

牺牲与亲密关系质量的关系研究综述

苏坦

西南大学心理学部, 重庆

收稿日期: 2023年11月21日; 录用日期: 2024年1月17日; 发布日期: 2024年1月24日

摘要

在亲密关系中, 伴侣双方的目标和偏好可能会发生冲突, 其中一方往往会为了伴侣的利益而放弃个人目标或偏好, 这一行为被称为“牺牲”。因此从二元视角探讨牺牲对伴侣双方关系质量的影响是十分重要的。牺牲对于伴侣双方的关系质量是一把“双刃剑”。通过趋近-回避假说、社会交换理论等理论假说可以解释牺牲对伴侣双方关系质量产生的不同影响。本文通过从伴侣双方的二元视角梳理牺牲对关系质量的影响及相关理论假说, 总结已有研究的不足, 从而为未来研究提供思考方向。

关键词

牺牲, 亲密关系质量, 趋近-回避动机, 相互依赖理论

A Review of the Relationship between Sacrifice and Intimate Relationship Quality

Tan Su

Faculty of Psychology, Southwest University, Chongqing

Received: Nov. 21st, 2023; accepted: Jan. 17th, 2024; published: Jan. 24th, 2024

Abstract

In intimate relationship, the goals and preferences of one partner often conflict with those of the other partner. One of intimate partners may give up the personal goals and preferences to promote his/her partner's welfare, then the sacrifices occur. Therefore, it is important to explore the relationship between sacrifice and relationship quality from a dual perspective. Sacrifice is a "double-edged sword" for the intimate relationship quality. Theoretical hypotheses such as approach-avoidance hypothesis and social exchange theory can explain the different effects of sacrifice on relationship quality. This article reviews the impact of sacrifice on relationship quality and related theoretical hypotheses from the dual perspective of both partners, summarizes the shortcomings of existing

studies, and provides directions for future research.

Keywords

Sacrifice, Intimate Relationship Quality, Approach-Avoidance Motivation, Interdependent Theory

Copyright © 2024 by author(s) and Hans Publishers Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

1. 引言

高质量的亲密关系在个人身心健康方面发挥着重要作用,可以帮助个体发展积极的自我概念和价值观,并调节生活压力(Conradi et al., 2021),稳定的亲密关系还会让伴侣双方更快乐(Be, Whisman, & Uebelacker, 2013),更健康(Robles, Slatcher, Trombello, & McGinn, 2014),并且拥有更长的寿命(Whisman, Gilmour, & Salinger, 2018)。此外,拥有更高质量亲密关系的个体倾向于报告更积极的结婚意愿(Shafer, 2006),而较低的亲密关系质量是预测随后关系破裂的重要因素(Gottman & Levenson, 1992; Rasand & Slinning, 2014)。《2022年民政事业发展统计公报》显示,2022年全年依法办理结婚登记共683.5万对,结婚率为4.8%,结婚率自2013年以来连续9年下降,25~29岁人群占结婚人口的比重最大,为37.24%,30~39岁人群占结婚人口的比重也在持续上升。结婚率降低、婚育时间推迟会导致新出生人口减少,进而导致人口负增长。因此探索亲密关系的影响因素和提升关系质量的方法不仅有益于个体的身心健康发展,还能为改善适龄人群的婚恋态度提供实证研究基础,具有重要的社会意义。

在人际交往中,关系双方往往会为对方或为了这段关系进行有形(分享物质财富)或无形(投入时间精力)的投资,这种投资行为也是影响关系的因素之一。投资行为往往会对个人与人际关系产生积极影响,研究表明,为他人提供帮助可以让接受者受益,同时可以提升提供帮助者的幸福感(Dunn, Aknin & Norton, 2008; Jebb, Morrison, Tay & Diener, 2020)。然而并非所有投资行为都只带来积极影响。在人际关系中,有的投资行为只需要付出很少的代价,而有的投资行为要求个体为了伴侣的利益而牺牲自己的目标与偏好,则需要付出高昂的代价。当伴侣双方面对利益冲突时,其中一方不得不为了满足对方的利益或为了避免冲突而放弃自己的利益偏好,这种行为被概念化为牺牲(Van Lange et al., 1997b)。在亲密关系中,牺牲十分常见(Visserman et al., 2019)。

牺牲是影响亲密关系的重要因素之一(Righetti et al., 2020a),而以往研究中,牺牲行为给亲密关系质量带来的影响却没有得到一致的结论,有的研究发现,牺牲可能会在亲密关系中创造信任和合作的氛围(Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Van Lange et al., 1997b);有的研究则表明,为对方的目标偏好而牺牲可能会导致更高的消极情绪(Fitzsimons, Finkel, & van-Dellen, 2015);而还有一部分研究发现,牺牲与亲密关系质量并没有显著关系(Impett, Gable, & Peplau, 2005; Righetti et al., 2016),或者牺牲导致了矛盾的情绪结果(Park et al., 2021)。导致这些不一致的研究结果可能是因为不同的牺牲动机而对关系质量产生差异影响(Visserman et al., 2019; Young & Curran, 2016; Righetti et al., 2020a),也有不同的理论假说来解释牺牲影响关系质量的不一致结果。

本文将综述亲密关系中的牺牲影响关系质量的实证研究,探讨不同牺牲动机的影响,以及牺牲影响关系质量的内在机制。

2. 牺牲与亲密关系质量

牺牲作为一种亲社会行为，可能对关系质量带来积极影响，但牺牲往往伴随着放弃自己的偏好和利益，所以也有可能带来消极后果，那么牺牲对于伴侣双方的关系质量可能起着“双刃剑”一样的作用。

2.1. 牺牲对关系质量的积极影响

研究发现，牺牲与关系满意度之间存在正相关关系(Van Lange et al., 1997b; Ruppel & Curran, 2012; Chen & Li, 2007; Lan et al., 2017; Zhang & Li, 2015; Zhu, Wang, Jin & Lu, 2020)。在对于牺牲的研究中，对牺牲的测量可以分为多个不同的测量指标，如牺牲意愿、牺牲行为、牺牲满意度等。研究者发现，牺牲意愿与关系质量之间存在正相关关系(Van Lange et al., 1997a; Wieselquist, Rusbult, Foster & Agnew, 1999)。具体的牺牲行为对关系质量也会产生积极影响(Van Lange et al., 1997b; Ruppel & Curran, 2012)。此外，还有一些研究者测量了牺牲者在作出牺牲后对牺牲行为的满意程度，并发现对牺牲的满意度与关系质量存在正相关关系(Whitton et al., 2007; Stanley & Markman, 1992; Stanley, Whitton, Sadberry, Clements & Markman, 2006)。

在亲密关系中，一方的行为往往会对方都带来影响，因此很多研究者还探讨了牺牲对牺牲接受者的影响。牺牲者在面对利益冲突时，选择放弃自己的偏好和目标而满足对方，因此牺牲接受者将获得收益，得到积极的结果，可能会导致更好的关系质量。研究也发现，牺牲接受者会对伴侣产生感激之情(Visserman et al., 2019; Visserman, Righetti, Impett, Keltner & Van Lange, 2018)。当牺牲被伴侣感知到时，伴侣双方可能会更加相互信任且更愿意合作(Wieselquist et al., 1999)，这种氛围会促进关系满意度和承诺水平的提升(Van Lange et al., 1997b)。

2.2. 牺牲对关系质量的消极影响

牺牲是在伴侣之间的利益冲突时才会发生，这意味着牺牲者放弃了自己的个人偏好与目标，因此牺牲对人际关系可能会产生消极影响(Fitzsimons, Finkel & van Dellen, 2015)。已有研究证实了这一假设，他们发现牺牲与关系满意度之间存在负相关关系(Totenhagen & Curran, 2011; Curran, Burke, Young & Totenhagen, 2016)。具体来说，实际的牺牲行为可能会导致较差的关系质量(Totenhagen et al., 2011; Whitton et al., 2007)，个体感知到牺牲给自己带来的代价也与关系质量呈负相关关系(Day & Impett, 2018; Visserman, Righetti, Muise, Impett, Joel & Van Lange, 2021; Cao, Fang, Fine, Ju, Lan & Zhou, 2017)。此外，一项研究全面地评估了个体牺牲后感知到的各种积极情绪和消极情绪(Righetti, Schneider, Ferrier, Spiridonova, Xiang & Impett, 2020b)，结果发现，牺牲者在牺牲行为发生后，会感受到作为一个好伴侣的自豪感、幸福感等积极情绪，同时也会产生后悔等消极情绪，同时，该研究的纵向结果表现，牺牲者在牺牲行为后产生的矛盾情绪可能会导致其分手的倾向提升，并提高了牺牲者在一年后实际分手的可能性。因此，牺牲作为一种可能会阻碍个体利益的亲社会行为，可能会对牺牲者感知到的关系质量并非有益。

与此同时，在亲密关系中，牺牲接受者的关系质量也可能会受到牺牲的消极影响。Righetti 等人(2020b)调查了牺牲接受者感知到的积极情绪和消极情绪，结果发现，个体在接受牺牲后，积极情绪、对伴侣的感激程度的确会有所上升，但同时，他们也会报告感知到了更多的消极情绪、内疚感、负疚感等消极后果。元分析也发现(Righetti et al., 2020a)，较高的牺牲代价会导致牺牲接受者报告的关系质量更差；而实际牺牲行为与牺牲接受者的关系质量没有显著关系。这可能是因为，在日常生活中，只有 50%的牺牲行为能被接受者感知到(Visserman et al., 2019)，被接受者忽略的那一部分牺牲行为无法对其关系质量产生影响。

3. 牺牲影响亲密关系质量的相关理论

3.1. 趋近 - 回避动机理论

Gray (1981)提出行为趋近系统和行为抑制系统都可以驱动行为。行为趋近系统产生的行为动机是寻求积极结果和奖励,即趋近动机;而行为抑制系统产生的行为动机是避免消极结果或受到惩罚,即回避动机(Carver, Sutton, & Scheier, 2000)。

亲密关系中,由不同动机驱动的牺牲行为对个人和关系会产生不同的影响。具体来说,当牺牲者受到趋近动机驱动时,做出牺牲的目的是促进积极关系结果、增进关系质量。趋近动机高(相比于低趋近动机)的牺牲者自我报告关系满意度更高,体验到更多的积极情绪,并且会对伴侣的需求做出更多行为反应(Impett & Gordon, 2010),此外,高趋近动机牺牲者的伴侣也会报告更高的关系满意度(Impett et al., 2014)。相反,当牺牲者受到回避动机驱动时,做出牺牲则是为了避免消极关系结果、避免与伴侣产生冲突,这会对伴侣双方报告的关系质量、关系亲密度及个人幸福感产生消极影响,还会增加情侣最终分手的可能性(Impett, Gable, & Peplau, 2005; Impett & Gordon, 2010; Neff & Harter, 2002)。

Wickham (2013)等人发现,牺牲动机对亲密关系结果产生的不同影响可能受到真实性的中介作用,趋近动机的个体在为了增进关系做出牺牲时,他们会报告更高的真实性;相反,当个体在经历冲突后,为了避免关系破裂而做出牺牲时,牺牲者会报告较低的真实感,最终导致感知到的关系质量较差。因此,趋近-回避动机可能是调节牺牲对关系质量影响的重要因素之一。

3.2. 社会交换理论

社会交换理论最早产生与20世纪50年代,是由社会学家霍曼斯提出的。该理论认为,人与人之间的社会活动是一种交换关系,及社会交换(Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005)。亲密关系作为一种长期稳定的社会关系,也包含了伴侣双方的社会交换过程,牺牲者为对方做出牺牲,是因为有预期回报,这种回报可能是物质或金钱等有形的回报,也能是伴侣的关心或支持等无形的回报。

社会交换理论视角下的牺牲关注牺牲成本和回报。研究发现,牺牲者感知到自己的牺牲成本较高时,其报告的个人幸福感和关系质量较低,并在牺牲后体验到更多的后悔情绪(Righetti et al., 2020b);此外,牺牲接受者在感知到伴侣付出较高成本的牺牲时,也会产生内疚感、负债感等消极感受,牺牲接受者也会报告更多的为伴侣牺牲的意愿(Righetti et al., 2020b)。当牺牲接受者开始回报——为对方做出牺牲后,伴侣双方在关系中平衡了自己的成本与回报,他们的幸福感会更高(Buunk and Schaufeli, 1999),越公平的亲密关系会让伴侣感到的痛苦越少(Walster, Berscheid and Walster, 1973),离婚率也越低(Frisco & Williams, 2003)。一项基于中国夫妻的研究发现,丈夫感知到的牺牲不平等对关系质量没有显著影响,而妻子感知到的牺牲不平等会对关系满意度产生影响,具体来说,妻子感知到过度受益时关系质量更高,而受益不足时的关系质量更差(Lan et al., 2017)。因此,通过伴侣双方互惠地牺牲与回报,他们在亲密关系中可能更加信任彼此,促使亲密关系长期稳定地发展。

3.3. 相互依赖理论

相互依赖理论认为互依的双方会对彼此产生影响,也会影响双方互动过程中的行为(Thibaut & Kelley, 1959)。Kelley 等人(1983)将相互依赖理论拓展至亲密关系中,将亲密关系定义为“长时间持续的一段强烈、频繁且多样的相互依赖关系”,关系中一方的行为、思想和情感都与另一方的行为、思想和情感有因果关系。

在相互依赖理论的视角下,个体的情感和幸福感会依赖于伴侣的行为和情感体验(Arriaga & Agnew,

2001; Berscheid & Ammazalorso, 2001; Butler, 2011)。当伴侣双方出现利益冲突时, 他们的个人幸福感和关系质量较低(Gere, Schimmack, Pinkus, & Lockwood, 2011; Righetti et al., 2016)。而相互依赖会促进亲密关系中的亲社会行为(Rusbult & van Lange, 2003), 他们在利益冲突时会为了伴侣和关系而愿意做出牺牲, 满足对方的偏好和目标(Columbus et al., 2020)。因此, 为了解决利益冲突, 维持关系的发展, 相互依赖的伴侣双方或其中一方则会选择抛弃个人利益——牺牲的方式来解决冲突, 当牺牲化解冲突后, 他们可以更好地协调共同利益, 并提高亲密感和关系满意度(Kelley, 1979; Ruppel & Curran, 2012; Rusbult & Arriaga, 1997); 相反, 若双方的相互依赖程度较低, 都不愿为了维持关系而做出牺牲, 那么关系质量会变得更差, 最终导致分手的可能性会提高。因此, 相互依赖的伴侣为了彼此会关系的利益牺牲时, 双方的幸福感和关系质量都会得到提升。

3.4. 交互目标动力理论

交互目标动力理论是指在相互依赖的关系中, 伴侣双方的目标、目标追求方式和结果是相互影响的(Fitzsimons et al., 2015)。当个体为了伴侣的目标和利益偏好而无法实现自己的目标, 他们会经历交互损失, 进而可能会导致人际关系受损。

在亲密关系中, 个体的某个目标与伴侣的目标相冲突时, 他们可能会放弃自己的目标, 并贬低个人目标的重要性(Gere & Impett, 2018)——做出牺牲行为。而后, 牺牲者可能会因为个人目标无法实现而产生沮丧、后悔等消极情绪(Brunstein, 1996; Carver & Scheier, 1990; Righetti et al., 2020b), 从而导致对个人幸福感和关系质量的消极影响; 此外, 个体因利益冲突而牺牲时, 可能会认为伴侣是阻碍自己目标实现的原因, 因此会感知伴侣的支持会降低(Drigotas, Rusbult, Wieselquist, & Whitton, 1999; Fitzsimons & Shah, 2008), 从而对伴侣及亲密关系感到不满。研究表明, 当个体为伴侣利益而牺牲时, 目标冲突会削弱关系依赖性对伴侣目标追求的积极影响(Columbus et al., 2021)。因此, 交互目标动力理论揭示了牺牲对亲密关系并不总是有利的, 也可能对关系质量产生消极影响。

4. 未来展望

亲密关系中的牺牲是指在伴侣之间发生利益冲突的情况下, 其中一方为了伴侣或关系的利益偏好而放弃自己的利益偏好(Van Lange et al., 1997b)。亲密关系中的牺牲是经常发生的, 是影响关系质量的重要因素之一。从伴侣双方的视角来看, 牺牲对亲密关系是一把“双刃剑”。牺牲行为和牺牲意愿可能会提升个体的幸福感及对关系的满意度, 同时, 当伴侣感知到对方的牺牲行为时, 会产生感激之情并进一步感知到更高的关系满意度。然而高昂的牺牲成本也可能让牺牲者感到后悔, 而牺牲接受者也会对此感到内疚和负疚感。此外, 牺牲只有在被感知到的情况下才会提升关系质量。本文通过趋近-回避理论、社会交换理论、相互依赖理论和交互目标动力理论等解释了牺牲影响伴侣双方关系质量的潜在机制。

目前对亲密关系中的牺牲的研究仍然存在一些局限, 在未来研究中可以有所改进。第一, 实验方法上, 目前研究通常采用日记法、情景讨论法的方式对牺牲进行探索, 几乎没有对牺牲进行实验室操纵。未来研究可以思考如何将其他社会关系中采用的博弈游戏实验范式改编应用于亲密关系中, 对牺牲行为进行操纵, 从而探索牺牲对关系质量的影响。第二, 在评估方式上, 目前研究在评估牺牲和关系质量时主要采用的是问卷调查的方式, 这可能会受到记忆偏差或社会赞许效应的影响, 导致结果存在偏差。未来研究可以借助眼动技术、近红外脑功能成像系统、脑电技术等探索牺牲影响关系质量的神经机制。第三, 在研究设计上, 目前研究主要是探讨牺牲对亲密关系质量的影响, 但实际上, 关系质量也可能对牺牲行为产生影响, 即伴侣感知到较高的关系质量时, 更愿意为对方做出牺牲。未来研究可以通过操纵关系质量或对关系质量进行分组的方式, 探讨关系质量是否会塑造牺牲行为。最后, 未来研究可以将理论

联系实践, 在临床咨询等方面指导亲密伴侣为对方做出适当的牺牲, 以此提高亲密关系质量, 从而提升个体维持关系的意愿以及对于婚姻态度的积极性。

参考文献

- Arriaga, X. B., & Agnew, C. R. (2001). Being Committed: Affective, Cognitive, and Conative Components of Relationship Commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1190-1203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201279011>
- Be, D., Whisman, M. A., & Uebelacker, L. A. (2013). Prospective Associations between Marital Adjustment and Life Satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 20, 728-739. <https://doi.org/10.1111/per.12011>
- Berscheid, E., & Ammazalorso, H. (2001). Emotional Experience in Close Relationships. In G. J. O. Fletcher, & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Interpersonal Processes* (pp. 308-330). Blackwell Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9780631212294.2002.00014.x>
- Brunstein, J. C. (1996). Personal Goals and Subjective Well-Being: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 1061-1070. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.65.5.1061>
- Butler, E. A. (2011). Temporal Interpersonal Emotion Systems: The “TIES” That Form Relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15, 367-393. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311411164>
- Buunk, B. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (1999). Reciprocity in Interpersonal Relationships: An Evolutionary Perspective on Its Importance for Health and Well-Being. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 10, 259-291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14792779943000080>
- Cao, H., Fang, X., Fine, M. A., Ju, X., Lan, J., & Zhou, N. (2017). Sacrifice, Commitment, and Marital Quality in the Early Years of Chinese Marriage: An Actor-Partner Interdependence Moderation Model. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 34, 1122-1144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407516670041>
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1990). Origins and Functions of Positive and Negative Affect: A Control-Process View. *Psychological Review*, 97, 19-35. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.97.1.19>
- Carver, C. S., Sutton, S. K., & Scheier, M. F. (2000). Action, Emotion, and Personality: Emerging Conceptual Integration. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 741-751. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200268008>
- Chen, F. M., & Li, T. S. (2007). Marital *Enqing*: An Examination of Its Relationship to Spousal Contributions, Sacrifices, and Family Stress in Chinese Marriages. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 147, 393-412. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.147.4.393-412>
- Columbus, S., Molho, C., Righetti, F., & Balliet, D. (2021). Interdependence and Cooperation in Daily Life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120, 626-650. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000253>
- Columbus, S., Münich, J., & Gerpott, F. H. (2020). Playing a Different Game: Situation Perception Mediates Framing Effects on Cooperative Behaviour. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 90, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.104006>
- Conradi, H. J., Noordhof, A., & Kamphuis, J. H. (2021). Satisfying and Stable Couple Relationships: Attachment Similarity across Partners Can Partially Buffer the Negative Effects of Attachment Insecurity. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 47, 682-697. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12477>
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- Curran, M. A., Burke, T. J., Young, V. J., & Totenhagen, C. J. (2016). Relational Sacrifices about Intimate Behavior and Relationship Quality for Expectant Cohabitors. *Marriage & Family Review*, 52, 442-460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2015.1113225>
- Day, L. C., & Impett, E. A. (2018). Giving When It Costs: How Interdependent Self-Construal Shapes Willingness to Sacrifice and Satisfaction with Sacrifice in Romantic Relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 35, 722-742. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517694965>
- Drigotas, S. M., Rusbult, C. E., Wieselquist, J., & Whitton, S. W. (1999). Close Partner as Sculptor of the Ideal Self: Behavioral Affirmation and the Michelangelo Phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 293-323. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.2.293>
- Dunn, E. W., Aknin, L. B., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Spending Money on Others Promotes Happiness. *Science*, 319, 1687-1688. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1150952>
- Fitzsimons, G. M., & Shah, J. Y. (2008). How Goal Instrumentality Shapes Relationship Evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 319-337. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.2.319>
- Fitzsimons, G. M., Finkel, E. J., & van Dellen, M. R. (2015). Transactive Goal Dynamics. *Psychological Review*, 122,

- 648-673. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039654>
- Frisco, M. L., & Williams, K. (2003). Perceived Housework Equity, Marital Happiness, and Divorce in Dual-Earner Households. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24, 51-73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X02238520>
- Gere, J., & Impett, E. A. (2018). Shifting Priorities: Effects of Partners' Goal Conflict on Goal Adjustment Processes and Relationship Quality in Developing Romantic Relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 35, 793-810. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517698851>
- Gere, J., Schimmack, U., Pinkus, R. T., & Lockwood, P. (2011). The Effects of Romantic Partners' Goal Congruence on Affective Well-Being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 45, 549-559. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2011.06.010>
- Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1992). Marital Processes Predictive of Later Dissolution: Behavior, Physiology, and Health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 221-233. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.2.221>
- Gray, J. A. (1981). A Critique of Eysenck's Theory of Personality. In H. J. Eysenck (Ed.), *A Model for Personality* (pp. 246-276). Springer-Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-67783-0_8
- Impett, E. A., & Gordon, A. M. (2010). Why Do People Sacrifice to Approach Rewards versus to Avoid Costs? Insights from Attachment Theory. *Personal Relationships*, 17, 299-315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2010.01277.x>
- Impett, E. A., Gable, S. L., & Peplau, L. A. (2005). Giving up and Giving in: The Costs and Benefits of Daily Sacrifice in Intimate Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 327-344. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.3.327>
- Impett, E. A., Le, B. M., Kogan, A., Oveis, C., & Keltner, D. (2014). When You Think Your Partner Is Holding Back: The Costs of Perceived Partner Suppression during Relationship Sacrifice. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5, 542-549. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550613514455>
- Jebb, A. T., Morrison, M., Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2020). Subjective Well-Being around the World: Trends and Predictors across the Life Span. *Psychological Science*, 31, 293-305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797619898826>
- Kelley, H. H. (1979). *Personal Relationships*. Erlbaum.
- Kelley, H. H. (1983). The Situational Origins of Human Tendencies—A Further Reason for the Formal Analysis of Structures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 8-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167283091003>
- Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal Relationships*. Wiley.
- Lan, J., Li, X., Cao, H., Zhou, N., Lin, X., Deng, L., & Fang, X. (2017). Inequity of Sacrifice and Marital Satisfaction in Chinese Young Couples. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 39, 169-192. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.12153>
- Neff, K. D., & Harter, S. (2002). The Authenticity of Conflict Resolutions among Adult Couples: Does Women's Other-Oriented Behavior Reflect Their True Selves? *Sex Roles*, 47, 403-417. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021692109040>
- Park, Y., Visserman, M. L., Sisson, N. M., Le, B. M., Stellar, J. E., & Impett, E. A. (2021). How Can I Thank You? Highlighting the Benefactor's Responsiveness or Costs When Expressing Gratitude. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 38, 504-523. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407520966049>
- Rasand, G. B., & Slinning, K. (2014). Relationship Dissatisfaction and Other Risk Factors for Future Relationship Dissolution: A Population-Based Study of 18523 Couples. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 49, 109-119. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-013-0681-3>
- Righetti, F., Gere, J., Hofmann, W., Visserman, M. L., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2016). The Burden of Empathy: Partners' Responses to Divergence of Interests in Daily Life. *Emotion*, 16, 684-690. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000163>
- Righetti, F., Sakaluk, J. K., Faure, R., Impett, E. A. (2020a). The Link between Sacrifice and Relational and Personal Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146, 900-921. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000297>
- Righetti, F., Schneider, I., Ferrier, D., Spiridonova, T., Xiang, R., & Impett, E. A. (2020b). The Bittersweet Taste of Sacrifice: Consequences for Ambivalence and Mixed Reactions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 149, 1950-1968. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000750>
- Robles, T. F., Slatcher, R. B., Trombello, J. M., & McGinn, M. M. (2014). Marital Quality and Health: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140, 140-187. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031859>
- Ruppel, E. K., & Curran, M. A. (2012). Relational Sacrifices in Romantic Relationships: Satisfaction and the Moderating Role of Attachment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 29, 508-529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407511431190>
- Rusbult, C. E., & Arriaga, X. B. (1997). Interdependence Theory. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of Personal Relationships: Theory, Research and Interventions* (pp. 221-250). Wiley.
- Rusbult, C. E., & van Lange, P. A. M. (2003). Interdependence, Interaction, and Relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 351-375. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145059>
- Shafer, E. F. (2006). Are Men or Women More Reluctant to Marry in Couples Sharing a Non-Marital Birth? *Gender Issues*,

- 23, 20-43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-000-0021-2>
- Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (1992). Assessing Commitment in Personal Relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 595-608. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353245>
- Stanley, S. M., Whitton, S. W., Sadberry, S. L., Clements, M. L., & Markman, H. J. (2006). Sacrifice as a Predictor of Marital Outcomes. *Family Process*, 45, 289-303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2006.00171.x>
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The Social Psychology of Groups*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Totenhagen, C. J., & Curran, M. A. (2011). Daily Hassles, Sacrifices, and Relationship Quality for Pregnant Cohabiters. *Family Science*, 2, 68-72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19424620.2011.597101>
- Van Lange, P. A., Agnew, C. R., Harinck, F., & Steemers, G. E. (1997a). From Game Theory to Real Life: How Social Value Orientation Affects Willingness to Sacrifice in Ongoing Close Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1330-1344. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.6.1330>
- Van Lange, P. A., Rusbult, C. E., Drigotas, S. M., Arriaga, X. B., Witcher, B. S., & Cox, C. L. (1997b). Willingness to Sacrifice in Close Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1373-1395. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.6.1373>
- Visserman, M. L., Impett, E. A., Righetti, F., Muise, A., Keltner, D., & Van Lange, P. A. (2019). To “See” Is to Feel Grateful? A Quasi-Signal Detection Analysis of Romantic Partners’ Sacrifices. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 10, 317-325. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550618757599>
- Visserman, M. L., Righetti, F., Impett, E. A., Keltner, D., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2018). It’s the Motive That Counts: Perceived Sacrifice Motives and Gratitude in Romantic Relationships. *Emotion*, 18, 625-637. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000344>
- Visserman, M. L., Righetti, F., Muise, A., Impett, E. A., Joel, S., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2021). Taking Stock of Reality: Biased Perceptions of the Costs of Romantic Partners’ Sacrifices. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 12, 54-62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550619896671>
- Walster, E., Berscheid, E., & Walster, G. W. (1973). New Directions in Equity Research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25, 151-176. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0033967>
- Whisman, M. A., Gilmour, A. L., & Salinger, J. M. (2018). Marital Satisfaction and Mortality in the United States Adult Population. *Health Psychology*, 37, 1041-1044. <https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000677>
- Whitton, S. W., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2007). If I Help My Partner, Will It Hurt Me? Perceptions of Sacrifice in Romantic Relationships. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 26, 64-91. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2007.26.1.64>
- Wickham, R. E. (2013). Perceived Authenticity in Romantic Partners. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 878-887. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.04.001>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.942>
- Young, V. J., & Curran, M. A. (2016). Intimacy Behaviors and Relationship Satisfaction for Cohabiters: Intimate Sacrifices Are Not Always Beneficial. *The Journal of Psychology*, 150, 779-792. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2016.1187110>
- Zhang, H., & Li, T. (2015). The Role of Willingness to Sacrifice on the Relationship between Urban Chinese Wives’ Relative Income and Marital Quality. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 41, 314-324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2014.889057>
- Zhu, W., Wang, C. D. C., Jin, L., & Lu, T. (2020). Adult Attachment, Sacrifice, and Emotional Wellbeing of Couples: A Cross-Cultural Comparison between the U.S. and China. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 38, 482-503. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407520963954>