

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers

Special Collections and University Archives

2-19-1971

"Romantic Love"

Elaine Hatfield Walster

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers>



Part of the [Psychological Phenomena and Processes Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Walster, Elaine Hatfield, ""Romantic Love"" (1971). *Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers*. 149.
<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers/149>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Elaine Hatfield Walster
"Romantic Love"
Portland State University
February 19, 1971

PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives
Oregon Public Speakers Collection
<http://archives.pdx.edu/ds/psu/11423>
Transcribed by Ruby Bontrager, July 6 – 12, 2020
Audited by Carolee Harrison, September 2020

PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives presents these recordings as part of the historical record. They reflect the recollections and opinions of the individual speakers and are not intended to be representative of the views of Portland State University. They may contain language, ideas, or stereotypes that are offensive to others.

ELAINE HATFIELD WALSTER: I wanted to announce that you have to wait until the end but if you have friendly questions I'll let you interrupt. It goes better I think if it's a dialogue than if I just give a speech. Usually when you start off people feel more comfortable if you talk a little about what you mean by "romantic attraction." "Liking" is... has been so well studied that there's a pretty well accepted definition for liking. In general, people say that liking is a positive attraction of people toward one another, and that generally they measure this by a tendency of people to try and approach with or interact with the other person.

Usually when you say, "What do you mean by romantic attraction?" they say, "Well, you just carry the scale out a little bit further; it's a kind of *extreme* liking." In the paper I'll be giving today I'll be suggesting that you may be at some more unique... [chuckles] more unique—it is a unique state—and that it might be very useful to view romantic attraction as a special state characterized by high arousal, lots of adrenaline going, and a labeling of that state as passionate love or romantic attraction. So that like, married love, when it's going on placidly and calmly, wouldn't be in this category. We mean a high state of intense focus, intense activation, an emotional experience. And so that's what we'll be talking about.

The first thing you usually do is kind of review the literature when you talk about a topic. Well romantic attraction is especially interesting, because it's been a taboo topic... and even though interpersonal attraction is one of the most researched areas in social psychology, there are thousands of studies, you'd think that accidentally they would slip and do a romantic attraction study now and then. It's a much more exciting state... we're all more interested in love and

attraction probably than liking, but there's almost no research. There are probably three main reasons for that. First of all, it used to be very difficult to get funds to do romantic attraction studies. Legislators have to give out the money, the names and descriptions of the studies are published, and for a long time they just assume their constituents would really give them a hard time if they started supporting love and sex studies.

When I was at Michigan, Harry Harlow was just getting his money for some of the monkey research: mother, love, and the monkeys. Well those are the most theoretically important studies around, and yet cartoons and comic strips were written about scientific agencies trying to find out why monkeys loved one another, and oh, such a furor that arose. Well after that, they hired people that worked for the granting agencies, and when proposals come in and the poor, naive person has stated clearly what he wishes to investigate, if it has anything to do with love and sex, for many years they used to cross it out and put "social affection" down, and hoping to save themselves from trouble. Well, it's clear that under conditions like that there's not going to be much support for studies of either romantic attraction or sexual attraction. And so that has been a big discouragement.

Secondly, but this has really changed dramatically, psychologists and sociologists themselves used to really apply pressure to prevent people from working in these areas. When I first—in about 1962—used to start going around describing studies on romantic attraction, all these old famous guys would come up, and they would sort of... walk slowly up to the platform and say, "You know, you young people aren't the first ones that did romantic attraction research. My very first study after I received my Ph.D. was on romantic attraction or sexual attraction." And after a while this happened with such regularity, and these studies were never published, that I really got very interested and started pursuing it, and in general what happens is they really got kidded. They did this research and they were doing lots of other things too, and even though they weren't kind of aware of it there was all this pressure and joking and kidding around... the suggestion that probably there was something a little funny about somebody that was interested in these topics, and that surely wasn't very professional, you probably had a lot of fun at work but... it wasn't a professional thing to do. And a lot of these people got opted out of the profession. Now, things have dramatically changed, and all these old time studies are being published—written up and published—and a lot of young people are coming into the area, and so circumstances have radically altered and now the rewards are all for working in that area, I think.

Probably the last reason that experimental research wasn't done on the topic was even though poets might feel confident that they can... that love at first sight exists, psychologists really haven't felt that they can reproduce it in the laboratory, and even if they did they didn't quite

know what you'd do then... [laughter] and so they just thought you couldn't do anything. Well, turns out that with a little imagination you can, and lots of people are doing that kind of research now. So, now we're in a brand new kind of world, and instead of explaining why it is that you should know something about romantic attraction, you're faced with the problem of telling people what it is you do know, and it turns out that we don't know... we know very little. We know almost nothing, and I'm gonna tell you a little bit that we know today. In about four years you'll probably know a lot more. The situation now is all the people that are doing stuff on romantic attraction, people kind of send them all their reprints and studies, and so there's kind of this underground network of people who are doing research on physical attractiveness, a lot of that is going on; self-esteem and receptivity to love and affection, and then just some physiological studies of romantic and sexual response. And probably those will be published soon, and there's really lots of them. So if anybody's interested in specific references, you might see me at the end.

Okay, today I'm gonna talk about the approach people have made to understanding passionate love. What's wrong with this, what didn't seem to work, a new approach that we might try, and then look at some very sketchy evidence—it's the worst kind of evidence but it's all that exists—that indeed the theory we've got might be a useful way of viewing the world. And then right at the end I'll try to give you some notion of where people are going in this area.

Okay, how come passionate love is a special problem, a special area of study? Well, because so much research effort has been put into understanding friendship and affection, it really seems like a sensible phenomenon. Except for experts, who always view everything as chaos because they see the small exceptions and small problems. Most people would say, "We know how to produce liking. We know how to make one person like another." Low-level, intense preference kind of thing. A man named Berne has suggested, and I think most people would agree, that the idea that we like those who reward us, who work so well, so predictably, so consistently, that he can put it in a mathematical formula and predict who will like who. Berne says, "Attraction towards x is a positive, linear function of the proportion of positive reinforcements received from x or expected from x ." The data look pretty good. They seem to support the notion, the more you're rewarded, the more you like that person.

Sometimes passionate love fits into that framework. Sometimes it happens that the mother says, "Why don't you like Joe Smith? He will give you everything, he's a good person, and your life with him will be comfortable and easy, he has all the virtues," and in rare occasions the daughter really does like Joe Smith. But that seems to be the exception more than the rule. People seem to fall in love with all kinds of confusing people, people that on the surface don't seem to be providing regular rewards, and fall in love in situations that seem more like they

make people dislike one another than necessarily fall in love. I can give you a couple of examples of sort of psychological principles that don't seem to work very well when we're talking about love.

For example, there is lots of data that when people are frustrated, they are aggressive. Miller and Dollard and that group feel that frustration always breeds aggression, and then we get these funny things that say frustration is a good thing; frustration is necessary to produce love. Freud, for example, says, "Some obstacle is necessary to swell the tide of the libido to its height, and at all periods in history whenever natural barriers in the way of satisfaction have not sufficed, mankind has erected conventional ones in order to enjoy love." What he says... is saying is you sexually frustrate people, they use all that frustration energy, and that's where romantic attraction comes from. Marshall McLuhan kind of has that same notion, that once people start being sexually free, romance won't exist anymore. High school counselors sort of like that notion too. [laughter] They propound that a lot. So that's sort of a funny notion! That's the opposite. They say you don't necessarily like the person that's easy, available, provides you with immediate rewards.

Another finding that's kind of a standard, always-works principle in psychology is that you like people who like you, and they count on that to such an extent that if they want to manipulate liking in the laboratory, they give a fellow false feedback and say, "This person's crazy about you." In general, that really engenders great liking. Well, if they say, "This guy really hates you," you get angry. You hate him. And yet, when you look at, kind of, the clinical literature, you find out that sometimes people feel great love for people just after they've been rejected. I just have a couple anecdotes. There's the example that's talked about a lot by the clinicians, of a woman who kind of likes her husband, they kind of get along, and then she discovers he's seeing another woman and all of a sudden she finds that she's been rejected. And at this point she suddenly discovers that she really loves him, realizes how intensely she feels about him, so that this kind of rejection is breeding the perception of great love and affection. That's hard to explain within a reinforcement paradigm. All those things don't go well. And so for a long time, people that were working in romantic attraction thought, "Something's wrong, we need something else." There's not much research to show that the reinforcement paradigm isn't the best one for explaining romantic attraction, but observations seem not to fit in nicely.

Okay... I can suggest a paradigm. How many of you are familiar with Schachter? Should I spend time, or can I go through easily? No, okay, I'll spend a little more time on him then. The framework I'm going to suggest might be applicable is a framework for understanding emotions proposed by Stanley Schachter. And he's one of the most creative, entertaining social psychologists around, and just for things to read that are fun, you might look up both his

research on emotions—his experiments are beautiful and fun to read—and his work on obesity. He's done some really good work to explain who eats when and why, and all of the experiments are in this marvelous, fun context so you'll really enjoy reading them. So, it's his theory of emotion that we'll talk about. What Schachter proposed was that you can predict when a person will have an emotional experience if you know two things; there are two components to an emotional experience. If either one of them is missing, it's a multiplicative relationship; you don't get anything. And the two components you need are arousal and labeling. And now, I'll explain what that means.

Schachter says the individual has to be physiologically aroused. If you're just sitting there and your body's not doing anything much, it's hard to think you're having an emotional experience. If your heart is pounding, if you're perspiring, if you're excited, if you're over-activated, you can interpret that a lot of ways. You can say, "My god, I'm hungry," [laughter] or "I'm panicky," or "I'm probably sick"; these strange things, or "I'm having a drug reaction," or lots of stuff, but unless there's something there to begin with, you can't have an emotional experience. Secondly, you've gotta label that in emotional terms. Society teaches us how to label and if we've been taught how to label it another way, we'll have a different kind of experience, we won't have an emotional experience. He has some very good evidence to support this contention.

We can produce emotion-like reactions in people if we inject them with adrenaline. All this early research used adrenaline. Turns out you can get almost the same effects if you use No-Doze and give them caffeine—it works the same way, and so recent research does that; it's easier to give people caffeine than an injection of adrenaline, but let's talk about adrenaline because that's how the early studies were done. After you receive an injection of adrenaline, several physiological things happen. Systolic blood pressure increases, your heart rate increases, continuous blood flow decreases, and muscle and cerebral flow increase, blood sugar and lactic acid concentration increase, and your respiration goes up... you know, panting. So, what happens to you, that you experience is palpitation of heart; tremor. You're kinda shaky, and your face gets red, you flush, and you breathe fast. All of these reactions happen in most emotions and you can produce them on command with adrenaline. It's a very exciting experience to experience adrenaline.

Well, back in the old days, some people thought that might be enough. That you could just inject people with adrenaline, and all these things would happen and they'd have an emotion. So a man named Maren Young did some research, did that, and he found out something very funny. He said, "What do you feel like?" and they said, "I feel *as if* I am frightened," or "I feel *as if* I am excited." Well, what does that mean, "as if"; how come you're not really excited? And

they said, "Well, I don't know, there's just something wrong with it... it's kind of a cold emotion. It's not the real thing somehow, something's missing."

Well, Schachter says what's missing is the proper labeling. I mean they've seen themselves get this big shot—when they think, "Why am I feeling this way?" they have a perfectly good explanation. They've gotten a shot. He said we could make them have real emotions if we discourage them from attributing what was happening to them to the shot, made them think that wasn't a likely thing to happen, and instead arrange this kind of play, this situation that they'd be all involved in when these effects started happening, and it would be plausible to attribute all their arousal to this situation. So he said, let's see if that works. Let's have one kind of control group where we give them a shot, they know what's going to happen, and they'll attribute it to the shot. And then two kinds of experimental groups. In one group they'll get a shot, but when it takes effect about twenty minutes later, they'll be involved in this gay, wild, fun situation. And then in the other group, when it takes effect about twenty minutes later, they'll be involved in this situation just designed to really outrage anybody, make somebody really mad. Well, the experiments are fun to read because Schachter has such a good grasp on the things that absolutely drive people crazy, make them mad, or things that are fun. And so the experiments are fun to watch in movies too.

The first we'll call "euphoria," the second we'll call "anger." In the euphoria group, it was when hula hoops were popular, and so the kids would get the shot and then they'd come into the experimental room, and there'd be this other guy there that would just start fooling around. And so he'd knock over some papers and kinda throw paper wads, and then he'd get more and more euphoric and start throwing paper planes out at passersby on the street and filling balloons with water and dropping them down near people's heads, [laughter] and it just sort of exploded into this very funny situation and finally it ended, he'd put on the hula hoop and kinda dancing around on tables and all this kind of stuff. And what they watched to see was: one, to what extent did people participate, to what extent did they get caught up in the action, think they were feeling gay; secondly, at the end of the session when you said, "How do you feel?" how euphoric would they say that they were. And the prediction was those people that had a shot, you had to have two things: the shot and they had no explanation for the shot. They hadn't been told that your heart will pound, you'll get flushed, et cetera, that they'd have true emotional experiences. They'd really go along with the action, they'd really see that... assume that the reason their heart was pounding was that the situation was so much fun. That worked, it turns out.

Okay, the other situation was the anger situation. Schachter, in that, took advantage of the fact that we all hate to fill out questionnaires, and that people give out remarkably stupid

questionnaires, and that it's totally frustrating to get one of these things and a boob is asking some unanswerable question, and you can't even tell him, I mean he's not there, and that's frustrating to begin with. Well, he thought he'd build this fantastically frustrating questionnaire so the poor kid sits down, looks at this questionnaire, and the questions start off being offensive, and go on to being unbelievable. So, they start off with, kind of, that kids' game, who in your family is this? And so, you're supposed to fill in, "Who in your family does not bathe? Who in your family is mentally ill?" [laughter] And just, on and on and on, and there's no sort of right answer, and then they get worse. They say, "Do you hear bells ringing?" And this whole time the confederate is kind of adding to the action; he says, "Yes! Every time I leave class," and he gets mad and says all these things, and then they get to the end and there's a checklist question and it says, "How many men did your mother have intercourse with before she was married?" And the lowest answer is five to ten, [laughter] and goes up from there.

So that's a situation in which the confederate says, "Oh, for christ's sakes," rips the thing up, gets very angry, and either the subject can go along and think he's getting mad too, or he can say, "Oh, for heaven's sakes, no wonder he feels all activated, he's had this shot." What happens, they find in both studies is if you have both things going for you—if you had a shot of adrenaline, and if you haven't been warned of its effects, you'll have strong emotional responses in those situations. And that the same adrenaline can produce anger or great joy, depending on the appropriateness of the situation. If you haven't had adrenaline, or you know how you're supposed to feel—you've had adrenaline; your face is supposed to flush, your hands are supposed to shake—you don't have any emotional response at all. Just look at these strange gentlemen doing these strange things, and nothing happens because you have a perfectly good explanation. You don't need to label it in emotional terms.

Okay, what we're going to try and do today is say, can we apply this very nice framework to passionate love? And does it give us some insights about the kind of research we need to do, and give us a way of organizing the research that does exist? So I'll try to review that now in a systematic way. What we would suggest is that the previous research kind of went wrong because it was only concentrating on labeling. It concentrated on what factors cause a person to assume that they should like the other, and we say a big chunk is missing; it's the arousal part. And sometimes the kind of thing that causes increased labeling might cause decreased arousal. So, let's go through that argument. We'd suggested it doesn't really matter how a person produces an agitated state in a person. Stimuli that are associated with sexual arousal, sexual deprivation—that kind of Freudian quote, the person who's agitated because they're frustrated—guilt, loneliness, hatred, jealousy, confusion; all those things increase a person's physiological arousal, and so all of these strange situations that we were saying, "Why are they related to love, what do they have to do with love?" might be related because a person in those

situations gets very aroused, okay—he's emotionally upset, or excited, or happy. As long as we could get him to attribute all this agitation to passion, he should experience true passionate feelings. If we say, "You're lonesome 'cause you're in love," or "Your sexual frustration is love," we should make it more likely that he will experience love and fall in love. As soon as he ceases attributing his feelings to passion and attributes them to something else, love should die; he shouldn't experience it anymore.

Okay, is there any evidence to support our contention? We have some anecdotal evidence from an early psychologist, and then there are some experimental studies—three—that I'll tell you about. There's a great quote from a man named Finck. He didn't know about Schachter's theory, but it's clear that he believes in that if you look at all of his examples, and he's fun to read because he's this old, Victorian guy who has opinions on everything, and they're such bizarre opinions in light of our experience that it gives us a new perspective on people that espouse our opinions now. His ideas are so strange, like, women are inevitably drawn to brass buttons [laughter] and so—like Indians or natives I guess—and so if a man wants to make a lady to fall in love with her [sic], he should join one of the armed services so he gets to wear brass buttons all the time, and can attract these ladies to him like a magnet. He has all kinds of ideas on women's education and women's liberation not near as appalling on his ideas on romance, but it is fun to read because he has a clear certainty that everybody would agree with him. So it is fun to read and he's very articulate. He says that "Love can only be excited by strong and vivid emotions, and it is almost immaterial whether these emotions are agreeable or disagreeable. The Cid wooed the proud heart of Diana Ximene, whose father he had slain, by shooting one after another of her pet pigeons. Such persons as arouse in us only weak emotions or none at all are obviously least likely to incline us toward them. Our aversion is most likely to be bestowed on individuals who, as the phrase goes, are neither 'warm nor cold'; whereas impulsive, choleric people, though they may randomly offend us, are just as capable of making us warmly attached to them." That's sort of a love-is-the-closest-thing-to-hate statement.

Okay, there is some experimental evidence that Schachter's notions might be pretty good ones. It's not good enough that you should go away feeling that this is the answer, but I think it is suggested enough that you think, gee, that might be a good area to do some research in. So the first thing we wanna hit since that's a problem for us in reinforcement theory, is the question of: why should unpleasant emotional states—which should be associated, see, with disliking—any learning theorist would say that if unpleasant things go on and you're around to dislike you... how does it happen that they get associated with love? Our answer would be: they generate arousal and that arousal is interpreted as love. But if it's interpreted as hate, then that arousal should produce kinda super-hating. Mm-hmm?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: [speaking in background, inaudible]

WALSTER: As an outside observer, what I would want to do, see you can say, okay, you can have multiple operational definitions of sort of the same concept, get different ways of measuring the same thing. So two that are most commonly used by this kind of researcher is, if you're an outside person, you would say, "Okay, what should happen is, in order for love to exist, you need both physiological arousal and cues that produce proper labeling." If these two exist, the fellow should label his experience in an emotional way. So you could do one of several things, okay, you could say... you can manipulate these two, are we right? Does he label that way? You can say, okay, "I'm going to measure physiological arousal and situational cues, I can either take that as my outside definition of romantic love, or I can move down to this step and take his response on a questionnaire or some unobtrusive measures." I could say, "Okay, by love I mean: how many people will go get marriage licenses; or by love I mean: how..." Zick Rubin's kind of stuff, the extent to which they look at each other continuously over a three-minute period. The way you operationalize that is up to the experimenter, by taking several different ways of measuring; and each little one has something wrong with it, but you hope you can get at a central core, if all of these measures go in the same way and produce the same kinda thing. Mm-hmm?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: [inaudible]

WALSTER: That's a technical question rather than a theoretical one. If you're a physiologist, one way you might wish... there are several ways you might wish to measure arousal. You can do an EEG. That's not a great measure. Everybody who works with it says, "Well, there are problems with it." You don't need one that's perfect, you just need one that's reliably better than chance, and then you can do well with that. Some of the people that have done research have put little cotton balls underneath people's arms, measured arousal by amount of perspiration [laughing] and they just weighed them, okay? [laughter] Some of the experimenters who've done work say your body temperature goes up when you're aroused, so they have surfaces of desks and things around covered with paper that, when you touch it, it either changes color or other permanent changes go on the paper, and they last. I mean, it's not like those kids' games that you touch and when you put your hand up it goes to the original color... it's kind of a permanent record. So some people have done things with heat, and so there's lots of technical problems to be solved and decided on. How do you want to measure it? But they kind of have the physiological things that are going on, and so any of those that you can measure ought to serve as a manipulation check. That's the main way.

Okay, let us look at the three studies, very briefly, that have been used to measure love, and see whether situations that are usually labeled in other ways, that are negative, can kind of be switched around so that people will label them as love. The first one is: does fear increase a person's chance of falling in love? I had this marvelous graduate student who's gone now, but he always sends me back these zany letters in which he attempts to operationalize in two seconds some fantastically difficult concept, and usually they're not bad but they're not good. His operationalization of that is: a pretty lady runs up in back of you and says, "Boo!" Okay? Are you more likely to love her than if you walk up and announce you're coming? Well, that's not very good, but that's sort of the outline or kind of thing that went on in this study. I'll tell you about Bob Brym: what he tried to do was scare guys. Then in a control group he didn't scare guys, and then see how that affected liking.

Here's the exact design. Brym brought students in and told them they were gonna get electric shocks, that they'd been randomly assigned to be in this group where you got terrible, very stiff, painful electric shocks. Then, in a control group, they were told somebody else got electric shocks, but you're in the control group who don't. So we have a control group, and then this group of very frightened guys. He broke them down into two groups. One group stayed frightened. He just let them believe they were going to get shocks. The other group, he said, "Oh, I guess I made a mistake! That's right, you're not in the electric shock group, you're in the control group." So they are frightened... relieved. Okay, he had two groups to sort out other theoretical interpretations of his results but we don't need to worry about them. So now we've got three groups: control, fright, fright relief. And a female co-ed type came by, she was a confederate actually, and chatted with these guys during a break, and then they talked to the fellow about his reactions to the girl.

Well, the fellows felt much more attraction, much more affection for the girl when they talked to her either when they were all upset because they were scared, or when they were all upset but relieved. You know, they'd been frightened, but now they were relieved. They had least interest in her in the control condition. And so there's a little bit of evidence that a frightened man is more receptive to love and affection than one that isn't. This squares with some sort of observations that people say that when you get into middle age—I guess I don't believe this observation, but—that you're not very likely to have passionate love. You're more likely to have "mature love," by which they mean not all these fun things of infatuation and passion, but kind of liking, out on the continuum. And an interpretation of that is that adolescent boys are very frightened by social encounters, they don't know quite what they're supposed to be doing, and so it's easier to interpret a lot of this stuff as love than as cowardice. They prefer that interpretation; that's a possibility. And in any case, there are data now from a couple of studies that fear and love are very closely related.

Secondly, rejection. These studies too were made to test different hypotheses. These studies were designed to test whether or not a person's self-esteem level affected his receptivity to love. It's a big problem for clinicians that some people have great trouble finding someone to love, and so some research has been done to find out what is it about your feelings, about yourself, that are suddenly conveyed to somebody else so that they never make any overtures. Well, there are a few experiments that were conducted for other reasons that fit very nicely back into the Schachter framework. What they did in these experiments was this: in one condition, the guy'd take a whole lot of personality tests in all conditions. And then they'd give him fake information about the results. In one set of conditions, the fake information would be very negative; they'd really dump on the guy. This is a depressing, upsetting, arousing experience. In the other set of conditions, they'd praise the guy; say good things.

Okay, the assumption is—and this is being checked out in experiments—that the rejected group is highly aroused, the praised group is pretty much a control group. It's possible that assumption is wrong, and that's why people are doing research. If it's right however, that suggests that low self-esteem manipulation people should have really volatile relations with others. If they're put in situations where they label all this upset as hatred, they should be really prone to hate; if they're in situations where it's reasonable to label it as love, they should really be prone to love. The data look just like that. In the experiments, these guys were either put in with ladies that were very receptive, gushy, affectionate, warm people that told them how wonderful they were, or they were put in with oh... snippy, unpleasant... really hostile ladies. And the high self-esteem guys like the nice lady better than the mean lady, so... But there was only a little bit of difference; they were pretty much neutral. While the low self-esteem people just turned the line up and down, end to end. They very much like the affectionate lady, and they very much hate the rejecting lady. So now, several people are doing results out in the field to say, do low self-esteem people more often have volatile relations than people higher in self-esteem or who haven't just suffered an emotional, traumatic experience?

The third area is frustration and challenge being facilitators of passion. This data's messier. Everybody who writes—and I have these great quotes from Socrates and Dear Abby... all the psychologists—saying that if you... a person is hard to get, so long as you have the hope that eventually you're going to get them, you should like them more than if they just kind of forced themselves on you, they're easy to get. Okay, a lot of people believe that. I can dig up one study that purports to find that, but I happen to know secretly that it never replicates and there are about fifteen studies around where they don't get it. Besides that, personally, I've worked for like five years trying to demonstrate hard-to-get effects, and either I don't know how to play hard-to-get with any kind of efficiency so I'm incapable of designing an experiment that works,

or else it's a big lie—people never like hard-to-get people—but I never get that effect. It doesn't seem to matter whether you play hard-to-get or easy-to-get; it seems to have no impact. That means those studies will never be published because they don't publish non-findings, but it suggests that gee, playing hard-to-get isn't the dramatic phenomena that we all think it is.

But I'll tell you about the one study that gets it... and if it's true that it works, we can easily interpret it within the Schachterian framework. If it doesn't work, then maybe we have a better idea how to get it if we apply Schachterian principles and try to design an experiment where you would get it and when you wouldn't. The experiment's Aronson's and Linder's, you might know about it. In the experiment, they put people together in a discussion group, and in one condition, it was a confederate and a subject. The confederate started out being negative: "I don't like you too much, you're not particularly a good person." And then the more contact they had, the more enthusiastic the confederate got, until finally she ended up saying, "Boy, I was entirely wrong. You're one of the most entertaining, neatest people I've ever met." In the other one, all along she started out saying, "Wow, are you neat and entertaining," and six interactions later she was still saying, "You're great! You're magnificent!" They like the hard-to-get person better than the one that just inundates them with affection all along. I don't know if it replicates; sometimes you get that effect.

Okay, the next point that I would like to make is in this whole discussion, you notice I've said again and again that all these negative states, if they contribute to arousal, and if we can get people to label that arousal properly, they contribute to love. A lady that's a colleague of mine named Ellen Berscheid thinks that's it. That's the foundation of love, that love is—passionate love, I'm not talking about married love, happy love, low-arousal love—but she thinks that love just is sort of a tragic experience, and that any time you've got passion you have a mixture of emotions, and that some of those emotions are negative because positive emotions just don't generate much arousal. And so, it's her view that love mostly has negative aspects because you don't get love without it. I guess I don't think that's so, and so I take a slightly different theoretical point of view, but we don't know which of us is right; we tend to work together a lot, so probably one of us will swing in the other's direction.

The reason that I don't think it's so is that I think that under the right conditions you can get positive reinforcements to generate arousal. Not all the time, not easily, but that you can do it. For example, the high school counselors that say that sexual deprivation is arousing neglect to mention that sexual satisfaction is very arousing too. And so if people... all the Masters and Johnson stuff suggests huge amounts of physiological arousal is generated during sexual intercourse. Well, if somebody attributes this arousal to love rather than just sexual intercourse, that kind of experience should be able to fuel passion as well as the guy being

deprived and agitated. Any time that a person has a deprived state... and that it's suddenly rewarded, that too should generate great arousal. We, generally I guess, think that most people get their major needs satisfied all the time, but that isn't always true. Sometimes the social structure is such that in order to get some needs satisfied, other needs are just kind of left and neglected for a long time. And so sometimes we're always surprised when we discover that somebody that we categorized as being without needs acts in a way that suggests, wow, he had strong needs in some areas all along, or enthusiasm about something all along, but it just wasn't showing up.

Consider all the examples, for example, about the old sort of distinguished, sedate, elderly professor who you always thought was just interested in books and reading and things, and then they'll run away with some seventeen-year-old girl or something and go down South, and that's always kind of stupefying; you think, all these years he never manifested any kind of interest in seventeen-year-old girls and suddenly this lady comes along and makes him feel either young or playful or fun or something and he discovers he has all this desire that he didn't even know he had before. In our culture, maybe a lot of people kind of had latent desires for human contact, getting to say exactly what they thought without lying, because in some phenomenon like tea groups comes along and gains fantastic popularity in an area where nobody recognized that there was much need before. In any case, if somebody is rewarded and they've been waiting around for that kind of reward for a long time, it's possible that that does generate great, intense emotional arousal, and that would be enough to generate a romantic experience. That's the passion part of the paper, in about two minutes now I'll try and tell you a little bit about labeling... and finish up, and I can answer any questions privately or at the end that you want.

We've concluded that negative states or positive states, so long as they generate arousal, if properly labeled can generate romantic passion. What makes a person label things as love? We're doing a lot of research on this now; I'll give you a very sketchy notion of some things we already know. Really, first I'll talk about cultural encouragements of love, and say that some cultures really up the reward for labeling things as love; others really provide punishments for labeling it that way. In a culture where there are big rewards for labeling as love, you're going to get a lot more people feeling love than in those other cultures. In those other cultures they'll feel the same thing, but they'll call it something else.

Linton, in '36, makes a point like that. He is talking about American society and saying, boy, the premium there is really on labeling your feelings as love. He says, "All societies recognize that there are occasional violent emotional attachments between persons of the opposite sex, but our present American culture is practically the only one which has attempted to capitalize on

these and make them the basis of marriage. The hero of the modern American movie is always a romantic lover, just as the hero of an old Arab epic is always an epileptic. The cynic may suspect that in any ordinary population, the percentage of individuals with the capacity for romantic love of the Hollywood type was about as large as that of a person's ability to throw genuine epileptic fits." That's probably true; if the culture tells you you should be in love all the time, you are. Women are in love more than men. It's possible to speculate that in the old days when the double standard clearly operated, it was acceptable for a man to have sexual intercourse under a wide variety of circumstances, but women were expected to have it only if they are in love. Given that that's the case and given that you would like to have sexual intercourse, it's an obvious conclusion that if you're a lady you should fall in love a lot, [laughter] but if you're a man you don't really need to. When we provide rewards for things, you're more likely to get that labeling.

In our society also, when you feel nervous, uncomfortable, maybe you're gonna be rejected, we say that's jealousy, and that's a natural state of affairs; if we label it as insecurity or something, people might have different emotional responses and a different likelihood of labeling things as jealousy. And then the last thing that could possibly affect labeling are individual expectations. Some men see themselves as the kind of person that's not likely to fall in love; they're just not the romantic kind. They are very unlikely to experience romantic feelings because every time one happens they call it something else; they have different ways of labeling. Also, sometimes people might not have romantic experiences just because of their own expectations about how likely people are to love them. If we... people don't know how to label things, quite often, and say we're having all these feelings, we're feeling very chaotic, messed-up feelings towards other people. Well, if that other person assumes that they are a repulsive person, and that all these messed-up feelings you're having aren't gonna be love, you're likely to go along with their expectations if you don't know how to label them either. And so there's kind of a drift to labeling them the way they say. In observations you see that people and couples differ fantastically in the way they label the same kind of thing.

For example, when somebody has sort of funny reactions, sometimes a low self-esteem person will say again and again and again, "You clearly don't love me. If you loved me, you would do X, Y, and Z and you're not doing X, Y, and Z and you feel this way, it's clear you don't love me. You probably just stay around with me either because you want to sleep with me or to do your homework, but I can tell, if you loved me you'd do these things," and then they name some remarkable thing that nobody's likely to do. So it's like my mother once said, "If your husband loved you, he'd send you a valentine." Well, anybody who knew my husband would think that's a fantastically funny statement; he doesn't know when Valentine's Day is! Clearly if my mother were married to him she'd convince him very quickly [laughter] that it wasn't real love, it was

something else. Similarly, people with high self-esteem, if they provide all these unconscious, very subtle interpretations of another person's behavior, might cause them to label in the same way. So some research is going on on that, and it looks like that's a pretty good description of what might be going on: that a person's own expectations about themselves cause them to give information to the other person about how he should label his feelings, and he accepts that to some extent, and it affects his real feelings toward her.

Okay, that's the end of my talk... anybody that wants to stick around for questions can do so, but give everybody else a couple of minutes to leave.

[voices in background]

[program ends]