9.5 Rusbult's Investment Model of Commitment in Relationships: 10-minute Pack

AQA 7182 · about 10 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions.

1 Outline what Rusbult means by 'comparison with alternatives' as a factor in commitment to a relationship.

(Total for Question 1 is 2 marks)

2 Outline what is meant by 'investment size' in Rusbult's model, and give one example of a tangible and one example of an intangible investment in a long-term relationship.

(Total for Question 2 is 3 marks)

3 Identify two methodological limitations of the evidence supporting the investment model, referring to the correlational nature of much of the research including Le and Agnew's meta-analysis.

(Total for Question 3 is 3 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 9.5 Rusbult's Investment Model of Commitment in Relationships: 10-minute Pack

Question 1

states that comparison with alternatives refers to considering other potential partners or being better off alone oe	**B1**
indicates that commitment falls when attractive alternatives are perceived to exist oe	**B1**

Answer: Comparison with alternatives is evaluating whether one could be happier with other partners or alone; commitment is lower when attractive alternatives are perceived.

Question 2

defines investment size as resources that would be lost or reduced if the relationship ended, increasing commitment oe	**M1**
gives a correct tangible example, e.g. shared house, joint finances, child oe	**A1**
gives a correct intangible example, e.g. shared memories, mutual friends, emotional support invested over time oe	**A1**

Answer: Investment size are resources put into the relationship that would be lost if it ended, increasing commitment. Tangible example: shared home or joint savings. Intangible example: many shared memories or emotional support built up over years.

Question 3

identifies correlational design as a limitation, so causation cannot be inferred oe	**M1**
explains that correlations between investment and commitment could reflect reverse causality or a third variable such as personality oe	**A1**
identifies another limitation such as reliance on self-report measures which may be biased, or sample issues in primary studies included in the meta-analysis oe	**A1**

Answer: One limitation is that much evidence is correlational, so we cannot infer that investments cause commitment; reverse causality or third variables like personality could explain the associations. Another limitation is frequent reliance on self-report measures and varied samples in the studies included in the meta-analysis, which can introduce bias or limit comparability.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk