Journal of Relationships Research, Volume 9, e4, 1–6
© The Author(s) 2018. doi 10.1017/jrr.2018.3

Relationship Efficacy and Relationship-Related Attitudes

Marisa T. Cohen
Psychology Department, St. Francis College, New York, USA

The purpose of this study was to examine the connection between relationship efficacy and other relationship-related attitudes. The sample consisted of 211 participants who were given measures of relationship efficacy, sociosexuality, and attitudes toward consensual non-monogamy. Results demonstrated a negative relationship between efficacy and views on non-monogamy, a negative relationship between efficacy and sociosexuality, and a difference in efficacy between those who were and were not in a relationship at the time of the study. Relationship efficacy is important to examine, as our beliefs about our capabilities are likely to influence our future success.

■ **Keywords:** relationship efficacy, consensual non-monogamy, sociosexuality, relationship-related attitudes

Self-Efficacy and Relationship Efficacy

According to Bandura, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Gerbino, and Pastorelli (1997), self-efficacy is defined as people's judgments of their capabilities and is regulated by cognitive, motivational, affective, and decisional processes. Specifically, self-efficacy refers to the task-specific beliefs one holds about pursuing the attainment of one's goals (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy affects volition and performance, and operates partially independently of underlying skills (Bandura, 1997). It influences goal choice, task persistence, goal revision, and goal-striving behaviour; and social-cognitive theory '. . . proposes that higher self-efficacy increases some motivational element (i.e., direction, effort, or persistence)' (Vancouver & Kendall, 2006, p. 1146).

Self-efficacy is influenced by information from personal accomplishments, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and the control of negative emotions (Devonport & Lane, 2006). Individuals with high self-efficacy are more eager to work on and persist at a task. Self-efficacy includes the ability to execute specific actions and the possession of the cognitive skills needed to accomplish a task. Many studies have found that self-efficacy is both a predictor of success and a mediator between tasks and outcomes (Vancouver & Kendall, 2006).

Self-efficacy does not only refer to task-specific beliefs, as it can also be connected to relationship-related beliefs. Fincham, Harold, and Gano-Phillips (2000) define relationship efficacy as the extent to which people believe they can resolve conflict with their partners. This may be a somewhat limiting definition, as it only relates to one aspect of relationships: conflict resolution.

Lopez and Lent (1991) take a much broader approach when discussing relationship efficacy, noting that it is the belief that the relationship can be successfully managed. While the ability to handle conflict is certainly a component of this, it also involves the ability to successfully negotiate differences and assert personal rights within the relationship (Raghavan, Swan, Snow, & Mazure, 2005).

As a result of the aforementioned connection to the resolution of conflict within the relationship, Cui, Fincham, and Pasley (2008) note that relationship-efficacy influences relationship satisfaction. Riggio et al. (2013) further note that: 'Individuals with high relationship self-efficacy believe they can competently cope with intimacy; they feel comfortable and at ease in intimate situations while individuals with low self-efficacy feel uneasy and awkward' (p. 643).

Despite the potential importance of relationship efficacy to the success of a relationship, little research has been done on this construct outside of an academic realm. While research has associated its ability to mediate links between parental behaviour and conflict behaviour (Cui et al., 2008), few studies to date have examined how relationship efficacy is tied to other relationship-related

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Marisa T. Cohen, St. Francis College, Psychology Department, 180 Remsen Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201, USA. Email: mcohen@sfc.edu

https://doi.org/10.1017/jrr.2018.3 Published online by Cambridge University Press

attitudes. This is important, as the relationship between cognitive beliefs as they relate to romantic entanglements may affect the quality or longevity of a relationship.

Consensual Non-Monogamy

Relationships are typically viewed from a heteronormic and mono-normative perspective, meaning that the focus is on the male-female dyad. This is because monogamous relationships are often viewed as the healthy ideal (Conley, Moors, Matsick, & Ziegler, 2013). In fact, those in consensually non-monogamous (CNM) relationships are often viewed as troubled and deviant. CNM relationships are those in which the partners have extra dyadic sexual and/or romantic relationships (Conley et al., 2013). Those who engage in CNM relationships are largely underrepresented by research, as there is a stigma surrounding their relationship configurations (Conley et al., 2013). Many therapists believe that those who engage in consensual non-monogamy are incapable of maintaining a monogamous relationship and that their primary dyadic relationship must have been inherently broken (Perel, 2007). The present study will take peoples' beliefs regarding non-monogamy into account.

Those in CNM structures will not be the target sample of this initial research. However, it is believed that those who demonstrate permissive attitudes toward consensual non-monogamy will demonstrate higher levels of relationship efficacy. While this may seem counterintuitive, in that those who believe they are successful at meeting the needs of a relationship should be able to maintain a successful partnership with one person, this approaches relationships from a mono-normative perspective. Instead, those who have a great deal of efficacy may hold the belief that many structures are capable of working for them and/or for others.

Proposed Study

Self-efficacy has been incorporated into studies focusing on individuals' romantic attributions; however, there is a need for this construct to be discussed as it pertains to the cognitive components surrounding intimate relationships (Riggio et al., 2013). In addition, most research on relationship efficacy has focused on college-aged students (Cui et al., 2008; Riggio et al., 2013), the majority of whom were Caucasian (Cui et al., 2008) or female (Conley et al., 2013). Therefore, a more diverse sample is desired. This diversity should extend beyond the characteristics of the participants themselves, but aim to gauge their view of diverse relationship configurations, namely consensual non-monogamy.

The purpose of the proposed study is to examine the relationship efficacy of individuals and the connection between this cognition and other relationship-related beliefs. The first hypothesis is largely exploratory and will examine the connection between relationship efficacy, as measured by the Relationship Efficacy Measure (REM; Fincham, Harold, & Gano-Phillips, 2013) and the Self-Efficacy and Romantic Relationships scale (SERR; Riggio et al., 2011); and permissiveness toward consensual non-monogamy, as measured by high scores on the Consensual Non-Monogamy Attitude Scale (CNAS; Cohen & Wilson, 2017). On the one hand, there may be a negative relationship, in that those who believe in their ability to maintain a relationship may be less likely to see the need for pursuing others beyond the primary partner. This, however, is a mono-normative view. The other alternative is that there will be a positive relationship between efficacy and the CNAS. This may be because if a person believes in his/her ability to maintain a successful relationship, he/she may be more likely to be open-minded when it comes to different types of relationship structures.

The second hypothesis is that those who are more willing to engage in sexual relationships outside of the primary relationship, as demonstrated by high scores on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R; Penke & Asendorpf, 2008), will have lower scores on the relationship-efficacy measures. This is because if you feel that you are successful in your ability to maintain the relationship, you will be less likely to want to be with others outside of this relationship.

The third and final hypothesis is that those who are in a relationship at the time of the study will have higher relationship efficacy than those who are not in a relationship, as they will be basing their beliefs on actual mastery experiences.

Overall, with a better understanding of how relationship efficacy is related to a broad range of relationship-related beliefs, we can get a better picture of this complicated and influential construct.

Methodology

Participants

A diverse sample of participants ($N = 211$) was recruited through social media and the subreddit /r/SampleSize. Only those over the age of 18 were permitted to take part in this study.

Precondition Measures

Informed consent. Participants received a SurveyMonkey link and were presented with an informed consent form describing the requirements, and risks and benefits of participating in the study.

Demographic questionnaire. Participants took the researcher-designed demographic questionnaire that elicited information from the participants, such as their age, gender, sexual orientation/identity, and relationship status.

Consensual non-monogamy attitudes. The Consensual Non-Monogamy Attitudes Scale (CNAS; Cohen &

https://doi.org/10.1017/jrr.2018.3 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wilson, 2017) consists of eight questions on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*) to assess the participants' relationship beliefs. Sample statements include: 'You must be in a monogamous relationship to be in love' and 'I can see myself entering into a non-monogamous relationship'. Cronbach's alpha for the eight-item scale is .914 (Cohen & Wilson, 2017).

Relationship efficacy. The Relationship Efficacy Measure (REM; Fincham et al., 2013) was used to examine the extent to which each participant believes he/she can handle conflict with his/her partners. The measure consists of seven items on a 7-point Likert-type scale, (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample statements include: 'There is no way I can solve some of the problems in my relationship'. Alpha coefficients are .87 for husbands and .90 for wives (Fincham et al., 2013). This scale was chosen as it is in line with the aforementioned Fincham et al. (2000) definition of relationship efficacy.

The Self-Efficacy and Romantic Relationships scale (SERR; Riggio et al., 2011) was also used to gauge the relationship efficacy of the participants. This is a 12-question scale in which the participants must respond to statements on a 9-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 9 = *strongly agree*. Sample statements include: 'I am just one of those people who is not good at being a romantic relationship partner'. The scale itself indicates participants' abilities as a partner and their ability to persist in relationships (Riggio et al., 2013). The alpha level of the SERR is .89 (Riggio et al., 2011). This more general relationship-efficacy scale was chosen to measure efficacy, as described by Lopez and Lent (1991).

Sociosexual orientation. The Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R; Penke & Asendorpf, 2008) is a scale that examines individuals' willingness to engage in sexual relationships outside of the primary relationship. The survey has nine questions, each of which can be answered on a 9-point scale. Sample questions include, 'How often do you experience sexual arousal when you are in contact with someone you are *not* in a committed romantic relationship with?' and 'I do *not* want to have sex with a person until I am sure that we will have a long-term, serious relationship'. The SOI-R has an alpha level of 0.83 (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008) for both males and females.

Procedure

Participants were provided with a link to SurveyMonkey. Once they accessed the survey, they were presented with the informed consent, demographic questionnaire, CNAS, REM-Revised, SERR, and the SOI-R. Upon completion, they were thanked for their participation.

Results

Demographics

The sample consisted of 211 participants over the age of 18. Of the 211, a majority (68.7%) were female, 27% were male, and 4.3% selected 'Other'. The sample ranged in age from 16 to 73 years old, with a mean age of 26.44 years (SD = 9.78 years). In terms of ethnicity, 81.5% identified as Caucasian, 7.1% as Asian, 3.8% as Hispanic, 2.8% as African American, and the rest selected 'Other'. Most of the sample identified as heterosexual (72.5%), 17.5% as bisexual, 3.3% as lesbian, 2.4% as gay, and 4.3% selected 'Other'. Seventy-three percent of the participants resided in the United States at the time of the survey, 12.8% in Europe, and 9.5% in Canada.

Relationship Status

At the time of the survey, 67.3% of the participants were in a relationship and 32.7% were single. Of those who indicated that they were in a relationship (n = 142), 67.6% were in a monogamous relationship, but were not married, 19% were married, 7.7% were in a consensually non-monogamous relationship, 2.1% were casually dating, and the remaining 3.6% selected 'Other'. Of those who selected 'Other', a majority noted that they were engaged to be married.

Of those who were in a relationship at the time of the study, the length ranged from 1 month to 34 years, with a median of 2 years, 3 months (M = 4 years, 10 months; SD = 5 years, 10 months).

Correlations

Relationship efficacy. The scores on the REM were correlated with the SERR, $r(209) = .605$, $p = .00$, demonstrating that the participants' scores on the two relationship-efficacy measures were positively related to one another.

The scores on the REM were negatively correlated with the scores on the CNAS, $r(209) = -.160$, $p = .02$. This means that the more efficacious people were when it came to relationships, the less permissive their attitudes were toward non-monogamy. However, there was no relationship between the SERR and CNAS scores. Therefore, the connection between relationship efficacy and attitudes toward consensual non-monogamy was found when it came to relationship efficacy to solve conflicts, but not overall relationship efficacy. These findings address the first hypothesis.

The SERR score was significantly negatively correlated with the desire subscale of the SOI, $r_{desire}(209) = -.194$, $p = .005$. This means that the more relationship efficacy participants had, the less desire they had for people outside of their romantic relationships. Items 7–9 of the SOI comprise the desire subscale, and all refer to people one is not in a committed relationship with. This supports the second hypothesis.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jrr.2018.3 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There was a significant negative relationship between REM and age, $r(209) = -.159$, $p = .021$, meaning that the older people were, the less efficacious they were when it came to relationships.

Sociosexuality. The CNAS was significantly correlated with the SOI total, as well as two of the subscales of the SOI, $r_{total}(191) = .341$, $p = .000$; $r_{attitude}(209) = .493$, $p = .000$; $r_{desire}(209) = .230$, $p = .001$). Therefore, the more unrestricted individuals scored on the SOI, the more accepting they were of consensual non-monogamy.

There was no significant relationship between the CNAS and the behaviour subscale of the SOI, $r_{behaviour}(191) = .098$, $p = .175$. A person's behaviour was not connected to his/her beliefs about consensual non-monogamy.

Relationship Efficacy

There was a significant difference in the relationship efficacy of those who were in a relationship and those who were not on both the SERR and the REM scales, $F_{SERR}(1,209) = 67.031$, $p = .000$ ($\eta^2 = .24$); $F_{REM}(1,209) = 34.670$, $p = .000$ ($\eta^2 = .14$). For the REM, the mean of those in a relationship was 39.55, and 33.00 for those not in a relationship. For the SERR, the mean of those in a relationship was 80.99, and was 61.41 for those who were not. This supports the third hypothesis.

Other Notable Results

There was a significant difference in SOI scores between genders, $F(2,190) = 3.524$, $p = .031$ ($\eta^2 = .04$). The difference was between the male participants ($M = 38.15$) and female participants ($M = 32.86$), demonstrating that the males had an overall higher level of sociosexuality in this particular sample.

There was a significant difference in CNAS scores based on sexual orientation, $F(4,206) = 9.414$, $p = .000$ ($\eta^2 = .15$). The difference was between those who identified as heterosexual ($M = 26.76$) and those who identified as bisexual ($M = 34.46$), and between those who identified as heterosexual ($M = 26.76$) and those who identified as 'Other' ($M = 41.00$).

There was also a significant difference in CNAS scores based on relationship status, $F(4,137) = 6.439$, $p = .000$ ($\eta^2 = .16$). The difference was between those who identified as consensually non-monogamous ($M = 45.82$), and all other groups; in a monogamous relationship, but not married ($M = 29.53$), married ($M = 27.70$), 'Other' ($M = 24.80$), and casually dating ($M = 17.67$).

Discussion

Correlations

Relationship-efficacy. It is not surprising that the two relationship-efficacy measures were correlated with one another, as they both examine the same construct. There is a slight difference, however, in that the SERR looks at overall relationship efficacy, whereas the REM focuses on efficacy to handle conflict within the relationship. This may explain why the relationship was only moderately positive.

The negative correlation between the REM and the CNAS demonstrates that as people were more permissive of consensual non-monogamy, the less efficacious they were when it came to handling conflict within their relationship. This is surprising, because those in non-monogamous relationships often have open and honest conversations within one another (Cohen 2016; Zimmerman, 2012).

This finding may be a result of the sample that was examined. The majority of participants were monogamous, and as such, may have been biased against non-monogamous relationships. In fact, research has shown that there is a stigma against those in CNM relationships (Conley et al., 2013), and that people often view individuals in these structures as having failed at their primary relationships. This particular monogamous sample may have felt that the more successful they were at handling conflicts in their relationship, as measured by the REM, the less likely they would be to need to explore other relationships in addition to one with their primary partner. Without a qualitative follow-up, or inclusion of a greater number of non-monogamous individuals, this interpretation is speculative.

There was no significant relationship found between the SERR and the CNAS. This suggests that overall relationship efficacy may not be related to a person's attitude about relationship structures.

With regard to the first hypothesis, which was exploratory in nature, while there was a negative connection between attitudes toward consensual non-monogamy and efficacy to handle conflicts within relationship, there was no relationship between these attitudes and overall relationship efficacy. More research on how views about one's own abilities affects views on others' relationships is warranted.

The finding that the SERR was negatively correlated with the SOI desire subscale demonstrates that the more overall relationship efficacy people had, the less likely they were to desire to be with others outside of the relationship. This is in line with the previous finding, and again may be a result of the sample mostly consisting of monogamous individuals who view relationships from a mononormative perspective. This directly supports the second hypothesis.

A surprising finding was the negative correlation between age and the ability to handle conflicts within the relationship, as measured by the REM. One would think that as people get older, they have had more relationships, and therefore have a better gauge on their ability to handle conflict. However, as a person ages, they may

https://doi.org/10.1017/jrr.2018.3 Published online by Cambridge University Press

confront more serious issues within the relationship, and as such, may have had a greater amount of conflict. Not all conflicts are able to be resolved, which may account for the lower REM score. Younger individuals may be basing their ability to handle conflict within their relationships on vicarious rather than mastery experiences, and as such, their efficacy is not as accurate. Their efficacy may be inflated.

Sociosexuality. Those who were more accepting of non-monogamy were more unrestricted when it came to sociosexuality. The CNAS was positively correlated with both the total SOI and the desire and attitude subscales. This makes sense, because a person who has more desire for others outside of the relationship is likely to be more accepting of alternative relationship configurations. The CNAS was not, however, correlated with the behaviour subscale of the SOI. As stated above, this may be a result of the composition of the sample. While those who were more open to alternative relationship configurations may have had more uninhibited attitudes and desires when it came to sexuality, this openness was not reflected in actual behaviours, because the sample was overwhelmingly monogamous.

Relationship Efficacy

The third hypothesis was supported, being that those who were in a relationship at the time of the survey had significantly higher scores on both the REM and the SERR. This makes sense, because those currently in a relationship are basing their efficacy beliefs on the mastery experiences they are having. Those not currently in a relationship may be basing their beliefs on previous relationships, which are influenced by the fact that the relationship is over and/or the vicarious relationship experiences of others.

Other Notable Results

The difference in sociosexuality scores between males and females is not so surprising in that previous research has shown that men tend to engage in more sexual behaviour and have more permissive attitudes toward sex than females (Peterson & Hyde, 2010). However, it is important to note that men and women may be answering research questions regarding sexual behaviour and sexuality in ways that conform to societal expectations. This may be true of the present study as well.

The difference in CNAS scores between different relationship configurations demonstrates that those who were in alternative relationship structures were much more likely to be permissive of those structures. There was also a difference in perceptions of consensual non-monogamy based on sexual orientation, which demonstrates that those who identified as bisexual and those who identified as 'Other', a majority of whom self-described as pansexual, were more permissive than those who identified as heterosexual. Research has shown links between polyamory and bisexuality (Rust, 1996). However, as Klesse (2005) notes, the assumption that all those who are bisexual are non-monogamous has potentially stigmatising effects and is not necessarily accurate. As such, more research is needed on how people with different sexual orientations view non-monogamy.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to this research. The first is that it was self-report in nature and therefore may be susceptible to social desirability bias. For example, a person in a monogamous relationship may have been less likely to demonstrate high levels of sociosexuality. This response bias may not have even been conscious. Even though the responses to the survey were confidential, participants may not have been completely truthful.

Another limitation was the composition of the sample, as it was largely comprised of young, Caucasian, female, heterosexual participants. This may be because the topic mostly appeals to this demographic, but without further investigation this conclusion cannot definitively be drawn.

Directions for Future Research

The goal of future research is to obtain a more diverse sample, specifically with regard to those in non-monogamous relationships. Increased diversity allows for greater generalisability of the results.

As previously mentioned, there is a need to examine how different characteristics may affect people's relationship efficacy and their views toward consensual non-monogamy. Therefore, in adding to the increasing diversity of the sample, a focus should be placed on obtaining individuals of different orientations and relationship configurations. This would also allow for a comparison between monogamous and consensually non-monogamous individuals to be made.

Finally, future research should attempt to relate relationship efficacy to other aspects of relationship success, such as ratings of relationship satisfaction and overall wellbeing, as well as marital success.

Implications

Self-efficacy is often studied as it relates to academics, skill acquisition, and health. However, within the realm of relationships, it has largely been ignored. With an increased understanding of how this cognition is related to other relationship beliefs, we can begin to predict what will increase efficacy, and in turn may improve relationships. Taking a closer look at relationship efficacy may be useful for explaining what leads some relationships to flourish, while others are doomed to fail.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jrr.2018.3 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Financial Support

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not for profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

None.

Ethical Standards

The author asserts that all procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national and institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008.

References

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.

Bandura, A., Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., Gerbino, M., & Pastorelli, C., (1997). Role of affective self-regulatory efficacy in diverse spheres of psychosocial functioning. *Child Development, 74*, 769–782.

Cohen, M.T. (2016). An exploratory study of individuals in non-traditional, alternativerelationships: How 'open' are we? *Sexuality & Culture*, *20*, 295–315.

Cohen, M.T., & Wilson, K. (2017). Development of the Consensual Non-Monogamy Attitude Scale (CNAS). *Sexuality & Culture*, *21*, 1–14.

Conley, T.D., Moors, A.C., Matsick, J.L., & Ziegler, A. (2013). The fewer the merrier?: Assessing stigma surrounding consensually non-monogamous romantic relationships. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP), 13*, 1–30. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2012.01286.x

Cui, M., Fincham, F.D., & Pasley, B.K. (2008). Young adult romantic relationships: The role of parents' marital problems and relationship efficacy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*, 1226–1235.

Devonport, T.J., & Lane, A.M. (2006). Relationships between self-efficacy, coping and student retention. *Social Behavior and Personality, 34*, 127–138.

Fincham, F.D., Harold, G.T., & Gano-Phillips, S. (2000). The longitudinal association between attributions and marital satisfaction: Direction of effects and role of efficacy expectations. *Journal of Family Psychology, 14*, 267–285.

Fincham, F.D., Harold, G.T., & Gano-Phillips, S. (2013). Relationship Efficacy Measure (REM). *Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Sciences*. Retrieved from http://www.midss.org/relationship-efficacy-measure-rem

Klesse, C. (2005). Bisexual women, non-monogamy and differentialist anti-promiscuity discourses. *Sexualities*, *8*, 445–464.

Lopez, F.G., & Lent, R.W. (1991). Efficacy-based predictors of relationship adjustment and persistence among college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *32*, 223–229.

Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2008). Beyond global sociosexual orientations: A more differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effects on courtship and romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*, 1113–1135.

Perel, E. (2007). *Mating in captivity: Unlocking erotic intelligence*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Petersen, J.L., & Hyde, J.S. (2010). A meta-analytic review of research on gender differences in sexuality, 1993–2007. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*, 21–38.

Raghavan, C., Swan, S.C., Snow, D.L., & Mazure, C.M. (2005). The mediational role of relationship efficacy and resource utilization in the link between physical and psychological abuse and relationship termination. *Violence Against Women, 11*, 65–68.

Riggio, H.R., Weiser, D., Valenzuela, A., Lui, P., Montes, R., & Heuer, J. (2011). Initial validation of a measure of self-efficacy in romantic relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *51*, 601–606.

Riggio, H.R., Weiser, D.A., Valenzuela, A.M., Lui, P.P., Montes, R., & Heuer, J. (2013). Self-efficacy in romantic relationships: Prediction of relationship attitudes and outcomes. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *153*, 629–650.

Rust, P. (1996). Monogamy and polyamory: Relationship issues for bisexuals. In B. Firestein (Ed.), *Bisexuality: The psychology and politics of an invisible minority* (pp. 127–148). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Vancouver, J.B., & Kendall, L.N. (2006). When self-efficacy negatively relates to motivationand performance in a learning context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 1146–1153.

Zimmerman, K.J. (2012). Clients in sexually open relationships: Considerations for therapists. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy: An International Forum*, *24*, 272–289. doi:10.1080/08952833.2012.648143

https://doi.org/10.1017/jrr.2018.3 Published online by Cambridge University Press