

## WHAT KEEPS MARRIED PARTNERS ATTRACTED TO EACH OTHER?

Susan Sprecher, Illinois State University

### ABSTRACT

This study identifies the factors that contribute to the maintenance of attraction in marital relationships and compares these predictors with the predictors of initial attraction (as recalled for an earlier stage of the relationship). A network sample of 157 married individuals were presented with a list of 17 predictors of attraction and asked to indicate both the level and the importance (as a reason for attraction) of each predictor, for either initial attraction or the maintenance of attraction (randomly assigned). Most of the predictors of attraction were perceived to be somewhat to extremely characteristic of the relationship or the partner, for both the initial attraction period and the current (maintenance) period. Physical attractiveness was judged to be a significantly more important predictor of initial attraction than of the maintenance of attraction. However, Other's liking (reciprocal liking), familiarity, and something special about the setting were all viewed as more important predictors of the maintenance of attraction than of initial attraction.

### INTRODUCTION

Considerable research has been conducted to examine what factors lead to initial attraction between previously unacquainted strangers. For example, four factors frequently discussed as determinants of initial attraction are similarity, proximity, physical attractiveness of the other, and reciprocal liking (Berscheid 1985; Brehm 1992). However, a neglected topic on interpersonal attraction is how these four factors and others contribute to the *maintenance* of attraction in long-term (marital) relationships. Attraction and love have been viewed in the U.S. and other western societies as necessary conditions for marriage (Cancian 1987; D'Emilio, Freedman 1988). We know, however, from divorce statistics that attraction erodes over time in many marriages. Thus, an important but neglected research question is: What factors contribute to the maintenance of attraction in marriage or other long-term relationships and how do these factors differ, if at all, from the factors that contribute to initial attraction?

### A Theoretical Model of Types of Predictors of Attraction

A number of factors have been identified as determinants of attraction, including the four mentioned above. After reviewing the social psychology literature on attraction, the family sociology literature on mate selection, and the psychology literature on falling in love, Aron, Dutton, Aron, and Iverson (1989) generated a list of 11 determinants of attraction and falling love. These were: similarity, proximity, desirable characteristics of other, reciprocal liking, social influences, filling needs, arousal/unusualness of the setting, specific cues, readiness for entering a relationship, isolation from others, and mystery. These determinants of attraction and others can be organized according to Kelley, Berscheid,

Christensen, Harvey, Huston, Levinger, McClintock, Peplau & Peterson's (1983) model of causal conditions affecting close relationships (Simpson, Harris 1994; Sprecher 1989; Sprecher, Hatfield 1985). *P* variables are attributes the *Person* brings to the relationship (social motives); *O* variables are attributes (physical attractiveness) of the *Other*, the target of *P*'s attraction; *P x O* variables are unique to the association between *P* and *O* (similarity); and *E* variables refer to aspects of the social or physical environment (social support for the relationship). Most research on determinants of attraction focuses on *O* variables (what is it about the Other that is attractive?) and *P x O* variables (what is it about the unique relationship between *P* and *O* characteristics that leads to attraction? [similarity]). In this research, *O*, *P x O*, and *E* factors are examined as determinants of attraction.

### The Maintenance of Attraction in Relationships

Perhaps because change is more interesting than stability, the initiation and termination stages of relationships have been of greater interest to relationship researchers than has the maintenance of relationships. According to Dindia and Canary (1993), there are at least four ways to define relational maintenance:

- 1) to keep a relationship in existence; 2) to keep a relationship in a specified state or condition; 3) to keep a relationship in satisfactory condition and 4) to keep a relationship in repair.

Although there has been research on the routine behaviors that contribute to either the maintenance of the existence of relationships or to the maintenance of relationships at a certain level of satisfaction (Dainton, Stafford

1993; Dindia, Baxter 1987), no research has examined how long-term (marital) partners maintain a level of attraction in their relationship. Simpson and Harris (1994) concluded, based on a review of the interpersonal attraction literature, that little research "has examined how attraction is maintained once a relationship becomes close and committed" and suggested that "Future research should explore how attraction is maintained in long-term relationships".

In response to Simpson and Harris's (1994) call for research on the maintenance of attraction, in an earlier preliminary investigation (Sprecher forthcoming), I used a self-report method (see Aron et al 1989; Sprecher, Aron, Hatfield, Cortese, Potapova, Levitskaya 1994, for examples of the use of this method in studies of attraction) to examine young adults' perceptions of the factors that contributed to either the maintenance of their attraction or to their initial attraction, in either friendship or dating relationships. Other's warmth and kindness, Other's (desirable) personality, something specific about Other, and reciprocal liking (O's liking for P) were rated among the most important predictors of both initial attraction and the maintenance of attraction. Physical attractiveness and proximity were found to be more important determinants of initial attraction than of the maintenance of attraction, whereas familiarity was found to be a more important determinant of the maintenance of attraction. This earlier study, then, suggests that determinants of the maintenance of attraction are very similar but not identical to the determinants of initial attraction, at least in friendship and dating relationships. However, the next step in research is to examine determinants of the maintenance of attraction for individuals in marital relationships.

### Purposes of This Investigation

In sum, the general purpose of this investigation was to examine how the determinants of initial attraction, as identified in previous literature (Aron et al 1989; Simpson, Harris 1994), might also lead to the maintenance of attraction in long-term (marital) relationships. A network sample of married individuals provided two types of information about each of 17 predictors of attraction: 1) the *level* of the predictor (the degree to which it was present in the relationship or in the partner); and 2) the *importance* of the predictor as a reason for attraction. Participants were randomly

assigned to complete their assessments for either the maintenance of their (current) attraction in marriage or their initial attraction recalled for the premarital stage of their relationship. Based on previous research on attraction conducted with non-marital relationships (Aron et al 1989; Sprecher et al 1994), I expected to find that reciprocal liking and intrinsic desirable characteristics of the other (Other's warmth and kindness) will be described as the most important reasons for attraction and also the most characteristic, both for the premarital (initial attraction) stage and for current (maintenance of) attraction stage. However, it is likely that there will be differences found in the degree to which some predictors of attraction are emphasized as a function of whether the focus is on initial attraction or on the maintenance of attraction. For example, O's physical attractiveness is likely to be described as more important (and more present) in the early attraction stage than in the current (marital) stage. Conversely, factors such as familiarity should be more important and more characteristic as predictors of attraction in the current period.

Gender differences in the ratings of the predictors will also be examined because of considerable research indicating that while men and women become attracted for many of the same reasons, there are differences in the degree to which certain factors are emphasized. For example, in response to mate selection lists, men have been found to express more desire than women for a physically attractive partner, whereas women have expressed more desire than men for a partner with earning potential and social status (Howard, Blumstein, Schwartz 1987; Sprecher, Sullivan, Hatfield 1994). However, the prior research documenting gender differences has been conducted primarily for initial attraction and in the context of hypothetical relationships (participants indicated what they would desire for a hypothetical, future relationship rather than why they are attracted to a specific other in an actual relationship). We do not know whether these same gender differences will be found for the predictors of the maintenance of attraction in marriage.

### METHOD

#### Sample

The sample consisted of 157 married individuals (representing 157 marriages) who were obtained based on a network sampling procedure conducted with a group of

Midwestern University students. Students in a class taught by the author were requested, as part of an optional research assignment, to distribute a questionnaire and conduct a follow-up interview with a married person from their social or kin network (the follow-up interview data were not collected). Many students chose either a sibling, a friend, or a parent. The participants had the option of either returning the questionnaire in a sealed envelope with the student assistant or returning it in campus mail to the investigator. Network sampling procedures conducted as part of a class project have been used successfully in previous research (Feeney 1996).

Thirty-one percent ( $n = 49$ ) of the sample were men and 69 percent ( $n = 108$ ) were women. Their ages ranged from 18 to 75, with a mean age of 30 and a median age of 26. Twenty-seven percent were married undergraduate students, thirteen percent were married graduate students, and sixty-one percent were not university students. Most of the participants (94%) were in their first marriage. Forty-five percent had one or more children. The length of the marriages ranged from less than one year to almost 50 years (mean was 7.5 years).

### Measurement

The self-administered questionnaire had two major sections: background questions about the participant and his or her marriage and the attraction measures.

**Attraction measures.** Participants were randomly assigned to either a version of the questionnaire that referred to "Factors Leading to Initial Attraction" or a version that referred to "Factors Leading to the Maintenance of Attraction." The directions the Initial Attraction participants ( $n = 68$ ; 22 men and 46 women) received were the following:

Think more specifically about the factors that caused you to become attracted to your spouse in the first place. That is, think about what factors made you want to become close to him/her very early in your relationship. Indicate how important each of the factors below was in your initial attraction for this person.

The Maintenance Attraction participants ( $n = 89$ ; 27 men and 62 women)<sup>1</sup> received the following directions:

Think more specifically about the factors that cause you to remain attracted to your spouse

over time. That is, think about what factors make you want to remain in a marriage with him/her. Indicate how important each of the factors below is in helping you maintain your attraction for your spouse.

Following these directions were listed 17 predictors of attraction, with each predictor ("The Other's Physical Attractiveness") followed by 12 possible responses that best summarized both the *level* of the factor (extreme amount, moderate amount, none; although the exact wording depended on the items) and its perceived *importance* in leading to (maintaining) attraction for the other (the major reason, somewhat important reason, slightly important reason, not a reason; recoded so that the higher number indicated greater importance). The wording of the items differed slightly for the different time frames.

Four items referred to a *type of similarity*, six items referred to *desirable characteristics* of the other, and the remaining items referred to other predictors of attraction as identified in the literature (Aron et al 1989; Simpson, Harris 1994), including environmental factors (proximity). The full list of items, and in the order in which they were presented in the questionnaire, is:

- 1) The Other's physical attractiveness
- 2) Similarity on background characteristics
- 3) Similarity on attitudes and values
- 4) Similarity on social skills (how interact)
- 5) Similarity on interests and leisure activities
- 6) Complementarity (being opposites) on personality characteristics
- 7) The Other's desirable personality
- 8) The Other's intelligence and/or competence
- 9) The Other's ambition
- 10) The Other's liking for you
- 11) Something specific about the other
- 12) Familiarity of the other
- 13) The setting in which first became acquainted (or spend time [maintenance condition])
- 14) Support from significant others for the relationship
- 15) Proximity of the other
- 16) The Other's warmth and kindness
- 17) The Other's money or earning potential

**Table 1: Perceived Level (Presence) of the Predictors of Attraction for the Current (Maintenance of Attraction) Period vs. the Initial Attraction Period**

Predictors of Attraction	Current Maintenance of Attraction Period			Initial Attraction Period			X-squared
	Extreme	Some-what	Low/None	Extreme	Some-what	Low/None	
<b>Types of Similarity and Other P x O Factors</b>							
Similarity on attitudes & values	50.00	45.50	4.50	50.70	40.30	9.00	1.37
Similarity on social skills	36.40	52.30	11.40	40.30	43.30	16.40	1.50
Similarity on interests and leisure activities	44.30	45.50	10.20	49.30	43.30	7.50	0.57
Similarity on background characteristics	26.10	56.80	17.00	32.40	57.40	10.30	1.79
Complementarity on personality	17.20	71.30	11.50	17.60	61.80	20.60	2.54
O's liking	89.80	9.10	1.10	63.20	35.30	1.50	16.58**
Familiarity of the Other	92.00	8.00	0.00	23.50	42.60	33.80	91.35**
<b>Characteristics of Other (O)</b>							
P's warmth and kindness	81.80	17.00	1.10	82.40	17.60	0.00	1.15
O's (desirable) personality	67.80	32.20	0.00	79.40	19.10	1.50	4.89
Something specific about the other	55.70	32.90	11.40	70.10	22.40	7.50	3.26
O's intelligence & competence	66.70	31.00	2.30	58.80	41.20	0.00	3.78
O's ambition	51.10	44.30	4.50	40.30	53.70	6.00	1.81
O's physical attractiveness	51.10	46.60	2.30	54.40	41.20	4.40	0.88
O's money or earning potential	26.10	58.00	15.90	8.80	67.60	23.50	8.45*
<b>Environmental Factors</b>							
Proximity	58.00	35.20	6.80	48.50	32.40	19.10	5.49
Support from others	58.60	36.80	4.60	47.10	35.30	17.60	7.39
Special setting	37.50	38.60	23.90	13.20	29.40	57.40	21.16**

\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*  $p < .001$

## RESULTS

### Predictors of Attraction in the Early Attraction Period vs. the Current (Maintenance of) Attraction Period

The first purpose of this research was to compare the level (presence) and importance of each predictor of attraction for early attraction vs. the maintenance of attraction. Because the participants were randomly assigned to the two conditions, they should be similar on all other extraneous factors. However, to be sure, the two groups were compared on age, length of marriage, and the proportion of males vs. females. No significant difference was found between the two groups on any of these variables.

A cross-tabular analysis was conducted to compare the two groups on the degree to which each predictor of attraction was present

in the relationship. In addition, the two groups were compared on the importance of each predictor, via t-test analyses. In addition, follow-up analyses, including ANOVAs, were conducted to examine the moderating influence of gender. To control for Type I errors, the significance level was set to  $p < .01$ .

*Level (presence) of the predictors of attraction.* As indicated by cross-tabular analyses of time frame and reported level, a significant difference ( $p < .01$ ) was found between the two groups in the presence of four predictors of attraction. Familiarity of Other, O's liking for P, special setting, and O's money or earning potential were viewed as more present (characteristic) in the current time period than in the initial attraction period. No predictor of attraction was perceived to be more present in the initial attraction period than in

**Table 2: Importance of Predictors of Maintenance of Attraction vs. of Initial Attraction**

Predictors of Attraction	Total Sample		Maintenance of Attraction		Initial Attraction	
	Maint.	Attr. Init.	Men	Women	Men	Women
<b>Types of Similarity and Other P x O Factors</b>						
Similarity on attitudes & values	3.19	3.24	3.08	3.24	3.38	3.17
Similarity on social skills	2.74	2.79	2.73	2.74	2.81	2.78
Similarity on interests and leisure activities	2.89	3.12	2.88	2.89	3.19	3.09
Similarity on background characteristics	2.74	2.69	2.85	2.69	3.27	2.41
Complementarity on personality	2.61	2.75	2.78	2.52	2.68	2.84
O's liking for you	3.60	3.22	3.31	3.73	3.27	3.20
Familiarity of the Other	3.42	2.69	3.23	3.50	2.82	2.63
<b>Characteristics of Other (O)</b>						
O's warmth and kindness	3.60	3.59	3.35	3.71	3.73	3.52
O's (desirable) personality	3.47	3.51	3.56	3.44	3.73	3.41
Something specific about O	3.19	3.30	3.09	3.23	3.50	3.20
O's intelligence & competence	3.06	3.06	2.85	3.15	2.91	3.13
O's ambition	2.81	2.81	2.50	2.94	2.41	3.00
O's physical attractiveness	2.34	2.88	2.50	2.27	3.14	2.76
O's money or earning potential	1.75	1.54	1.31	1.94	1.32	1.65
<b>Environmental Factors</b>						
Proximity	2.35	2.57	2.69	2.21	2.59	2.57
Support from others	2.60	2.50	2.60	2.60	2.50	2.50
Setting	2.40	1.71	2.27	2.45	1.45	1.83

the current period (see Table 1). For both time periods, most predictors of attraction were viewed as either extremely or somewhat present, as shown in Table 1.

*Importance of the predictors of attraction.* As indicated by t-test analyses, four factors were found to differ in importance as a function of whether the time frame was initial vs. maintenance of attraction (see the means in the first two columns of Table 2). Physical attractiveness was judged to be a significantly more important predictor of initial attraction than of the maintenance of attraction ( $t[154] = 3.58, p < .001$ ). Three other factors were viewed as more important predictors of the maintenance of attraction: O's liking for P ( $t[154] = -3.08, p < .01$ ), familiarity ( $t[154] = -4.88, p < .001$ ), and special setting ( $t[154] = -3.95, p < .001$ ). Overall, however, there was considerable similarity between the two conditions in the relative ratings of the predictors of attraction, as shown in Table 2. For example, included among the highest rated predictors of attraction, both initially and currently, were O's warmth and kindness, O's desirable personality, something specific about O, and O's

liking for P; and rated as least important as a predictor of both types of attraction was O's money or earning potential.<sup>2</sup>

*Gender differences and similarities.* Thus far, the analyses have been conducted with men and women combined. However, possible differences and similarities between men and women in their responses were also explored. In the total sample, men and women were found not to differ in their perceptions of the levels (presence) of the predictors of attraction, as indicated by a series of cross-tabular analyses of gender by level of predictor. These analyses were also repeated within each condition (initial attraction vs. maintenance of attraction) separately, and a gender difference was found only for O's money or earning potential in the current time period. A much larger proportion of men (42%) than of women (5%) rated the partner as having "little money or little potential to earn money" in the current (marital) period. However, this same difference was not found for the initial attraction period (23% of the men and 24% of the women recalled their partner was low on money or earning potential).

To examine gender differences in the importance ratings overall and within each time frame, a 2 (gender) x 2 (time frame: Initial attraction vs. Maintenance of Attraction) ANOVA was conducted for the importance rating of each predictor. The main effect of gender was significant ( $p < .01$ ) for three predictors. Similarity on background characteristics was a more important determinant of attraction for men than for women ( $M_s = 3.04$  for men and 2.57 for women;  $F[1,152] = 7.94$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Conversely, O's ambition ( $M_s = 2.46$  for men and 2.96 for women;  $F[1,151] = 8.09$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and O's money or earning potential ( $M_s = 1.31$  for men and 1.81 for women;  $F[1,152] = 10.66$ ,  $p < .001$ ) were rated as more important determinants of attraction for women than for men. No gender x time frame interaction was significant at  $p < .01$ .

## DISCUSSION

This study examined married persons' perceptions of the importance (and level) of several predictors of attraction. A network sample of married individuals responded to a list of predictors of attraction either for the current period (maintenance of attraction) or for the acquaintance period of their premarital relationship (initial attraction). The major goal of the study was to determine whether the predictors of initial attraction identified in previous literature (Aron et al 1989; Simpson, Harris 1994) also contribute to the *maintenance* of attraction in married couples. Strong evidence was found that factors that lead to initial attraction (desirable characteristics of the other, reciprocal liking) also lead to the maintenance of attraction in marriage. These findings contribute to a small body of literature that has examined married individuals' perceptions of what makes their relationship successful (Dickson 1995).

Participants who responded to the predictors of attraction for the current (maintenance) of attraction period perceived four predictors of attraction to be more present than participants who responded to the initial attraction period. These were familiarity of other, O's liking (reciprocal liking), special setting, and O's money or earning potential. These factors are likely to increase with the passage of time in marriage or with increasing age. For example, people generally make more money as they move out of college-age; a partner becomes more familiar with time in the relationship; O's liking [and its expression] is likely to increase over the course of a relationship; and

with the passage of time there are more opportunities for a couple to have experiences in special settings. Although some (Hinde 1979) have argued that people become more similar in attitudes, interests, and other dimensions, the longer they have been together, no evidence was found in this study that married individuals perceive themselves to be more similar to their partner in the current period than in the early acquaintance period. Furthermore, O's characteristics (warmth and kindness, physical attractiveness) were perceived to be no more or no less desirable in the current (maintenance) period than in the early acquaintance period.

Three of the attraction predictors that were perceived to be more characteristic of the current period than the initial time period were also perceived to be more important determinants of the maintenance of attraction than of initial attraction. These were O's liking, O's familiarity, and something special about the setting. Thus, not only were these factors more present in the current time period, but they also were judged to be stronger predictors of current (maintenance of) attraction than of initial attraction. Another factor, the physical attractiveness of the partner, was a stronger predictor of initial attraction than of the maintenance of attraction. This difference in the importance of physical attractiveness for initiation vs. maintenance of attraction provides support for Murstein's (1976) Stimulus-Value-Role Theory, which states that stimulus characteristics, such as physical attractiveness, may be more important early in the relationship than later.

Overall, however, the determinants of the maintenance of attraction were very similar to the determinants of initial attraction. These results suggest that theoretical explanations for initial attraction also apply to the maintenance of attraction later in marriage. For example, attraction, regardless of when it is experienced, can probably be explained by reinforcement principles, i.e., attraction is increased when the other provides rewards (Byrne, Clore 1970).

Another purpose of this investigation was to examine whether there were gender differences in the importance of some of the predictors of attraction. For example, prior research (Howard et al 1987; Sprecher et al 1994) suggests that the physical attractiveness of a partner is more important to men than to women, whereas social status variables are more important to women. However,

the prior research was conducted on preferences in the context of initial attraction and not on factors contributing to the maintenance of attraction in marriage. In this research, gender differences were found in the importance ratings for only a few predictors of attraction. Consistent with gender differences found in research using other types of methods (Sprecher et al 1994), women rated partner's ambition and partner's money or earning potential as more important predictors of both initial attraction and the maintenance of attraction than did men. However, contrary to prior research, men did not rate physical attractiveness to be more important than women. It is worth noting that the opposite results were found in an earlier investigation by the author (Sprecher forthcoming), who examined self-reports of predictors of attraction among college students' non-marital relationships. In this earlier study, men rated physical attractiveness to be significantly more important than women, but women did not rate earning potential or money to be significantly more important than did men. Thus, the degree to which these traditional gender differences are found may depend on age group and/or type of relationship (dating vs. married).

Only one other gender difference was found in the importance ratings of predictors. Men rated similarity on background characteristics to be a more important reason for attraction than did women, particularly for initial attraction. Because men still take more initiative in relationships than women in our society, it is possible that men are more aware of and affected by a matching on background characteristics at the time they initiate relationships.

### Implications for Practice

The results of this study may have implications for programs designed to help couples before problems develop in the relationship as well as for couples who are seeking help because they are unhappy in their relationships. One finding that has strong implications is the important role of expressed liking and warmth and kindness as reasons for attraction, including the maintenance of attraction. Indeed, O's liking for P was found to be a stronger predictor of the maintenance of attraction than of initial attraction. Programs that emphasize the open expression of positive feelings in the relationship (Miller, Nunnally, Wackman 1976) may help restore, increase, or maintain attrac-

tion in long-term relationships.

The results of this study also suggest that focusing on the positive qualities of the relationship and the partner may have positive effects on relationship quality. Cognitive therapy programs involve re-structuring thought patterns to become more positive. Distressed partners may be given guidance for focusing on the positive aspects of the relationship and the partner. Even if these positive impressions are "illusions" to some degree, research suggests that these illusions have positive effects on relationship outcomes (Murray, Holmes 1996).

While attraction is a relationship sentiment often associated with the beginning stages of the relationship (Simpson, Harris 1994), attraction also is important to be maintained in long-term relationships. This research indicates that many of the factors associated with people becoming attracted in the first place also help to maintain their attraction. Thus, the courtship strategies that couples may engage in early in their relationship to emphasize certain qualities ("O" factors) or to emphasize the similarities between the two ("P x O" factors) are important to do later in marriage as well.

### Limitations of the Research

As is true of all studies, this study has certain limitations that call for more research to be conducted in the future. A majority of the sample was relatively young (67% were under 30 years of age) and had not been married for many years (65% were married for 5 years or less). Larger and more diverse samples of married couples are needed to examine how maintenance of attraction in marriage may depend on number of years married or the stage of the family lifecycle. More diverse samples would also allow for an examination of how predictors of initial and the maintenance of attraction depend on background characteristics, such as social class, race/ethnicity, and cultural background.

Another limitation of the study is the retrospective nature of the participant reports about initial attraction. For some of the participants, the initial period of acquaintance had been many years (even decades) earlier. Perhaps greater differences would be found between determinants of initial attraction and determinants of the maintenance of attraction with a longitudinal design, in which couples are surveyed early in their courtship and then again later in the marriage.

Despite these limitations, this study yielded

some interesting findings about attraction in marriage, both as recalled for the initial attraction period and as reported for the maintenance of current attraction. Factors that have been identified in prior literature as contributing to initial attraction were also found to be important for the maintenance of attraction in long-term relationships.

## ENDNOTES

- 1 More copies of the Maintenance version were distributed because the primary focus of this research was on the maintenance of attraction.
- 2 Because of the variation in the age of the participants and in the number of years married, I also examined whether people of different ages or married for different lengths of time rated the predictors of attraction in different ways. To examine this for the level of each predictor, the moderate and low categories were combined and compared to the extreme category, on age and years married, via t-test analyses within each condition separately. Participants viewed the presence of 16 of the 17 predictors of attraction the same regardless of their age or the number of years they were married. However, younger participants and those married for fewer years rated O's personality more desirable than older respondents and those married a greater number of years.

To examine whether age and years married were related to the importance ratings of the predictor variables, age and length of marriage were each correlated with the importance ratings. These analyses were also conducted within each group separately. None of the correlations was significant at  $p < .01$ . Thus, the reasons judged to be important factors leading to attraction were the same regardless of age or number of years married, both for initial attraction and for maintenance of attraction.

## REFERENCES

- Aron A, DG Dutton, EN Aron, A Iverson 1989 Experiences of falling in love *J Social Personal Relationships* 6 243-257
- Berscheid E 1985 Interpersonal attraction. p. 413-484 In G Lindzey, E Aronson Eds *Handbook of Social Psychology* NY: Random House
- Brehm SS 1992 *Intimate Relationships* 2nd ed NY: McGraw-Hill
- Byrne D, GL Clore 1970 A reinforcement model of evaluative responses *Personality* 1 103-128
- Cancian FM 1987 *Love in America: Gender and Self-Development* NY: Cambridge
- D'Emilio J, EB Freedman 1988 *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America* NY: Harper & Row
- Dainton M, L Stafford 1993 Routine maintenance behaviors: a comparison of relationship type, partner similarity and sex differences *J Social Personal Relationships* 10 255-271
- Dickson FC 1995 The best is yet to be: research on long-lasting marriages. pp. 22-50 in JT Wood, S Duck Eds *Under-Studied Relationships: Off the Beaten Track* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Dindia K, L Baxter 1987 Strategies for maintaining and repairing marital relationships *J Social Personal Relationships* 4 143-158
- Dindia K, DJ Canary 1993 Definitions and theoretical perspectives on maintaining relationships *J Social Personal Relationships* 10 163-173
- Feeney JA 1996 Attachment, caregiving, and marital satisfaction *Personal Relationships* 3 401-416
- Hinde RA 1979 *Towards Understanding Relationships* London: Academic Press
- Howard JA, P Blumstein, P Schwartz 1987 Social or evolutionary theories? Some observations on preferences in human mate selection *J Personality Social Psych* 53 194-200
- Kelley HH, E Berscheid, A Christensen, JH Harvey, TL Huston, G Levinger, E McClintock, LA Peplau, DR Peterson 1983 Analyzing close relationships. pp. 20-67 in HH Kelley et al Eds *Close Relationships* San Francisco: WH Freeman
- Miller S, EW Nunnally, DB Wackman 1976 Minnesota couples communication program (MCCP): premarital and marital groups. pp. 21-40 in DH Olson Ed *Treating Relationships* Lake Mills, IA: Graphic Publishing
- Murray SL, JG Holmes 1996 The construction of relationship realities. pp. 91-120 in GJO Fletcher, J Fitness Eds *Knowledge Structures in Close Relationships: A Social Psychological Perspective* New Jersey: Erlbaum
- Murstein BI 1976 The stimulus-value-role theory of marital choice. pp. 165-168 in H Grunebaum, J Chris Eds *Contemporary Marriage: Structures, Dynamics, and Therapy* Boston: Little, Brown
- Simpson JA, BA Harris 1994 Interpersonal attraction. pp. 45-66 in AL Weber, JH Harvey Eds *Perspectives on Close Relationships* Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Sprecher S 1989 Influences on choice of a partner and on sexual decision-making in the relationship. pp. 115-138 in M McKinney, S Sprecher Eds *Human Sexuality: The Societal and Interpersonal Context* New Jersey: Ablex
- \_\_\_\_\_ Forthcoming. Insiders' perspectives on reasons for attraction to a close other *Social Psychology Qrtly*
- Sprecher S, A Aron, E Hatfield, A Cortese, E Potapova, A Levitskaya 1994 Love: American style, Russian style, and Japanese style *Personal Relationships* 1 349-369
- Sprecher S, E Hatfield 1985 Interpersonal attraction. pp. 179-216 in G Stricker, R Keisner Eds *From Research to Clinical Practice* NY: Plenum
- Sprecher S, Q Sullivan, E Hatfield 1994 Mate selection preferences: gender differences examined in a national sample *J Personality Social Psych* 66 1074-1080