amount of research suggests that marriage is highly related to overall personal well-being. In a cross national study, Stack and Eshleman (1998), found that married individuals across seventeen nations perceived themselves to be healthier and happier than their unmarried counterparts. Although the divorce rate in the Unites States is generally high, in recent years there has been a slight downward shift in divorce rates. For the past three years the divorce rate in the United States has dropped from 3.6 per 1,000 people in December 2007, to 3.5 per 1,000 people in December 2008, and to 3.4 per 1,000 people in December 2009 (Tejada-Vera & Sutton, 2010). Why is there a downward shift in divorce rates? Perhaps an important factor promoting this decline is partners' willingness to strategically respond in relationship affirming versus destructive ways in response to

stressors, in other words, to accommodate (Rusbult, 1987). It is one factor that both partners can actively work on and have some level of control over.

An *accommodative dilemma* is a type of a threatening interpersonal experience or situation that might trigger a partner to behave in a potentially destructive manner (e.g., yelling at the other partner, acting in a hostile manner, or saying something inconsiderate; Rusbult, Verette, Whitney, Slovik, & Lipkus, 1991). This situation is characterized as a dilemma because it requires the person to make a decision and either respond in a kind and non-destructive manner or destructively by withholding impulses of responding in kindness. In addition, accommodation is someone's willingness to adopt constructive relationship maintaining behavior and inhibit those behaviors that are potentially destructive to the relationship when faced with an accommodative dilemma (Rusbult, Drigotas, & Verette, 1994). In other words, an individual chooses to tolerate (engage in accommodative behavior) or retaliate (engage in non-accommodative, destructive behavior) against their partner's gratuitous negative actions. For example, when a relationship partner finds out that their partner has been unfaithful, the non-offending partner faces an accommodative dilemma. The

non-offending partner has to then decide to either retaliate or not. One can choose to get back at their partner and engage in self-interest behavior by getting revenge or they could inhibit the urge of retaliation and accommodate by engaging in more pro-relationship behavior.

Accommodative Responses

Rusbult and Zembrodt (1983) identified four distinctive responses to accommodative dilemmas. Two of the four responses are constructive towards the overall well-being of a relationship, hence, they can be thought of as proximity-promoting behaviors. One of the constructive responses is voice, when an individual actively attempts to resolve the dilemma. For example, people would engage in behaviors like discussing the situation, compromising, suggesting solutions to problems, etc. Second of the constructive responses is loyalty, when an individual remains committed to the relationship, but passively waits for the situation to improve. For example, people would engage in behaviors like praying for improvement or supporting the partner. In contrast to the two constructive responses are two destructive responses to accommodative dilemmas in relationships, hence, they can be thought of as proximity-rejecting behaviors. One of

the destructive responses is exit, when an individual actively harms the relationship. For example, people would engage in behaviors like yelling at the partner, threatening to break-up, etc. Second of the destructive responses is neglect, when an individual passively allows conditions to worsen. For example, people would engage in behaviors such as, refusing to talk about the problem, spending less time with the partner, sweeping problems under the rug, etc. These four types of responses are often referred to as the exit-voice-loyalty-neglect (EVLN) typology.

Transformation of Motivation Theory

It is important for researchers as well as partners involved in romantic relationships to expand their knowledge about the role of accommodation in relationships because failure to accommodate can lead to serious relationship consequences. Research suggests that, in general, people who experience violent impulses, but do not act on them in a confrontational situation with their romantic partner tend to inhibit these impulses (Finkel, DeWall, Slotter, Oaten, & Foshee, 2009). However, inability to regulate one's behaviors, or the lack of motivation to do so, may interfere with this tendency of

inhibiting destructive behavior. In severe cases this inhibition may lead to intimate partner violence.

The cognitive phenomenon of *transformation of motivation* (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978) refers to the tendency of delaying an immediate response to an accommodative dilemma, weighing the long term consequences of the immediate response, and responding in an pro-relationship accommodative manner (i.e., voice or loyalty). Yovetich and Rusbult (1994) conducted a two-part study to test whether transformation of motivation results in accommodation. In the first part of the study, undergraduate participants who were involved in a dating relationship at the time of participation in the study were asked to state a couple of recent accommodative dilemma that resulted from their current romantic partners' misbehavior. After writing the situations, participants were asked to rate their intended responses to each accommodative dilemmas and the actual responses using the EVLN typology. The results indicated that the intended responses were significantly more destructive (exit and neglect) in nature than the actual responses (voice and loyalty). These findings suggest that the transformation of motivation inhibits the initial intended response from being enacted. In the second part of the

study, participants were either placed on time limitation or given plenty of time to respond to the accommodative dilemmas that they had written about earlier. The results of the second part of the study indicated that people who were asked to respond quickly to their partner's misbehavior responded in more destructive ways than those who were given abundant time to respond. The researchers concluded that accommodation relies on the transformation of motivation which requires cognitive effort that requires processing time.

Along these same lines, recent research suggests that although accommodation, in general, requires transformation of motivation and therefore additional time, for some people accommodation is an automatic behavior. Perunovic and Holmes (2008) examined the relationship between certain personality traits (e.g., agreeableness, conscientiousness), attachment anxiety/avoidance, and automaticity of accommodative behavior in romantic relationships via an online study. After completing numerous personality-trait questionnaires, participants were asked to respond to hypothetical accommodation scenarios either with or without time pressure. Results of this study suggested that people who are highly motivated to maintain

relationships (i.e., high on agreeableness and low on attachment avoidance) were the ones who accommodated in a more automatic fashion under time pressure than those who were less motivated to maintain the relationship. This implies that for those highly motivated to maintain relationships, responding in a kind manner may be a default response and effortless. These findings suggest that under time pressure people tend to engage non-accommodating behavior unless there are other personal or relational factors that override this automaticity.

Self-control as well as Self-regulatory Strength

Self- control and self-regulatory strength are strong predictors of transformation of motivation where a person overcomes an automatic urge of retaliating and instead engages in a more controlled and pro-relationship behavior of accommodation. Baumeister and Heatherton (1996) defined self-control as a consistent personality trait measuring one's ability to control their impulses in general and self-regulatory strength as one's ability to control their impulses at a given time or situation. In keeping with the findings that transformation of motivation to accommodate is, in general, an effortful task, Finkel and Campbell (2001) tested whether self-control and the depletion of self-regulatory strength has any effect on accommodation.

In order to test the research hypothesis, they conducted one pilot study and three additional studies. In the pilot study, participants that were involved in a romantic relationship at the time of participation and were asked to complete a self-control scale followed by the accommodation scale.

Results of the pilot work suggested that those who possessed high self-control were likely to engage in more pro-relationship type accommodative behavior than those who possessed low self-control. In the first study, participants were asked to write about two situations, one in which they responded in an accommodating manner towards their partners misbehavior and another in which they responded in a non-accommodating manner. Following the documentation of each situation, participants completed the Concurrent Depletion Scale which measured the self-regulatory depletion at the time of the documented situation, the Recent Depletion Scale which measured the self-regulatory depletion prior to the documented situation, and a Self-control Scale. Results of this study showed that people with depleted self-regulatory strength (both concurrent and recent) behaved in a non-accommodating manner. In the second study, researchers experimentally manipulated self-regulatory depletion.

Emotional expression was suppressed which required effort and therefore this task depleted the self-regulatory strength (this method of self-regulatory manipulation was adopted from Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998, Study 3). All participants watched an emotional short film; participants in the self-regulatory depletion group were asked to not feel or show any emotions towards the film while participants in the non-self-regulatory depletion group were asked to genuinely feel or show any emotions towards the film. The manipulation check confirmed that as expected, only people in the self-regulatory depletion group were depleted of self-regulatory strength, while the non-self-regulatory depletion group's self-regulatory strength was unaffected. Following the depletion task, participants completed the accommodation scale. The results of this study showed that people with depleted self-regulatory strength behaved in a non-accommodating manner. The final study examined the ability to exhibit self-control and commitment to the relationship as predictors of accommodation (i.e., voice and loyalty) in romantic relationships. Results of this study revealed that both self-control and commitment were independent predictors of accommodation. In summary, the aforementioned research findings suggest that our ability

to accommodate by transformation of motivation requires significant amount of self-control and self-regulatory strength.

Self-regulation: A Limited Resource Theory

Self-regulation, according to Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, and Tice (1998) is a limited resource which can be compromised. One compromise to self-regulation is ego-depletion, which is conceptually defined as a temporary shortage of one's capability to engage in subsequent self-regulatory actions. In four different experiments, the authors provide support for their theory that an initial act of self-regulation draws from this limited resource which results in ego-depletion. In the first experiment, participants were presented with chocolates and radishes. Participants in the experimental group were asked to resist the tempting chocolates and eat radishes while participants in the control group were allowed to eat whatever they pleased. Following this task, all participants were asked to solve a frustrating puzzle. The authors believed that both resisting temptations and trying to solve a frustrating puzzle are acts of self-regulation that draw from the same limited resource, which pertains to the goal of this experiment.

Participants who resisted the tempting chocolates gave up trying to solve the puzzle quicker than those who did not resist the tempting chocolates. This finding suggests that the initial act of self-regulation depletes the limited resource which is required for the completion of subsequent task. The other three experiments led to similar results using different predictors such as giving speech that was against one's belief system, monitoring self-behavior, and overruling rules. There are numerous other behaviors that also consume this limited resource which results in ego-depletion. For example, management of impression (Vohs, Baumeister, & Ciarocco, 2005), controlling spending (Vohs & Faber, 2004), restraining aggression (DeWall et al., 2007; Stucke & Baumeister, 2006), and management of food and alcohol consumption (Kahan et al., 2003; Muraven, Collins, & Nienhaus, 2002) all result in ego-depletion. The aforementioned findings support the theory that one act of self-regulation results in ego-depletion, which has detrimental effects on a subsequent acts of self-regulation.

Ego-depletion

There are many benefits that come with being an effective self-regulator, and many disadvantages of being

a poor self-regulator. According to Tangney and colleagues (2004), individuals with good self-control perform better in academic settings. They seem to have fewer impulse control problems (e.g., binge eating and alcohol abuse), fewer psychopathological symptoms, obsessive-compulsive patterns, depression, anxiety, and hostile anger. Additionally, they have better interpersonal relationships with very few conflicts, are securely attached, are emotionally stable, and are better at anger management. These characteristics of people with high self-control suggest that these individuals may be more resistant to ego depletion. One the other hand, people with poor self-control might easily fall prey to ego depletion.

Factors that Override the Effects of Ego-depletion

Fortunately, some factors like motivation and practice help override the effects of ego-depletion and people are able to successfully engage in tasks that demand self-control. It has been suggested that motivational factors may protect against ego-depletion. To better understand this phenomenon, Muraven and Slessareva (2003) conducted a three-part study out of which two are relevant and therefore discussed. In the first part of the study, participants performed one of two cognitive tasks. One was a thought repressing task, which was designed to

be more ego-depleting. In this task, participants were asked to not think about a white bear and every time they thought of a white bear they had to write that thought down and try their hardest to not think of a white bear again. Second was a memory task, which was designed to be less ego-depleting. In this task participants were asked to memorize a short list of words. After the completion of the ego-depletion task, one group was told a cover story by the experimenter that their participation in the study will assist in the development of therapies for Alzheimer's patients and then participants were asked to solve an unsolvable puzzle (another self-controlling task). The other group proceeded to solve an unsolvable puzzle without any cover story. The cover story was meant to serve as a motivational factor because it promoted benefits for others. Results revealed that unmotivated ego-depleted individuals gave up on the unsolvable puzzle sooner than unmotivated non-ego-depleted, motivated ego-depleted, and motivated non ego-depleted individuals. In the second part of the study, one group of participants in the ego-depletion group gave a speech without any specific instructions which did not require any self-control while participants in the non-ego-depletion group were instructed to avoid saying "um" or "er" which

are habitual speech fillers and therefore require a lot more self-control. After giving the speeches, participants played a frustrating game which required self-control for successful completion. Prior to playing the game, participants either received motivational instructions regarding practicing before playing the game or non-motivational instructions. Specifically, the participants in the motivational group were told that practicing will improve their performance on the game while the participants in the non-motivational group were told that practicing will have no effect on their performance on the game. Results revealed that individuals who were highly motivated did not give-up on a frustrating game as quickly as individuals with lower motivation. The results from both studies confirmed the hypothesis that motivation that is driven from both benefit for others and benefit for self does indeed act as a buffer against ego-depletion.

The old saying, "Practice makes perfect", holds true when it comes to tasks that require self-regulation. Muraven, Baumeister, and Tice (1999) investigated the relationship between unrelated tasks of self-regulation and performance on subsequent tasks that also require self-regulation after practicing self-regulation over a

two-week period between tasks. Baseline self-regulation capacity was recorded for comparison purposes. For that, participants were asked to engage in a self-regulatory act of thought suppressing that was mentioned earlier. Following the initial self-regulatory task, participants were asked to squeeze a hand-grip apparatus which requires physical strength. The urge of relaxing the hand upon the squeeze is also a self-regulatory demand because participants were asked to avoid the urge of relaxing their hands and continue with the task which requires self-control. The experimenter as well as fellow participants recorded the time each participant engaged in the hand-grip task. Participants were then divided into five different groups and every group received different instructions to follow for the next two weeks. One group was instructed to monitor their posture, try to maintain a good posture, and record their progress for two weeks. The second group was instructed to monitor their mood, try to alter their bad moods into good ones, and record their progress for two weeks. The third and fourth groups were asked to keep an intensive record of food they consumed for two weeks; these groups were not instructed to alter their dietary habits. The final fifth group was not given any instructions to follow during the next two weeks and

served as a control group. At the end of two weeks, participants returned to the laboratory for the final part of the study which was to repeat the thought suppressing and the hand-grip tasks. The results of this investigation indicated that participants in the instructional group (the ones that practiced self-regulation for two weeks) performed better at the self-regulation tasks than the control group. Results revealed that consistent with previous research, initial acts of self-regulation have detrimental effects on subsequent acts of self-regulation; moreover, with self-regulation practice, this effect can be diminished thereby reducing vulnerability to ego-depletion.

In summary, self-regulation requires effort which is energy depleting and in turn it makes subsequent self-regulation tasks more difficult. Because accommodation involves self-regulation, this means that accommodation is difficult when a person has engaged in prior self-regulation. Nonetheless people can overcome this depletion when they are motivated which means individuals may still be able to accommodate in their relationships if they are motivated. Additionally, people who practice self-regulation often are less affected by

depletion and can successfully complete subsequent regulation tasks.

Self-construals and Accommodation

A potentially important factor that may enhance or inhibit accommodation in relationships is cultural influences (i.e., collectivism and individualism). The concept of self-construal (i.e., the view of self as primarily independent or interdependent) was developed based upon the cultural models of collectivism and individualism (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Due to rapid industrialization, the two distinctive cultural models, collectivist and individualistic, are starting to merge. Hence, self-construal might be a better alternative to assess cultural influences on behavior. Additionally, the measurement of self-construals might provide us with the precise explanation of the relationship between cultural values and behavior on an individual level (Singelis & Brown, 1995). Specifically, independent self-construal, consistent with the values of individualistic cultures, involves the tendency to interpret and view the self as a unique, autonomous, self-directed, self-sufficient and self-governing entity (Singelis, 1994). On the other hand, interdependent self construal, consistent with the values

of collectivist cultures, involves the tendency to interpret and view the self in relationship to the group, conforming to group norms, maintaining harmonious relationships, and having high concern for others' expectations and group-related goals (Singelis, 1994).

Seeley and Gardner (2003) proposed that individuals with collectivist orientations are more practiced at self-regulating and thus less susceptible to ego-depletion than their individualistic counterparts. To test their hypothesis, Seeley and Gardner (2003) compared U.S. students (presumably independent) and Asian foreign exchange students (presumably interdependent). In order to examine the self-control strength, participants completed a thought suppression task in which they were instructed to imagine a white bear. Participants were then asked to tape-record their thoughts for five minutes. Participants were assigned to one of two groups; a non-suppression group in which participants were instructed to talk about any thoughts including the ones regarding a white bear; or a suppression (ego-depletion) group in which participants were instructed to only talk about thoughts other than the white bear and to knock on the desk every time they thought of a white bear. Subsequently to completion of these tasks, both groups were asked to complete a

physically demanding, timed hand-grip task to test for self-regulatory strength. Results indicated that for the thought suppression task only, Asian students and those students scoring high on interdependence performed significantly better on the handgrip task than U.S. students or those scoring low on interdependence. These findings support the study hypothesis that interdependent people would be better at self-regulatory tasks than independent people.

In a more recent study, researchers examined the relationship between self-construals and reactions to relationship dissatisfaction (Sinclair & Fehr, 2005). In keeping with the prior research, the authors hypothesized that those relationship partners with more independent self-construals will respond to relationship dissatisfaction with more active accommodative responses (voice and exit) while partners with more interdependent self-construals will respond with more passive accommodative responses (loyalty and neglect). To test the proposed hypotheses, researchers ran two separate studies. In the first study, participants completed the Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect Scale (Rusbult & Zembrodt, 1983), the Self-Construal Scale (Singelis, 1994), and some demographic questions. In the second study, participants

were primed with either independent or interdependent self-construal via a commonly used priming method. Specifically, participants read one of two different versions of a story. One version was designed to prime the participant with independent self-construal; in this version the main character was selfish. The other version was designed to prime the participant with interdependent self-construal; in this version the main character is selfless and cares for others. After reading the story, participants answered manipulation check type questions and completed the Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect Scale (Rusbult & Zembrodt, 1983). Consistent with hypotheses, the results from both studies provide evidence for the relationship between self-construals and responses to conflict. Specifically, participants who identified themselves with independent self-construal or to whom independent self-construal was made accessible via priming were more likely to respond with an active, constructive response of voice. On the other hand, participants who identified themselves with interdependent self-construal or to whom interdependent self-construal was made accessible via priming were more likely to respond with a passive, constructive response of loyalty. Interestingly, both, independent as well as interdependent individuals

were more likely to respond constructively (voice and loyalty), which is common for those involved in stable romantic relationships. These results suggest that accommodative behavior might be governed by active versus passive motivations rather than constructive versus destructive.

Self-regulation and Self-construals

As mentioned earlier, accommodation in romantic relationships is an act of self-regulation which requires a sufficient amount of self-control. It has also been established that individuals who identify themselves with interdependent self-construal (collectivist background) are highly motivated and practiced at tasks that require self-control. These individuals also appear to care for other's needs before their own needs. Additionally, interdependent participants are generally inclined toward pro-relationship behavior when they are faced with accommodative dilemma type situations.

To further the understanding of the cultural differences and accommodation in romantic relationships, Yum (2004) investigated the hypothesis that collectivist cultures are more likely to constructively accommodate with loyalty and voice and less likely to engage in destructive or non-accommodative behavior such as neglect

or exit than their individualistic counterparts. The author also hypothesized that those individuals who identify themselves with bicultural self-construals (i.e. those who identify highly with both independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal) will accommodate more than the others (i.e. those who identify themselves with independent self-construal, those who identify themselves with interdependent self-construal, and marginal individuals: those who identify low with both independent and interdependent self-construals). Students from the U.S. mainland, Korea, and Hawaii took apart in this study. Participants were placed in cultural groups according to their origin. The self-construal groups were assigned within the cultural group by using the Self-Construal Scale (Singelis, 1994). Upon self-construal assignment, participants completed the Exit Voice Loyalty and Neglect Scale (Rusbult & Zembrodt, 1983), to assess their accommodative strategies. Yum (2004) found cultural differences in employing accommodative strategies. Specifically, the results indicated that Koreans and U.S. mainlanders, as a group, showed similar preference in employing exit, voice, and loyalty type accommodative strategies. Further analysis revealed that Koreans and Hawaiians were more likely to behave in neglect type

behavior than U.S. mainlanders, and that Hawaiians were more likely to behave in exit type behavior than both Koreans and U.S. mainlanders. Self-construal differences in accommodative strategies were also in keeping with the hypothesis. Those who identified with bicultural self-construal used the loyalty strategy of accommodation more and the neglect strategy of accommodation significantly less than the other three self-construals. Findings from this study provided further evidence for long-existing research on the relationship between cultural influences and accommodative strategies. The proposed study will also explore the relationship between self-construals and accommodations in similar context, to provide further support for this under researched topic.

Attachment Style Theory

Another potentially important factor that may enhance or inhibit accommodation in relationships is attachment-style. Attachment theory was first introduced by Bowlby (1969). He hypothesized that infants become emotionally attached to their primary caregivers and experience separation distress when they are separated from primary caregivers. Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall, (1978) suggested that early relationships with

attachment figures, such as with the mother, father, or caregivers, create lasting ways of relating to others in future relationships. Ainsworth et al identified three presumably enduring working models or attachment styles: secure, avoidant, and anxious-ambivalent. A secure attachment style results from socially and emotionally accepting childhood attachment figures. Securely attached individuals find it fairly easy to trust the adult attachment figures (Bartholomew, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). The avoidant attachment style results from constant neglect and rejection of an individual from their primary caregiver; they avoid proximity as well as interaction with caregivers on reunion (Crittenden & Ainsworth, 1989). The anxious-ambivalent attachment style results from an unpredictable and inconsistent care-giving approach; they are confused at the time of separation from their caregivers and are not comforted by them at the time of reunion (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994). Hazan and Shaver's (1987) research on adult attachment suggests that attachment styles remain relatively stable over time. Adults with a secure attachment style experience love in a positive manner which includes friendliness, happiness, and trust from and towards their romantic partner. On the other hand, adults with avoidant attachment style

experience fear of intimacy and adults with anxious/ambivalent attachment style experience high levels of jealousy, emotional instability, and other negative feelings.

Attachment Styles and Conflict Management/ Accommodation

Along the same line of research, Shi (2003) explored the relationship between attachment styles and conflict resolution motives. In this study, participants were grouped accordingly with one of four attachment categories: Secure (low on anxiety and avoidance); Fearful (high on anxiety and avoidance); Dismissing (low on anxiety and high on avoidance); and Preoccupied (high on anxiety and low on avoidance). This four-category model is derived from the original three-model of attachment styles which included secure, avoidant, and anxious-ambivalent. After the attachment style assignment, participants completed an inventory that measured interpersonal conflict resolution styles on two dimensions: solving the conflict, keeping one's own needs in mind, or trying to satisfy others. The relationship between the attachment styles and conflict resolution motivations found in this study was as expected. Securely attached individuals were able to satisfy both parties (self and the other) by

constructively solving the conflict. Those who scored high on both avoidance and anxiety overlooked their own concerns and dwelled on pleasing others, hence they were unable to satisfy both parties and solve the conflict constructively. The author discussed the importance of marital conflict resolution for the longevity of the marriage as well as marital satisfaction and how attachment styles might be a strong predictor of conflict resolution outcomes.

Securely attached individuals are likely to react to accommodative dilemmas in a constructive manner in comparison to the individuals with anxious/ambivalent and avoidant attachment styles (Gaines et al., 1997). Across four studies, which were conducted in different contexts, researchers examined the relationship between attachment styles and adult accommodative strategies in a romantic relationship. Results from all four settings revealed that securely attached individuals were more likely to react to accommodative dilemmas constructively by using the strategy of voice, whereas, insecurely attached individuals were less likely to employ the constructive accommodative strategy of voice. Also, securely attached individuals were less likely to react to accommodative dilemmas in a deconstructive manner by using exit or

neglect, whereas, insecurely attached individuals were likely to employ the deconstructive accommodative strategies. These results are similar for heterosexual couples as well as homosexual couples (Gaines & Henderson, 2002). Additionally, secure/ secure couples, in general, do not engage in destructive accommodative strategies, whereas, insecure/ insecure and secure/ insecure do (Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994). In keeping with the empirical evidence, adult attachment style pairings in romantic relationships might be an important component to further examine the accommodation strategies.

Investment Model Theory

The investment model is an extension to the interdependence theory. The independence theory was one of the initial theories to put together a frame work for partners' persistence towards one another. In other words, this theory provided a rationale for why one stays in a relationship. This persistence heavily depends on partners high levels of satisfaction towards one another and having poor alternatives to the current relationship (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978). Rusbult and colleagues argued that independence theory does not fully explain the persistence within a relationship. They added the component of

investment (time, money, assets, etc.) and suggested that it arises from dependence. The investment model suggests that commitment is an essential asset of relationships which promotes pro-relationship behavior including accommodation. Commitment develops as a result of three relational attributes: increase in relationship satisfaction, decline in other alternatives, and increase in investments (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998). Relationship satisfaction refers to the gratification of one's intimacy and security needs. Decline in other alternatives means that important relationship needs could not be fulfilled by alternative romantic partners, friends, or relatives. Increase in investment size refers to increase in assets like personal identity, endeavors, or material possessions that are associated with a relationship (Rusbult, 1983; Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998). An abundance of research supports the argument that highly committed individuals are more likely to adopt and enact constructive rather than deconstructive strategies when faced with a relationship threatening situation (Rusbult et al., 1991; Rusbult, Yovetich, & Verette, 1996; Rusbult, Bissonnette, Arriaga, & Cox, 1998; Weiselquist, Rusbult, Foster, & Agnew, 1999). Some recent findings demonstrated that narcissistic individuals who possess an

exaggerated self-image and think very highly of themselves are immensely invested in themselves and are self-centered. Therefore, they are less likely to commit to their romantic partner. In keeping with the findings of Rusbult and her colleagues (1991), due to this negative correlation between narcissism and commitment, narcissists were less likely to accommodate than non-narcissists (Campbell & Foster, 2002). Furthermore, highly committed individuals tend to perceive their partners transgressions as less negative which fosters the likelihood of accommodation in relationship threatening situations (Menzies-Toman & Lydon, 2005). Greater commitment might even endow insecurely attached people with a long-term perspective over their relationship that in return will help them maintain happier and healthier relationships (Kelley, 1983). Along the same line, Tran and Simpson (2009) suggested that greater partner commitment may even buffer insecurely attached individuals from engaging in destructive behaviors when dealing with relationship threatening situations.

Hypotheses

Self Construals and Accommodation

Based on the knowledge of self-construal theory and limited resource theory, it is hypothesized that independent self-construals will be positively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Exit and Neglect and negatively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty. Additionally, it is expected that interdependent self-construals will be negatively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Exit and Neglect and positively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty. Lastly, it is hypothesized that the relationship between self-construals and accommodative strategy will be moderated by ego-depletion.

Attachment Style and Accommodation

Based on the knowledge of attachment-style theory and limited resource theory, it is hypothesized that a secure attachment style will be negatively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Exit and Neglect and positively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty. Additionally, it is expected that preoccupied, fearful, and dismissing attachment styles will each be positively correlated with the accommodative

strategies of Exit and Neglect and negatively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty. Lastly, it is hypothesized that the relationship between self-attachment style and accommodative strategy will be moderated by ego-depletion.

Investment and Accommodation

Based on the knowledge of investment model theory and limited resource theory, it is hypothesized that relationship commitment, satisfaction, and investment size will be negatively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Exit and Neglect and positively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty. Additionally, it is hypothesized that quality of alternatives will be positively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Exit and Neglect and negatively correlated with the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty. Lastly, it is hypothesized that the relationship between self-relationship investment variables and accommodative strategy will be moderated by ego-depletion.

CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

Participants involved in a romantic relationship (85.5% dating and 14.5% married) took a part in an online study about romantic relationship issues. The mean length of dating relationship was 2.80 years with standard diviation of 2.33 and mean length of married relationship was 8.79 years with the standard deviation of 7.39. Participants were 186 (102 women, 83 men, and 1 participant chose to not disclose any information regarding his/her gender) students enrolled in social sciences undergraduate courses at California State University, San Bernardino. Study participants ranged in age from 18 to 52 ($M = 23.79$, $SD = 5.84$). The ethnic composition of the sample was 6.5% African/ African-American/ Black, 2.2% Arab/Arab-American/ Middle-Eastern, 8.6% Asian/ Asian-American/ Pacific Islander/ Indian, 32.8% Caucasian/ European-American/ White, 40.9% Latino/ Hispanic/ Chicano, 7% Multiethnic or "Other", and 2.2% of the sample chose to not disclose information regarding their ethnicity. Upon completion of the online-based experiment, the participants were awarded

two extra credit points for their participation in the study. All guidelines of the American Psychological Association (APA, 2002) regarding informed consent and the ethical treatment of human participants were followed.

Materials

The Self-Construal Scale

The Self-Construal Scale (SCS; Singelis, 1994) is a 24-item, seven point Likert scale with anchors of *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* measuring the two main types of self-construals based upon the theory of self-construals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The scale yields two subscale scores: independent construals (e.g., 'My personal identity is autonomous from others, and is very important to me') and interdependent construals (e.g., 'It is important for me to maintain harmony in my relationships'). The SCS has been shown to possess sufficient internal consistency with reported Cronbach's Alpha reliabilities of .70 and .74 for the independent and interdependent subscales respectively (Singelis, 1994). SCS is a valid measurement of self-construals at numerous levels. The SCS consists of a variety of assets that define independent and interdependent self-construals, which testifies for content validity. Asians-Americans

have been shown to be more interdependent than Caucasian-Americans and Caucasian-Americans have been shown to be more independent than Asians-Americans, these results testify for construct validity (Singelis, 1994).

The Relationship Questionnaire

The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) consists of four vignettes describing four adult attachment prototypes (secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissing) (See Appendix). Participants were asked to rate personal relevance of each prototype vignette on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree); to 7 = strongly agree).

The four vignettes were:

Secure: It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me;

Preoccupied: I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others;

Fearful: I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are

reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them;

Dismissing: I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

(Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991, p. 231)

Secure and preoccupied subtypes have a positive outlook of other people whereas the dismissing and fearful subtypes have a negative outlook of others. Additionally, the secure and dismissing subtypes have a positive self-perspective and the preoccupied and fearful subtypes have a negative self-perspective. The RQ has been demonstrated to be a reliable and valid scale. Internal consistencies for the RQ subscales range from .87 to .95. The concurrent validity of the RQ has been demonstrated via high correlations with self-report of self-concept and interpersonal functioning (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

The Investment Model Scale

The Investment Model Scale (IMS; Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998) is a 37-item (15 facet items and 22 global items), nine-point Likert scale designed to measure one's

level of overall commitment in a relationship across four subscales. The facet items prepared participants to answer the global questions. Only the global items were analyzed in this study. The subscales included commitment (e.g. "I am committed to maintaining my relationship with my partner."), satisfaction (e.g. "I feel satisfied with our relationship."), and quality of alternatives (e.g. "My needs for intimacy, companionship etc., could easily be fulfilled in an alternative relationship."), and investment size (e.g. "I invested a great deal of time into our relationship.") (See Appendix). Participants recorded item responses using the options ranging from 0 (do not agree at all) to 8 (agree completely). The IMS has good psychometric properties and has been tested in numerous studies with abundance of participants in different regions of the world (Le & Agnew, 2003, Rusbult, 1983; Rusbult et al., 1998). Through these studies and its initial validation study, the scale has demonstrated good construct, predictive, and external validity. It has also demonstrated high internal consistency across three studies with alpha coefficients for commitment level ranging from .91 to .95, satisfaction level ranging from .92 to .95, quality of alternatives ranging from .82 to

.88, and investment size ranging from .82 to .84 (Rusbult et al., 1998).

The Exit-Voice-Loyalty-Neglect-Forgiveness Scale

The Exit-Voice-Loyalty-Neglect-Forgiveness Scale (EVLNS; Finkel, Rusbult, Kumashiro, & Hannon, 2002) was designed to determine how romantic partners react to potential relationship accommodative dilemmas (See Appendix). Finkel and colleagues (2002) modified the original EVLNS (Rusbult & Zembrodt, 1983) by adding the variable of forgiveness to the original four tendencies of exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. Participants read descriptions of 16 hypothetical scenarios of accommodative dilemmas (e.g., "You find out that your partner kissed someone else at a party.") and responded to four items assessing four types of accommodative strategies (e.g. exit: "I would tell my partner I'm going to cut off the relationship unless things improve fast"; voice: "I would ask if my partner is upset about something, and if that caused him/her to let me down"; loyalty: "I would understand that things got out of hand, and that my partner behaved in a very atypical manner on that one occasion"; neglect: "I would decide to quit supporting my partner so much in the future"; and forgiveness: "I would forgive my partner."). Participants are asked to rate each

tendency on an 8-point Likert scale ranging from 0 being *not at all likely to react this way* to 8 being *extremely likely to react this way*. The EVLNS has been shown to have adequate reliability with alpha coefficients for exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect being .78, .84, .79, .72, and .84 respectively (Finkel, Rusbult, Kumashiro, & Hannon, 2002). Additionally, the EVLNS has construct validity as the constructive accommodative strategies of voice and loyalty were positively correlated with prior relationship satisfaction and investment size and the destructive strategies of exit and neglect were negatively related with prior relationship satisfaction and investment size (Rusbult, Isabella, & Lawanna, 1982).

Demographics Questions included items related to participant's relationship status, length of current relationship, age, gender, ethnicity, language preference, affiliation with colleges, self judgment of one's typing abilities, and family income. See Table 1 for descriptive statistics on all study variables.

Procedure

Participants were recruited via an online server. Computer presentation of questions appeared in the following order. The first screen of questions consisted

of two inclusion/exclusion questions about the participants' relationship status. First, participants were asked to select their relationship/marital status from the list of single, in a relationship, married, divorced, separated. Participants who indicated their relationship status as "in a relationship" or "married" qualified to continue their participation in the study. If the participant indicated that they were currently in a relationship or married, then they were asked about the duration of the relationship with their romantic partner. Participants were to estimate the duration of their relationship to the closest month (e.g., "5 months"; "1 year and 2 months"). After being qualified to participate in the present study, participants completed the SCS, IMS, and RQ. Following the completion of the personality and relationship questionnaires, participants completed a behavioral regulation task designed to create a state of ego depletion. This variable of ego-depletion was categorized as a within subject variable. All participants were first instructed to retype as quickly and as accurately as possible five sentences from an advanced statistics book that appeared on the computer screen one sentence at a time. The computer recorded all key presses and displayed to participants what they were

typing. In the non-depletion condition, participants received no additional instructions. In addition to the initial instructions, participants in the depletion condition were also instructed not to type any letter "E/e's" or "spaces". The No "E/e's or spaces" manipulation was designed to assess participant's self-control. This task is designed to require participants to restrain an automatic response of typing a letter that has been presented on the computer screen (Muraven, Shmueli, & Burkley, 2006). The choice of the no spaces response is required after every word typed. Furthermore, 'E/e' is a vowel that frequently appears in the writing of English language. Thus, retyping the passage as quickly and as accurately as possible, but not pressing these two characters, should require overriding or inhibiting the automatically triggered behavior of typing. After the behavioral regulation task, participants completed the EVLNS, which was followed by 6 manipulation check type questions (See Appendix) to determine whether the participants had any idea as to what the study is all about. The study concluded with seven demographics questions (See Appendix).

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Self-construals and Accommodation

Results of Pearson's Bivariate Correlational Analyses provided partial support for study hypotheses. Contrary to the study hypotheses, there was no relationship between independent self-construals and the accommodative strategies of Exit and Neglect. Likewise, contrary to the study hypotheses, results revealed a statistically significant positive versus a negative linear relationship between independent self-construals and the accommodative strategies Voice and Loyalty (See Table 2).

For interdependent self-construals, consistent with study hypotheses, results revealed a statistically significant positive linear relationship between interdependent self-construals and the accommodative strategies of Voice ($r = 0.25$, $p < .05$) and Loyalty ($r = 0.23$, $p < .05$.) However, contrary to study hypotheses, there was no relationship between interdependent self-construals and the accommodative strategies of Exit and Neglect (See Table 2.)

For moderation hypotheses, correlation coefficients for the relationship between independent self-construals

and accommodative strategies and interdependent self-construals and accommodative strategies were compared under conditions of ego depletion and no ego depletion using Fisher's *r* to *z* transformation analyses. Results revealed that there was no significant difference between the correlation coefficients under the two ego depletion conditions for the relationship between independent self-construals the accommodative strategies of Exit ($z = -1.25$, $p = 0.21$), Voice ($z = 0.34$, $p = 0.73$), Loyalty ($z = -0.16$, $p = 0.87$), Neglect ($z = -0.54$, $p = 0.59$), and Forgiveness ($z = -0.86$, $p = 0.39$) nor the relationship between interdependent self-construals the accommodative strategies of Exit ($z = 0.87$, $p = 0.38$), Voice ($z = -0.41$, $p = 0.68$), Loyalty ($z = -0.40$, $p = 0.69$), Neglect ($z = 0.55$, $p = 0.58$), and Forgiveness ($z = -0.85$, $p = 0.40$) (See Table 3. for correlations)

Attachment Style and Accommodation

Results of Pearson's Bivariate Correlational Analyses provided partial support for study hypotheses. Contrary to study hypotheses, there was no relationship between the secure attachment style and all of the accommodative strategies including Exit, Voice, Loyalty, Neglect, and Forgiveness.

Consistent with study hypotheses, there was a statistically significant positive linear relationship between the preoccupied attachment style and the accommodative strategy of Exit (r = .18, p < .05) and Neglect (r = .16, p < .05). Additionally, results revealed a statistically significant negative linear relationship between the preoccupied attachment style and the accommodative strategy of Forgiveness (r = -.15, p < .05). Contrary to study hypotheses, there was no relationship between preoccupied attachment style and the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty.

Consistent with study hypotheses, there was a statistically significant positive linear relationship between the fearful attachment style and the accommodative strategy of Exit (r = .16, p < .05) and Neglect (r = .21, p < .05). Contrary to study hypotheses, there was no relationship between fearful attachment style and the accommodative strategies of Voice, Loyalty, and Forgiveness.

Finally, contrary to study hypotheses there was no relationship between the dismissing attachment style and all of the accommodative strategies including Exit, Voice, Loyalty, Neglect, and Forgiveness (See Table 2.)

For moderation hypotheses, correlation coefficients for the relationship between the four attachment styles and accommodative strategies were compared under conditions of ego depletion and no ego depletion using Fisher's *r* to *z* transformation analyses. Results revealed that there was no significant difference between the correlation coefficients under the two ego depletion conditions for the relationship between secure attachment styles and the accommodative strategies of Exit ($z = -0.79$, $p = 0.43$), Voice ($z = -0.05$, $p = 0.96$), Loyalty ($z = -0.57$, $p = 0.57$), Neglect ($z = -1.21$, $p = 0.23$), and Forgiveness ($z = 0.11$, $p = 0.91$); nor the relationship between preoccupied attachment style and the accommodative strategies of Exit ($z = 1.1$, $p = 0.27$), Voice ($z = 0.72$, $p = 0.47$), Loyalty ($z = 0.47$, $p = 0.64$), Neglect ($z = 1.28$, $p = 0.20$), and Forgiveness ($z = -0.01$, $p = 0.99$); nor the relationship between fearful attachment style and the accommodative strategies of Exit ($z = 0.23$, $p = 0.82$), Voice ($z = -0.44$, $p = 0.66$), Loyalty ($z = -1.68$, $p = 0.09$), Neglect ($z = 0.6$, $p = 0.55$), and Forgiveness ($z = 0.17$, $p = 0.87$); nor the relationship between dismissing attachment style and the accommodative strategies of Exit ($z = 0.28$, $p = 0.78$), Voice ($z = -1.1$,

$p = 0.27$), Loyalty ($z = -0.74$, $p = 0.46$), Neglect ($z = -0.43$, $p = 0.67$), and Forgiveness ($z = -1.23$, $p = 0.22$) (See Table 3. for correlations).

Commitment and Accommodation

Results of Pearson's Bivariate Correlational Analyses provided partial support for study hypotheses. Consistent with study hypotheses, there was a statistically significant negative linear relationship between commitment and the accommodative strategies of Exit ($r = -.25$, $p < .05$) and Neglect ($r = -.25$, $p < .05$). Additionally there was a statistically significant positive linear relationship between commitment and the accommodative strategies of Voice ($r = .26$, $p < .05$), Loyalty ($r = .17$, $p < .05$), and Forgiveness ($r = .25$, $p < .05$). Also, consistent with study hypotheses, there was a statistically significant positive linear relationship between satisfaction and the accommodative strategies of Loyalty ($r = .20$, $p < .05$) and Forgiveness ($r = .19$, $p < .05$). However, contrary to study hypotheses, there was no relationship between satisfaction and the accommodative strategies of Exit, Voice, nor Neglect. Consistent with study hypotheses, there was a statistically significant negative linear relationship

between quality of alternatives and the accommodative strategy of Exit (r = -.26, p < .05) and Neglect (r = -.29, p < .05). Additionally, there was a statistically significant positive linear relationship between quality of alternatives and the accommodative strategies of Voice (r = .19, p < .05) and Forgiveness (r = .24, p < .05). However, contrary to study hypotheses, there was no relationship between quality of alternatives and the accommodative strategy of Loyalty. Contrary to study hypotheses, there was a statistically significant positive linear relationship between investment and the accommodative strategy of Exit and Neglect. Additionally, contrary with hypotheses, there was a statistically significant negative linear relationship between investment and the accommodative strategy of Voice and Forgiveness. Furthermore, there was no relationship between investment and the accommodative strategy of Loyalty (See Table 2.)

For moderation hypotheses, correlation coefficients for the relationship between commitment levels, satisfaction, quality of alternatives, investment and accommodative strategies were compared under conditions of ego depletion and no ego depletion using Fisher's r to z transformation analyses. Results revealed that there was

no significant difference between the correlation coefficients under the two ego depletion conditions for the relationship between commitment and accommodative strategies of Exit ($z = -0.74$, $p = 0.46$), Voice ($z = -0.3$, $p = 0.76$), Loyalty ($z = 0.23$, $p = 0.82$), Neglect ($z = -0.74$, $p = 0.46$), and Forgiveness ($z = 0.75$, $p = 0.45$); nor the relationship between satisfaction and accommodative strategies of Exit ($z = -1.35$, $p = 0.18$), Voice ($z = -0.76$, $p = 0.45$), Loyalty ($z = -0.49$, $p = 0.62$), Neglect ($z = -0.94$, $p = 0.35$), and Forgiveness ($z = 0.28$, $p = 0.78$); nor the relationship between investment and accommodative strategies of Exit ($z = -1.56$, $p = 0.12$), Voice ($z = 0.17$, $p = 0.87$), Loyalty ($z = -0.56$, $p = 0.58$), Neglect ($z = -1.41$, $p = 0.16$), and Forgiveness ($z = -0.21$, $p = 0.83$); nor the relationship between quality of alternatives and accommodative strategies of Exit ($z = 1.24$, $p = 0.22$), Voice ($z = 1.09$, $p = 0.28$), Loyalty ($z = 0.82$, $p = 0.41$), Neglect ($z = 1.15$, $p = 0.25$), and Forgiveness ($z = -0.37$, $p = 0.71$) (See Table 3. for correlations).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Participant's Demographics	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation	Percentage
Relationship Status					
In a Relationship					85.5
Length of the relationship (years)	.08yrs.	17yrs.	2.80	2.33	
Married					14.5
Length of the relationship (years)	.17yrs.	28yrs.	8.97	7.39	
Age	18	52	23.79	5.84	
Gender					
Male					44.6
Female					54.8
Chose not to mention their ethnicity					0.5
Ethnicity					
African/African-American/ Black					6.5
Arab/Arab-American/ Middle-Eastern					2.2
Asian/ Asian-American/ Pacific Islander/ Indian					8.6
Caucasian/ European-American/ White					32.8
Latino/ Hispanic/ Chicano					40.9
Multiethnic or "Other"					7.0
Chose not to mention their gender					2.2

Independent Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Self-construals				
Interdependent	2.75	7.00	4.74	0.65
Independent	2.58	6.67	5.10	0.79
Attachment Styles				
Secure	1.00	7.00	4.14	1.82
Preoccupied	1.00	7.00	3.70	1.87
Fearful	1.00	7.00	3.38	1.72
Dismissing	1.00	7.00	4.19	1.60
Commitment Level				
Commitment	1.00	8.00	6.80	1.45
Satisfaction	1.20	8.00	6.41	1.62
Investment	0.40	8.00	5.49	1.63
Quality of Alternatives	0.00	8.00	3.10	1.96

Dependent Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Accommodation				
Exit	0.19	6.88	3.42	1.41
Voice	0.25	7.25	4.62	1.22
Loyalty	0.19	6.75	3.39	1.28
Neglect	0.56	6.75	3.24	1.21
Forgiveness	0.00	8.00	4.50	1.88

Table 2. Correlations between Self-construals, Attachment Style, Commitment Level, and Accommodation

	Exit	Voice	Loyalty	Neglect	Forgiveness
Self-construals					
Independent	-.064	.197*	.146*	-.094	.058
Interdependent	.003	.254*	.230*	.131	.252*
Attachment Styles					
Secure	.093	.070	.132	.117	.038
Preoccupied	.183*	-.050	-.039	.156*	-.145*
Fearful	.161*	-.017	.059	.214*	-.067
Dismissing	.100	.035	.124	.085	.018
Commitment Level					
Commitment	-.250*	.264*	.172*	-.251*	.250*
Satisfaction	-.023	.136	.195*	.037	.191*
Quality of Alternatives	-.262*	.185*	.018	-.286*	.243*
Investment	.296*	-.195*	.023	.341*	-.154*

Note: * Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

Table 3. Correlations between Self-construal, Attachment Style, Commitment Levels, and Accommodation Under Ego-depletion or Non-Ego-depletion Conditions

	Exit		Voice		Loyalty		Neglect		Forgiveness	
	Ego-depleted	Non Ego-depleted	Ego-depleted	Non Ego-depleted	Ego-depleted	Non Ego-depleted	Ego-depleted	Non Ego-depleted	Ego-depleted	Non Ego-depleted
Self Construals										
Independent	-.110	.020	.214*	.180	.133	.149	-.112	-.056	.103	-.013
Interdependent	.045	-.046	.234*	.274*	.213*	.253*	.159	.102	.215*	.298*
Attachment Styles										
Secure	.061	.177	.069	.076	.084	.167	.054	.230*	.033	.017
Preoccupied	.267*	.109	.002	-.105	-.012	.082	.245*	.059	-.159	-.157
Fearful	.169	.136	-.052	.014	-.058	.190	.251*	.165	-.047	-.072
Dismissing	.111	.070	-.044	.120	.079	.187	.053	.117	-.061	.122
Commitment Levels										
Commitment	-.310*	-.207	.164	.207*	.034	-.001	-.332*	-.231*	.293*	.188
Satisfaction	-.329*	-.140	.215*	.320*	.135	.206*	-.305*	-.173	.264*	.225*
Investment	-.126	.105	.152	.127	.149	.230*	-.056	.153	.155	.186
Quality of Alternatives	.368*	.199	-.121	-.277*	.084	-.038	.405*	.253*	-.175	-.121

Note: * Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

Relationship between the Present Findings and Alternative Theories

Based on the theoretical framework of self-construals we expected a positive relationship between independent self-construals and the accommodative responses of Exit and Neglect and a negative relationship between independent self-construals and the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty. For interdependent self-construals, we expected a negative relationship between the interdependent self-construals and the accommodative strategies of Exit and Neglect and a positive relationship between interdependent self-construals and the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty. Interestingly, contrary to expectations, both independent as well as interdependent self-construals were positively correlated with the pro-relationship accommodative responses of Voice and Loyalty. In other words, both self-construal orientations (i.e., focus on self in relation to others or focus on others in relationship to self), was related to accommodation toward the maintenance of relationships. Additionally, interdependent construal was associated with forgiveness.

Sinclair and Fehr (2005) came to a conclusion that partners that are involved in a stable romantic relationship tend to respond to accommodative dilemmas in a constructive manner i.e. with voice and loyalty. However, Sinclair and Fehr (2005) found that independent individuals tend to respond with voice while interdependent individuals tend to respond with loyalty. The present research did not find such preference among self-construals. One reason for this could be the ethnic background of participants. Participants in the present study belonged to various ethnic backgrounds, which is different from common self-construal studies. Prior research (e.g., Sinclair & Fehr, 2005; Seeley & Gardner, 2003; Yum, 2004; etc.) frequently employ the use of Asian/ Asian American and White/ Caucasian participants when exploring the effects of self-construals on other factors. It is possible that the ethnic makeup of our sample, although identify themselves with either one of the self-construals, may respond to relationship threatening situations differently than a typical sample of Asian/ Asian American and White/ Caucasian participants.

The social desirability effect refers to the tendency to answer to self-report questionnaires in a manner that makes the respondent appear more favorable or socially

accepted (Paulhus, 1991). This could be another explanation of the results we found, as we found that both self-construal styles were related to responding constructively to accommodative dilemmas. Paulhus (1984 &1991) studied the effects of social desirability on self-report measurements, like the one we used to measure accommodative behavioral tendencies. There are two means of social desirable responding, self-deception and impression management (Paulhus, 1984 & 1991). Self-deception is a biased positive but true self-description and impression management is a biased positive but false self-description. Participants tend to use one of these means of motives to provide favorable self-descriptions on self-report measures. Self-deception could be a possible explanation for the constructive accommodative responses from both self-construals, specially, if they were motivated to appear more favorable and socially acceptable. Impression management, on the other hand, could not have affected the results as our data is anonymous.

Based on the theoretical framework of attachment styles, we expected a negative relationship between secure attachment style and the accommodative responses of Exit and Neglect and a positive relationship between secure

attachment style and the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty. For insecure attachment styles (fearful, preoccupied, and dismissing), we expected a positive relationship between insecure attachment styles and the accommodative strategies of Exit and Neglect and a negative relationship between insecure attachment styles and the accommodative strategies of Voice and Loyalty. Again, the forgiveness response was an added exploratory element to the study. Partial support for the hypothesis was found. As opposed to the previous findings (Gaines et al., 1997; Gaines & Henderson, 2002) suggesting that securely attached individuals are likely to use constructively accommodate and that insecurely attached are likely to deconstructively accommodate, the present study suggests that only fearful and preoccupied attached individuals (two out of three insecure attachment styles) were more likely to respond in a destructive manner i.e. Exit and Neglect to the accommodative dilemmas in a relationship. Those with preoccupied attachments were also less likely to forgive their partner's misconduct. These results suggest that insecure attachment styles were more related to relationship destructive accommodative strategies and that none of the attachment styles were related to relationship enhancing accommodative

strategies. It is possible that the pre-occupied and fearful attachment styles predispose individuals to respond to relationship threatening dilemmas with mistrust and avoidance (Exit and Neglect) versus approach (Voice and Loyalty).

Unlike previous studies investigating the effects of commitment (e.g. Rusbult et al., 1991; Rusbult, Yovetich, & Verette, 1996; Rusbult, Bissonnette, Arriaga, & Cox, 1998; Weiselquist, Rusbult, Foster, & Agnew, 1999) the present study did not average the scores of sub scales of satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment size to measure commitment. As suggested by (Etcheverry & Le, 2005), we looked at each sub-scale as an independent indicator of commitment and analyzed it accordingly. These analytical discrepancies between the current and previous research might explain the results found in present research. The variables of satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment are theorized to be the underling variables of the concept of commitment. Therefore, they could be studied independently for specificity.

The primary goal of the current research was to establish an experimentally induced state of ego-depletion which was expected to interact with study independent

variables in the prediction of general responses to accommodative dilemmas. The current research employed a rather common method of achieving ego-depletion. Based on the limited resource theory, it was expected that upon completing the ego-depletion task participants would not be able to accommodate constructively as it requires that energy which would no longer be available. To test this hypothesis two groups were compared, a group that completed the ego-depleted task and the group that did not complete the ego-depleted task. Contrary to our expectations, no difference was detected between the control and experimental group.

Because self-control is an act that depletes a limited resource, we are likely to conserve and only use it when necessary (Muraven et al., 2006). When we encounter situations like accommodative dilemmas that are important to us and require self-control, we often choose to make those resources available for utilization then (Muraven & Slessareva, 2003). In the case of the present research, this was not the case. It is possible that the participants did not feel the necessity to utilize their resources during the typing task. In other words, the typing task presented to the participants in the present study might have not been perceived as an important task

where limited resource should be expended. Additionally, the accommodative dilemma scenarios might not have felt resource worthy because these were not the real dilemmas in their current relationships that they were encountering or have ever encountered. In other words the dilemmas might have been perceived as just statements to have an opinion about rather than having any real implications or importance to the participant. Finally, it could be that the ego depletion task lacked the external validity to everyday depletion that affects relationships.

Limitations of Current Research and Direction for Future Research

The present research has some limitations that may have contributed to the observed results and can be addressed by future research. First, the present research was an online study which implemented self-report measures. Self-report measures used in research have received significant amount of criticism as means of accurate measurements of variables as the respondents may exhibit response biases in completing the questionnaires (Paulhus, 1991). Second, the present research only measured accommodative behavior for one of the partners involved in a romantic relationship disregarding the other partner's influence on the accommodative behavior. Future

research can incorporate a lab setting where couples are invited to participate in a study where a real life accommodative dilemma/s could be manipulated by the experimenter. The results then may have more external validity and generalizability to real relationships. Third, we found some statistically significant relationships (consistant and contrary to our hypothesis); however, they only ranged from week to moderate effect sizes (Cohen, 1992).

Finally, ego-depletion failed to moderate the accommodative responses, despite the theoretical support (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998). Limitations of the study could be responsible for the lack of empirical support for the limited resource theory. The ego-depletion task employed in the present research (the typing task) could have not been as demanding of the limited resource as the ones used in other lab studies (thought/emotional-supression followed by a hand grip task) that investigated the effects of ego-depletion (e.g. Muraven & Slessareva, 2003; Muraven, Baumeister, & Tice, 1999; etc.). Muraven, Shmueli, and Burkley (2006) used a long paragraph for the typing task from a statistics textbook, while in the present study we only used first five sentences of that paragraph. Finally, it could be

that the typing task has no relevance to the accommodative response choice. For example the typing task incorporated few sentences from a statistics textbook, which is not related to romantic relationships in any means. We believe that if the ego-depletion task has direct relevance to the romantic relationships, we may have found statistical significance for ego-depletion as a potential moderating factor. Future research can utilize more realistic relationship related strains such as disagreement tasks over relationship issues, decisions about money, time spent together, time spent with family/friends etc., arguments between couples to accurately measure and establish the state of ego-depletion.

Implications of Current Research

The present research contributes to the existing literature in various ways. First, the present study considered the demographics of the participation pool and the concept of assimilation when inviting participants to take part in the present study. Unlike previous studies, the present study examined the effects of self-construals from individuals of various ethnic backgrounds instead of just Asian/ Asian American and White/ Caucasian

participants (Singelis, 1994; Seeley & Gardner, 2003; Yum, 2004; etc.).

Second, the present research examined accommodative behaviors of individuals involved in dating relationships as well as marriage which covers a wider spectrum of population than just married people or individuals involved in a romantic relationship for generalization purposes (Yovetich & Rusbult, 1994; Finkel & Campbell, 2001; etc.) Unlike other studies that only examined accommodative behaviors in either individuals involved in dating relationships or married individuals (Campbell & Foster, 2002; Etcheverry & Le, 2005; Perunovic & Holmes, 2008; etc.)

Relationship related complaints are often the reason why college students go for counseling. When assessing the relationship related concern of the client, the counselors can be aware of their client's personality traits like self-construals, attachment styles, how committed they are to their partner and relationship and how these traits might explain their behavior in relationship threatening situations. The results from the present study could serve as a tool for developing therapeutic techniques for college students with relationship troubles. For instance, counselors can provide assistance to someone who is

insecurely attached and having relationship troubles by addressing his/her usual way of coping with stressful situations and then implement the strategies of constructive coping mechanisms.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Qualifier Questions

1: Please indicate your relationship/marital status:

_____ Single _____ Separated

_____ In a relationship _____ Divorced

_____ Married _____ Other:

2: How long have you been with your romantic partner? Please estimate the duration of your relationship to the closest month (e.g., "5 months"; "1 year and 2 months").

_____

Singelis Self-Construal Scale

Please indicate the extent of your agreement with the following items by answering with a number from 1 to 7.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly disagree						strongly agree

_____1. My personal identity independent of others is very important to me.

_____2. I value being in good health above all else.

_____3. I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.

_____4. It is important for me to maintain harmony within groups I belong to.

_____5. Having a lively imagination is important to me.

_____6. I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.

_____7. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.

_____8. I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor.

_____9. I respect people who are modest about themselves.

_____10. I am the same person at home that I am at school.

_____11. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.

_____12. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.

_____13. I'd rather say "No" directly, than risk being misunderstood.

_____14. Speaking up during a class is not a problem for me.

_____15. I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education/career plans.

_____16. It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.

_____17. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I'm not happy with the group.

_____18. If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.

_____19. Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.

_____20. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.

_____21. I act the same way no matter who I am with.

_____22. I feel comfortable using someone's first name soon after I meet them, even when they are much older than I am.

_____23. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met.

_____24. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.

Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 580-591.

Investment Model Scale

Please indicate the degree to which each of the following statements pertain to your current relationship (circle your answer for each item).

	Completely Agree				Somewhat Agree				Don't Agree at all
1a) My partner fulfills my needs for intimacy (sharing personal thoughts, secrets, etc.).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
b) My partner fulfills my needs for companionship (doing things together, enjoying each others company etc.).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
c) My partner fulfills my sexual needs (holding hands, kissing, etc.).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
d) My partner fulfills my needs for security (feeling trusting, comfortable in a stable relationship, etc.).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
e) My partner fulfills my needs for emotional involvement (feeling emotionally attached, feeling good when another feels good, etc).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2. I feel satisfied with our relationship.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3. My relationship is much better than others' relationships.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4. My relationship is close to ideal.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5. Our relationship makes me very happy.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6. Our relationship does a good job of fulfilling my needs for intimacy, companionship, etc.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7a) I invested a great deal of time into our relationship.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
b) I told my partner many private things about myself. (I disclose secrets to him/her).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
c) My partner and I have an intellectual life together that would be difficult to replace.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
d) My sense of personal identity (who I am) is linked to my partner and our relationship.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
e) My partner and I share many memories	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

8. I put a great deal into our relationship that I would lose if the relationship were to end.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
9. Many aspects of my life have become linked to my partner (recreational activities, etc.), and I would lose all of this if we were to break up.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
10. I feel very involved in our relationship – like I have put a great deal into it.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
11. My relationships with friends and family members would be complicated if my partner and I were to break up (e.g., partner is friends with people I care about.).	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
12. Compared to other people, I know, I have invested a great deal in my relationship with my partner.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
13. I want our relationship to last for a very long time.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
14. I am committed to maintaining my relationship with my partner.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
15. I would not feel very upset if our relationship were to end in the near future.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
16. It is likely that I will date someone other than my partner within the next year.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
17. I feel very attached to our relationship – very strongly linked to my partner.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
18. I want our relationship to last forever.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
19. I am oriented toward the long-term future of my relationship (for example, I imagine being with my partner several years from now).	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
20a) My needs for intimacy (sharing personal thoughts, secrets, etc.) could be fulfilled. in alternative relationships.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
b) My needs for companionship (doing things together, enjoying each other's company, etc.) could be fulfilled in alternative relationships.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
c) My sexual needs (holding hands, kissing, etc.) could be fulfilled in alternative relationships.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

d) My needs for security (feeling trusting, comfortable in a stable (relationship, etc.) could be fulfilled in alternative relationships.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
e) My needs for emotional involvement (feeling emotionally attached, feeling good when another feels good, etc.) could be fulfilled in alternative relationships.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
21. The people other than my partner with whom I might become involved are very appealing.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
22. My alternatives to our relationship are close to ideal (dating another, spending time with friends or on my own, etc.).	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
23. If I weren't dating my partner I would do fine. I would find another appealing person to date.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
24. My alternatives are attractive to me (dating another spending time with friends or on my own, etc.).	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
25. My needs for intimacy, companionship etc., could easily be fulfilled in an alternative relationship.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The investment model scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships, 5*, 357-391.

The Relationship Questionnaire

Following are four general relationship styles that people often report. Place a checkmark next to the letter corresponding to the style that best describes you or is closest to the way you are.

____ A. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

____ B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.

____ C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.

____ D. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

Now please rate each of the relationship styles above to indicate how well or poorly each description corresponds to your general relationship style.

Style A

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style B

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style C

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style D

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Bartholomew, K. & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 226-244.

Ego Depletion Task

1: The basic premise behind growth modeling is that a set of repeated measures observed on a given individual can be used to estimate an unobserved trajectory that is believed to have given rise to the set of repeated measures.

2: Once estimated, these trajectories then become the primary focus of analysis. Although easy to describe, growth models can be remarkably vexing to compute. Early examples of modeling individuals trajectories include Gompertz (1825) and Wishart (1938).

3: Although both ingenious and well ahead of their time, these early attempts were limited by significant statistical and computational problems.

4: Important recent developments in statistical theory and high-speed computing have allowed us to overcome many of these earlier limitations.

5: Thanks to the work of Bryk and Raudenbus (1987); Goldstein (1986); McArdle (1988, 1989,1991); and many others, there are now several statistical approaches that can be used to estimate a broad class of random effects trajectory models.

Please retype the above paragraph as accurately and as fast as you can.

Please retype the above paragraph as accurately and as fast as you can EXCEPT FOR TYPING THE LETTER "E/ e" OR HITTING THE SPACE BAR

Muraven, M., Shmueli, D., & Burkley, E. (2006). Conserving self-control strength. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*, 524-537.

Reaction to Hypothetical Incidents (aka Exit-Voice-Loyalty-Neglect Scale)

We list four possible reactions to each of the following hypothetical incidents. Please use the following scale to describe the degree to which you would react in each way. For each incident, please record a rating for all possible responses (i.e., indicate how likely you are to react in each way).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Not at all likely to react this way				*Somewhat likely to react this way*				*Extremely likely to react this way*

1.) During an argument, your partner says, "Sometimes I think I'd be better off without you."

_____ I would say something like "that could be easily arranged" and storm away.
_____ I would ask my partner what was bothering him/her that led to such a remark.
_____ I wouldn't think much of it, assuming that my partner was just in a bad mood.
_____ I would be silently upset and think that my partner was being a real jerk.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

2.) Your partner cancels plans he/she has made with you in order to spend time with friends.

_____ I would be okay with it, but I'd make sure we reschedule in the near future.
_____ I would say nothing, realizing that couples need time apart from each other.
_____ I would say nothing but think about possible ways to annoy my partner later.
_____ I would say that if my partner wants to act that way, I'd be happier alone.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

3.) Your partner belittles you at a recent social event in front of your mutual friends.

_____ I would make sure that I had a constructive chat with my partner about why I am upset.
_____ I would realize that my partner probably was not trying to be hurtful.
_____ I would be secretly angry with him/her and think about how unfair he/she was being.
_____ I would act openly angry with him/her for the criticism and criticize hi/her in return.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

4.) Your partner shows up two hours late for a date that the two of you had made together.

_____ I would give my partner the "cold shoulder" and act unpleasantly on the date.
_____ I would tell my partner how furious I was and call him/her "unreliable."
_____ I would say that I was upset, but that I'm sure that there is a good explanation.
_____ I would not complain at all, happily noting that at least we are together now.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

5.) You and your partner go out to a party and he/she ignores you all night.

_____ I would be happy that my partner was having fun and look forward to spending time together later on.
_____ I would happily make an extra effort to include myself in my partner's good time.
_____ I would become angry with my partner, but I wouldn't bother to let him/her know this.
_____ I would confrontationally ask my partner why he/she is being such a jerk.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

6.) Your partner forgets to ask you about an important event in your life.

_____ I would not worry about it, assuming that he/she has other important things going on.
_____ I would not mention anything at all, but I'd think he/she was being a jerk.
_____ I would aggressively tell him/her how thoughtless he or she had been.
_____ I would pleasantly bring the topic of the event up and let him/her know how everything went.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

7.) In a conversation with mutual friends, your partner discloses one of your embarrassing secrets.

_____ I would assume that he/she is inconsiderate and I that I'd better not share personal things with him/her anymore.
_____ I would step into the room and openly criticize my partner for his/her behavior.
_____ I would later ask my partner to sit down and discuss why I was upset with him/her.
_____ I would assume that he/she didn't mean to embarrass me and shrug the incident off.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

8.) Your partner talks to friends about private issues in your relationship

_____ I would tell my partner that it will take a long time to make it up to me.
_____ I would calmly tell my partner why I'd prefer that our private life remain private.
_____ I would assume that my partner probably didn't mean to expose our private life.
_____ I would dwell on how angry I feel, but wouldn't talk to my partner about it.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

9.) Your partner makes fun of you when you talk about your deepest fears.

_____ I would assume that my partner must feel very uncomfortable about the issue underlying my fears.
_____ I would imagine ways to obtain revenge in the future.
_____ I would make fun of my partner at the next available opportunity.
_____ I would talk about how important it is that we understand each other's weaknesses.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

10.) Your partner becomes sexually intimate with another person.

_____ I would retaliate, and attempt to become sexually intimate with another person myself.
_____ I would imagine breaking up because there are "other fish in the sea."
_____ I would suggest that we have a positive talk about sexual monogamy.
_____ I would remind myself that in general, my partner treats me very well.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

11.) Your partner deliberately says something that hurts you badly.

_____ I would ask my partner why he/she had hurt my feelings.
_____ I would say something equally mean right back to my partner.
_____ I would try to understand that my partner may not have intended to hurt me.
_____ I would give my partner "the cold shoulder" for a while.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

12.) You find out that your partner kissed someone else at a party.

_____ I would understand that things got out of hand, and that my partner behaved in a very atypical manner on that one occasion.
_____ I would decide to quit supporting my partner so much in the future.
_____ I would ask if my partner is upset about something, and if that caused him/her to let me down.
_____ I would tell my partner I'm going to cut off the relationship unless things improve fast.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

13.) Your partner lies to you about something important.

_____ I would feel angry that my partner couldn't be honest with me.
_____ I would tell my partner I'd like us to try to resolve the situation.
_____ I would try to understand the situation from my partner's point of view.
_____ I would come up with ways to get even with my partner.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

14.) Your partner fails to support you when you're really upset.

_____ I would recognize that my partner's life is busy, and deal with the situation myself.
_____ I would decide to quit supporting my partner so much in the future.
_____ I would ask if my partner is upset about something, and if that caused him/her to let me down.
_____ I would tell my partner I'm going to cut off the relationship unless things improve fast.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

15.) Your partner says something bad about you behind your back.

_____ I would feel so irritated that I wouldn't be able to deal with the situation.
_____ I would forgive my partner because I've done similar things in the past.
_____ I would tell my partner that I hope we can work out this problem.
_____ I would get even by saying bad things about my partner behind his/her back.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

16.) Your partner tries to prohibit you from going out with your other friends because he/she is so possessive.

_____ I would forcefully inform my partner that I can do whatever I want with my own life.
_____ I would try to understand why my partner was concerned about me spending time with friends.
_____ I would try not to become angry, assuring my partner that he/she need not be concerned.
_____ I would ignore my partner and go out with my friends anyway.
_____ I would forgive my partner.

Finkel, E. J., Rusbult, C. E., Kumashiro, M., & Hannon, P. A. (2002). Dealing with betrayal in close relationships: Does commitment promote forgiveness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 956-974.

Manipulation Check Questions

How hard did you have to concentrate on the typing task? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5
Not very hard		Somewhat hard		Extremely hard

How tired did you feel after completing the typing task? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5
Not very hard		Somewhat hard		Extremely hard

What was the purpose of this study?

Was there anything odd or confusing about this study? If so, what?

Do you think there was more to this study than you were told? If so, what?

Do you think that anything influenced your responses during today's study? If so, what?

Demographics

What is your age? _____

What is your gender? (circle one) Female Male

What is your ethnicity? (put an "X" next to your response...specify if necessary)

_____African/African-American/Black
_____Arab/Arab-American/Middle Eastern
_____Asian/Asian-American/Pacific Islander/Indian
_____Caucasian/European-American/White
_____Latino/Hispanic/Chicano
_____Multiethnic or "Other", please specify
_____

Is English the first language you learned? (circle one) Yes No

a) If not, what is your first language? _____
b) If not, how long have you been speaking English? _____

Please indicate the College you are enrolled in:

_____Arts and Letters
_____Business & Public Administration
_____Education
_____Extended Learning
_____Natural Sciences
_____Social & Behavioral Sciences
_____Other:

In comparison to other CSUSB students, how would you rate your typing abilities?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor			Average			Very proficient

What was your total family income last year (from all sources, before taxes)? This refers to the summed incomes of all individuals living in your home:

_____less than $15,999
_____$16,000 to $19,999
_____$20,000 to $29,999
_____$30,000 to $39,999
_____$40,000 to $49,999
_____$50,000 to $59,999
_____$60,000 to $69,999
_____$70,000 to $79,999
_____$80,000 to $89,999
_____$90,000 or more

APPENDIX B

HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD

Human Subjects Review Board
Department of Psychology
California State University, San Bernardino

PI:	Faiza Furqan
From:	Kristy K. Dean
Project Title:	Self-Construal, Ego Depletion, and Relationship Accommodation
Project ID:	H-09WI-29
Date:	Wednesday, December 01, 2010

Disposition: Expedited Review

Your application to use human subjects has been reviewed and approved by the Chair of the Psychology Department Institutional Review Board (IRB) of California State University, San Bernardino. IRB approval includes approval of the protocol and consent forms. This approval is valid for a year, until 4/3/2010.

IRB approval is granted with the understanding that the investigator will:

- Change neither the procedures nor the consent form without prior IRB review and approval
- Report serious adverse events to the Psychology Department IRB Chair
- Submit a Renewal Form to the Psychology Department IRB Chair prior to the expiration of this approval, if continued use of this protocol is desired.

If you have any questions regarding the IRB decision, please contact Dr. Kristy Dean, Psychology Department IRB Sub-Committee Chair (909) 537-5583 or kdean@csusb.edu. Please include your application identification number (above) in all correspondence.

Good luck with your research!

John P. Clapper
Psych IRB Sub-Committee

Luis Rivera
Psych IRB Sub-Committee

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C, Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7,* 147-178.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61,* 226-244.

Baumeister, R. F, Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 74,* 1252-1265.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment.* New York: Basic Books.

Campbell, W. K., & Foster, C. (2002). Narcissism and commitment in romantic relationships: An investment model analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 484-495.

Cassidy, J., & Berlin, L. J. (1994). The insecure/ambivalent pattern of attachment: Theory and research. *Child Development, 65,* 971-991.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 155-159.

Crittenden, P. M., & Ainsworth, M. (1989). Child maltreatment and attachment theory. In D. Cicchetti & V. Carlson (Eds.), *Child maltreatment: Theory and research on the causes and consequences of child abuse and neglect* (pp. 432-463). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

DeWall, C. N., Baumeister, R. F., Stillman, T. F., & Gailliot, M. T. (2007). Violence restrained: Effects of self-regulation and its depletion on aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43,* 62-76.

Etcheverry, P. A., & Le, B. (2005). Thinking about commitment: Accessibility of commitment and prediction of relationship persistence, accommodation and willingness to sacrifice. *Personal Relationships, 12,* 103-123.

Feeney, J., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 281-291.

Finkel, E. J., & Campbell, W. K. (2001). Self-control and accommodation in relationships: An interdependence analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81,* 263-277.

Finkel, E. J., DeWall, C. N., Slotter, E. B., Oaten, M., & Foshee, V. A. (2009). Self-regulatory failure and intimate partner violence perpetration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(3), 483-499.

Finkel, E. J., Rusbult, C. E., Kumashiro, M., & Hannon, P. A. (2002). Dealing with betrayal in close relationships: Does commitment promote forgiveness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 956-974.

Gaines, Jr., S. O., & Henderson, M. C. (2002). Impact of attachment style on responses to accommodative dilemmas among same-sex couples. *Personal Relationships,* 9, 89-93.

Gaines, Jr., S. O., Reis, H. T., Summers, S., Rusbult, C. E., Cox, C. L., Wexler, M. O., et al. (1997). Impact of attachment style on reactions to accommodative dilemmas in close relationships. *Personal Relationships, 4,* 93-113.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 511-524.

Kahan, D., Polivy, J., & Herman, C. P. (2003). Conformity and dietary disinhibition: A test of the ego-strength model of self-regulation. *International Journal of Eating Disorders, 32,* 165-171.

Kelley, H. H. (1983). Love and commitment. In H. H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J. H. Harvey, T. L. Huston, G. Levinger, et al. (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 265-314). San Francisco: Freeman.

Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence,* New York: Wiley.

Kilpatrick, S. D., Bissonnette, V. L., & Rusbult, C. E. (2002). Empathic accuracy and accommodative behavior among newly married couples. *Personal Relationships,* 9, 369-393.

Kim, M. S., Hunter, J. E., Miyahara, A., Horvath, A. M., Bresnahan, M., & Yoon, H-J. (1996). Individual- vs. culture-level dimensions of individualism and collectivism: Effects of preferred conversational styles. *Communication Monographs, 63,* 29-49.

Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Davis, K. E. (1994). Attachment style, gender, and relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 502-512.

Koball, H. L., Moiduddin, E., Henderson, J., Goesling, B., & Besculides, M. (2010). What do we know about the link between marriage and health? *Journal of Family Issues*, *31*(8), 1019-1040.

Le, B., & Agnew, C. R. (2003). Commitment and its theorized determinants: A meta-analysis of the Investment Model. *Personal Relationships, 10,* 37-57.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

Menzies-Toman, D. A., & Lydon, J. E. (2005). Commitment-motivated benign appraisals of partner transgressions: Do they facilitate accommodation? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22,* 111-128.

Muraven, M., Baumeister, R. F., & Tice, D. M. (1999). Longitudinal improvement of self-regulation through practice: Building self-control strength through repeated exercise. *Journal of Social Psychology, 139,* 446-457.

Muraven, M., Collins, R. L., & Neinhaus, K. (2002). Self-control and alcohol restraint: An initial application of the self-control strength model. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 16,* 113-120.

Muraven, M., & Slessareva, E. (2003). Mechanisms of self-control failure: Motivation and limited resources. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 894-906.

Muraven, M., Shmueli, D., & Burkley, E. (2006). Conserving self-control strength. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91, 524-537.

Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 598-609.

Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S.Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 17-59). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Perunovic, M., & Holmes, J. G. (2008). Automatic accommodation: The role of personality. *Personal Relationships,* 15, 57-70.

Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45,* 101-117.

Rusbult, C. E. (1987). Responses to dissatisfaction in close relationships: The exit-voice-loyalty-neglect model. In D. Perlman, & S. Duck (Eds.), *Intimate relationships: Development, dynamics, and deterioration* (pp. 209-237). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rusbult, C. E., Bissonnette, V. L., Arriaga, X. B., & Cox, C. L. (1998). Accommodation processes during the early years of marriage. In T. Bradbury (Ed.), *The developmental course of marital dysfunction* (pp. 74-113). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rusbult, C. E., Drigotas, S. M., & Verette, J. (1994). The investment model: An interdependence analysis of commitment processes and relationship maintenance phenomena. In D. Canary, & L. Stafford (Eds.), *Communication and relational maintenance* (pp. 115-139). San Diego, CA: Academic.

Rusbult, C. E., Isabella, Z., & Lawanna, G. (1982). Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect: Responses to Dissatisfaction in Romantic Involvements, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*, 1230-1242.

Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The investment model scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships, 5*, 357-391.

Rusbult, C. E., Verette, J., Whitney, G. A., Slovik, L. F., & Lipkus, I. (1991). Accommodation processes in close relationships: Theory and preliminary empirical evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 53-78.

Rusbult, C. E., Yovetch, N. A., & Verette, J. (1996). An interdependence analysis of accommodation processes. In G. J. O. Fletcher & J. Fitness (Eds.), *Knowledge structures in close relationships: A social psychological approach* (pp. 63-90). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rusbult, C. E., & Zcmhrodt, I. M. *(1983)*. Responses to dissatisfaction in romantic involvements: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 19*, 214-293.

Seeley, E. A., & Gardner, W. L. (2003). The "selfless" and self-regulation: The role of chronic other-orientation in averting self-regulatory depletion. *Self and Identity, 2,* 103-117.

Shi, L. (2003). The association between adult attachment styles and conflict resolution in romantic relationships. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 31,* 143-157.

Sinclair, L., & Fehr, B. (2005). Voice versus loyalty: Self-construals and responses to dissatisfaction in romantic relationships. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 41,* 298-304.

Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 580-591.

Singelis, T. M., & Brown, W. (1995). Culture, self, and collectivist communication: Linking culture to individual behavior. *Human Communication Research, 21,* 354-389.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 30,* 526-537.

Stack, S., & Eshleman, J. R. (1998). Marital status and happiness: A 17-nation study. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60,* 527-536.

Stucke, T. S., & Baumeister, R. F. (2006). Ego depletion and aggressive behavior: Is the inhibition of aggression a limited resource? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36,* 1-13.

Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality, 72,* 271-322.

Tejada-Vera, B., & Sutton, P. D. (2010). Births, marriages, divorces, and deaths: Provisional data for 2009. *National Vital Statistics Reports, 58*(25), 6.

Tran, S., & Simpson, J. A. (2009). Prorelationship maintenance behaviors: The joint roles of attachment and commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(4), 685-698.

Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., & Ciarocco, N. J. (2005). Self-regulation and self-presentation: Regulatory resource depletion impairs impression management and effortful self-presentation depletes regulatory resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 632-657.

Vohs, K. D., & Faber, R. J. (2004). To buy or not to buy? Self-control and self-regulatory failure in purchase behavior. In R. F. Baumeister, & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 509-524). New York: Guilford Press.

Wieselquist, J., Rusbult, C. E., Foster, C. A., & Agnew, C. R. (1999). Commitment, pro-relationship behavior, and trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77,* 942-966.

Yovetich N. A., & Rusbult C. E. (1994). Accommodative Behavior in Close Relationships: Exploring Transformation of Motivation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 30(2),* 138-164.

Yum, Y. (2004). Culture and self-construal as predictors of responses to accommodative dilemmas in dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*(6), 817-835.