



## **WHEN PARTNERS GET BORED IN THEIR RELATIONSHIPS? A MIXED METHOD AND CROSS- CULTURAL APPROACH OF ROMANTIC RELATIONAL BOREDOM**

**Andreea Ursu• Maria Nicoleta Turliuc**  
*Cuza University of Iasi, Romania*

### *Abstract*

*The present study extends the research by proposing a typology of events which elicit romantic relational boredom from the perspective of the receptor, and the source of the emotion. Firstly, we examined the events reported by participants for each condition (receptor and source of boredom). Secondly, we organized the situations in categories. Thirdly, we analyzed and presented the similarities and differences between conditions and across countries and the categories which are specific for each condition and country. One hundred and thirty-five Romanians (n=87) and Spaniards (n=48) responded to a questionnaire in which they described situations which provoke boredom in romantic relationships using a receptor-source model of eliciting emotions. The results suggest more similarities across conditions and samples than differences. In the receptor condition, lack of novelty elicits the most romantic relational boredom across the Romanian and Spanish samples, while in the source condition, insistence and obligations together with lack of novelty categories elicit the highest level of romantic relational boredom within the both samples.*

**Keywords:** boredom; romantic relationships; cross-cultural comparisons; emotion receptor; emotion source

In the past decades, research on the emotional dynamic within romantic relationships has increased. Although, there are emotions which have been intensely studied, there are others which received scant empirical attention.

---

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to:

• Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi.  
Address: Toma Cozma Street, No. 3, 700704, Iasi, Romania. E-mail: [ursu.andreea@gmail.com](mailto:ursu.andreea@gmail.com)

Boredom is one example of understudied emotions either at intrapersonal or interpersonal level. However, although limited, past research on romantic relational boredom showed that it is one of the major obstacles for maintaining love during time (Aron & Aron, 1986), that it can shape relationships over time, and predicts less relational satisfaction in the future (Tsapelas, Aron, & Orbuch, 2009). Furthermore, research has showed that the major themes of romantic relational boredom are “lack of interest in partner”, “lack of fun”, “decrease in sexual interest”, “sick and tired of partner”, “feel nothing”, “no longer exciting”, “feels too comfortable”, “too similar to each other”, “nothing in common”, “not going out together” (Harasymchuk & Fehr, 2012). However, the research on boredom and interpersonal relationships is limited and does not examine the events which elicit this emotion taking into account different events in both conditions - receptor and source of emotion. Moreover, all studies on boredom were conducted in West cultural contexts as U.S., Canada (Harasymchuk & Fehr, 2012; Tsapelas, Aron, & Orbuch, 2009), ignoring the European cultural context. Thus, to cover this gap in the literature, the aim of the present study is to identify and present a typology of events which elicit romantic relational boredom, based on two conditions (receptor and source of emotion), and across two European countries (one for the Western, and the other from the Eastern part of the continent).

### **Emotion elicitation**

Emotions tend to be elicited by specific types of events appraised as being real, which are important to individuals' motives, concerns, goals (Fridja, 1988). There is evidence, which suggests that negative emotions arise as responses to events that threaten or harm the individual's concerns, goals or motives (Fridja, 1988). Further, negative emotions signal situations for which the individuals need greater attention in order to produce an appropriate response (Forgas & Bower, 1987; Forgas, Bower, & Krantz, 1984). The way in which the individuals appraise events, which elicit emotions enables us to know more about individual and their romantic relationships. Thus, situations that elicit emotions within romantic relationships are an indicator of many different ways in which partners interact and how these interactions influence their dynamic.

### **Boredom in close relationships: definition, characteristics, and outcomes**

Boredom is an emotion which has received little research interest. In time, it has been suggested that it is a discrete emotion (Barbalet, 1999), with negative and positive impacts on behavior, cognition, experience and physiology (Bench & Lench, 2013; Martin, Sadlo, & Stew, 2006). However, boredom is characterized by low arousal and dissatisfaction due to inadequate environmental stimulation (Mikulas & Vodavich, 1993). In the area of long-term relationships, the most of the research focused on the effects of conflict, tensions or anger, but failed to analyze emotions as boredom in long-term relationships. Studies have shown that marital satisfaction decrease in time (Berscheid, 2010) and that dissatisfaction can be a result of many stressors (*e.g.*, life transitions, financial strain, illnesses etc.), and negative dyadic interactions between partners (*e.g.*, conflict), but also an outcome of loss of positivity (Gable & Reis, 2001). Indeed, romantic relational boredom is a major problem in the process of maintaining love in long-term relationship (Aron & Aron, 1986). In a longitudinal study, greater boredom strongly and significantly predicted less satisfaction nine years later, but a greater initial satisfaction did not significantly predict less boredom nine years later (Tsapelas, Aron, & Orbuch, 2009). Recently, Harasymchuk and Fehr (2013) analyzed the prototypicality of the features of relational boredom. The features that received the highest ratings are identified: *lack of novelty*, defined as doing the same things, activities or having the same interactions which are no longer novel; *lack of stimulation*, defined by issues which involve not going out, nothing to talk about, nothing to do; *constraint* involves doing something the partner likes, but not you, the partner's resistance to try new things; *external causes*, which imply causes external to the relationship, as children interference, limited outcome, busy with housekeeping activities, and *destructive*, which is defined by fighting or having discussions.

### **The cultural context of Romania and Spain**

Romania and Spain represent two underrepresented populations in the study of emotions and romantic relationships. Although, both countries have Latin-origins, historical, social, economic and cultural are different. Romania is an Eastern-European country with a communist past, while Spain is a Southern

European country with a fascist past. Related to social and economic issues, it should be mentioned that Spain has a higher life satisfaction compared to Romania (HDR, 2011) and a higher average salary. Culturally, Romania and Spain are similar on uncertainty avoidance and masculinity-femininity dimensions and different on individualism-collectivism and power distance dimensions (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). More precisely, both countries are high on uncertainty avoidance (90 and 85 out of 100 for Romania and Spain, respectively) and low on masculinity (42). However, Romania is a more collectivist country, while Spain a more individualist one (90 and 51 out of 100 for Romania and Spain, respectively). Even if both countries are examples of high power distance countries, we suspect some differences because of the high discrepancy in their scores (90 and 57 out of 100 for Romania and Spain, respectively). Moreover, Matsumoto (1989) suggested that countries on high uncertainty avoidance tend to not recognize emotions or to express them less intensely, feminine countries make less strong differences on how women and men express emotions, having less emotions stereotypes for gender, countries high on power distance express less frequently negative emotions in social groups because it may threaten the social order and in collectivist countries communication of negative emotions is not desirable, while in individualist countries it is. In this study we try to analyze the data in a comparative way based on the cultural differences identified by Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov (2010).

### **Objective**

The aim of the present study is to present an eliciting events typology of romantic relational boredom based on two contexts (source and receptor of emotion), in two European countries (Romania and Spain).

We decided to employ a qualitative and quantitative approach because we wanted to gain that kind of in-depth knowledge of events which elicit boredom within romantic relationships and, in the same time, to assess the frequency of events mentioned by participants in two different conditions: receptor and source of emotion.

In addition to the existing studies on romantic relational boredom, the present study extends the body of literature by (a) non-student sample; (b)

within subjects design; (c) studying underrepresented populations, (d) mixed method.

## **Method**

### *Participants*

The data for this study were collected from a community sample. All 87 Romanians (85.1%) and 48 (89.6%) Spanish participants were involved in a committed romantic relationship for at least 3 months. The majority of them were involved in non-marital relationships (71.3% and 87.5% for Romanians respectively for Spaniards) with a mean length of 34.20 months ( $SD=27.46$ ) and 50.48 months ( $SD=35.49$ ) for Romanian respectively Spanish participants. All participants were young, aged between 18 and 30 years old with a mean age of 23.32 ( $SD=3.13$ ) and 25.13 ( $SD=3.16$ ) for Romanians respectively Spaniards. Concerning their educational level, 34.5% and 35.6% of Romanians had completed their high school degree, respectively bachelor degree, while 12.5% and 56.3% of Spaniards had completed their high school degree, respectively their bachelor degree.

### *Instruments*

Participants fill in the study questionnaire, more precisely demographic questions (gender, age, education level, marital status and length of their relationships) and two open questions in which they presented situations in which (a) they experienced boredom because of their partner behavior or attitude and (b) their partner experienced boredom because of their behavior or attitude. The duration of relevant questionnaire for this study was approximately 5 minutes.

### *Procedure and design*

We recruited participants through social media channels (Facebook). Members of Facebook group of Romanian and Spanish universities and Romanian and Spanish cities were invited to fill in the study questionnaire in their mother tongue (Romanian and Spanish). After two weeks we posted a reminder with study link. All participants provided informed consent.

## **Results and discussion**

### *Data analysis*

The data analysis was organized in two steps. Firstly, we used inductive analysis for identifying, creating and reporting themes within romantic relational boredom. Moreover, we used inductive analysis because we wanted to see participants' meanings, experiences and views and not to conform their experiences to preexisting theories (Koch, Tricia, & McCarthy, 2014) or preexisting coding frame. The authors read all data and created the categories and categories definitions. Secondly, first author and two blinded coders (one native Romanian and one native Spanish) have employed the coding frame to independently categorize the data. The data was checked for inter-rater reliability between the two coders. For Romanians, in source condition the Kappa coefficient was .80 while for receptor condition was .78. For Spaniards, in source condition Kappa coefficient was .88 while for receptor condition was .96. According to Cohen (1960) the inter-rater agreement varied from substantial agreement to almost perfect agreement.

The main research questions were to examine which situations elicit romantic relational boredom in two conditions, across two countries. More precisely, we aimed to present the similarities and differences on quantitative level (percentages and ranks), but also on qualitative level (participants meanings) in two conditions (receptor and source of emotion) across two Latin-origin countries (Romania and Spain).

The results section is organized in four parts. First, we will present the results overview, for example, number of categories emerged, percentage of responses coded in categories. Secondly, we will present the differences and similarities between percentages and ranks of categories. Thirdly, we will focus on differences and similarities of participants' meanings. Fourthly, we will present the country specific events categories.

The structure of the following tables is: name and definition for each category, examples for each category, and for each country and the relative percent and ranks.

### *Boredom- receptor condition*

*Validity of the coding scheme.* The data could be coded in 6 categories, which are presented across the two cultures. Over 63% of participants'

responses (67% and 56.2% of Romanian and Spanish participants, respectively) were codable into one of the four categories, while 7% (8% and 6.3% of Romanian and Spanish participants, respectively) and 30% of data (25.3% and 37.5% of Romanian and Spanish participants, respectively) was coded into other category, and the “no answer” category, respectively. The final categories, as well as examples from each country and their relative percent and ranks are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Coding Scheme of Situations Eliciting Boredom (Receptor Condition): Category Definitions, Examples, Percentages (and Ranks) by Country

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	% SP
<i>Lack of novelty</i> : lack of excitement; lack of initiatives; routine	“When my partner did not initiate new activities”/ “our relationship was monotone” (“Cand nu avea initiative”/ “era monoton”)	“When none of us wants to decide a plan”/ “When all the days are similar with my partner” (“Cuando ninguno no tiene iniciativa para decidir un plan y salir”/ “Cuando todos los días son iguales con mi pareja”)	23(1)	35.4(1)
<i>Lack of interest toward partner and relationship</i> : lack of commitment; lack of sharing; lack of shared activities; no future for relationship; lack of connectivity between partners.	“I got bored fighting for us”/ “When my partner is ignoring me” (“M-am plictisit sa lupt pt noi”/ “Cand simt ca ma ignora”)	“When he is playing Fifa 2-3 hours instead of going somewhere together” (“Cuando él lleva 2-3h jugando a Fifa-chat en vez de hacer algo juntos”)	20.7(2)	8.3(3)
<i>Different interests</i> : different hobbies; activities which are not pleasant for both;	“When he is speaking about technical things, airplanes’ motors”/ “when my partner is watching TV shows” (“Când îmi vorbeste multe date tehnice despre motoare de avioane.”/ “cand se uita la TV la programe seci”)	“In same places where I did not want to be”/ “When my partner speaks about some topics that I am not interested at all” (“En algun sitio donde no me apetecia estar”/ “Cuando pasa horas hablando de una afición que sabe que no me interesa en absoluto”)	17.2(3)	10.4(2)
<i>Insistences and obligations</i> : doing things, participating at activities because of obligations or because of partner’s insistences.	“Visiting relatives”/ “when my partner is insisting” (“Vizita la rude”/ “se resimte atunci cand insista”)	“When we are speaking after some time in which we did not see each other” (“cuando charlamos despues de tiempo sin vemos”)	5.7(4)	2.1(4)

Note: Numbers in parenthesis are categories ranks; RO: Romanian; SP: Spanish

*Percentages and ranks of categories by country.* The results depicted in Table 1 revealed more similarities than differences. Three of the most frequent categories across the two cultures are lack of novelty, lack of partner's interest toward the participant's and their relationship and different interests. For example, lack of novelty is the first most frequent category across the two cultures, lack of partner's interest toward the participant and their relationship is the second most frequent category for Romanians while different interests is the second most frequent category for Spaniards. Even if lack of novelty is the first most frequent category across the two cultures, the frequency of Spanish sample is higher compared to the Romanian sample category. Next, the third most frequent categories are different interests for the Romanians and lack of partner's interest toward the participant and their relationship category for the Spanish sample respectively. Insistences and obligations is the category with a lesser frequency across both samples.

In conclusion, while lack of novelty is the category which elicits the most romantic relational boredom across the two samples, lack of partner's interest toward the participant and toward their relationship category is eliciting more romantic relational boredom in the Romanian cultural romantic context compared to the Spanish cultural context, where different interests category is eliciting more romantic relational boredom.

The results related to the categories ranks are consistent with the results related to categories frequencies.

*Shared and country specific meanings.* All four categories are common across the two samples. First, lack of novelty is seen as lack of excitement, lack of initiatives, routine; which suggests a high level of predictability and complacency in relationships, in which the activities and the partners' interactions are not novel anymore, and the partners feel that there is nothing interesting about each other or new to say to each other. Lack of the partner's interest toward the participant and their relationship is seen as lack of commitment, lack of shared activities, lack of sharing and no future for the relationship, which may suggest both a low level of positive affect, but also a low level of negative affect (Harasymchuk & Fehr, 2012). Next, it may suggest the lack of intimacy between partners, which leads to a dissatisfying state of the partners (Harasymchuk & Fehr, 2013). Moreover, it may suggest the stagnation stage of the romantic relationship due to the habituation between partners.



While the central idea of lack of novelty is that the partners are too similar or that there is no excitement in the relationship, lack of the partner's interest toward the participant and toward their relationship is seen as lack of involvement in the relationship, different interests suggest the differences between partners, different hobbies and that the interactions or the activities are not pleasant for both partners.

Second, as expected, there are some similarities and differences within the meanings of common categories. For example, within the lack of novelty category there are more similar meanings given by both Romanian and Spanish participants than different meanings. For instance, situations as the partner not taking the initiative, not having new and interesting activities, having the same shared activities or not going out, their relationship being in routine are presented by both Romanian and Spanish participants. In addition, the Spanish participants add certain new meanings when they are feeling bored. For example, they feel bored because of long pauses (siestas), having sex without passion or when their partner is not deciding anything, letting the participants to take all the decisions. Lack of the partner's interest toward the participant and toward their relationship category and different interests category offer us more situations with different meanings across the two samples. For samples, the Romanians recalled events in which their partner is not involved and present in their relationships, while the Spanish participants recalled events in which they are bored because of their partner lack of willing to participate in new activities.

The situations presented suggest that the Romanians partners had more interests related to videogames and computers compared to the Spaniards while the Spanish participants get bored when they are in places in which they don't want to be or when their partner is not willing to go out. There are also some similarities within the different interests' category across the two samples. Both groups of participants presented situations in which their partner spoke too much about their work or watching movies which are not interesting for both of them as events in which they felt bored.

In addition, there are more differences on meanings within insinuations and obligations category across the two samples. For example, meeting with the partner's friends is more specific to the Spanish sample, while the family or relatives meetings are more specific to Romanians. This might suggest that the Romanians are more family oriented comparing to the Spaniards (Hofstede,

Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Moreover, it seems that the insistences of the Romanian participants' partners elicit more romantic relational boredom compared with the Spanish sample.

*Country specific categories.* There is no specific country category.

*Boredom - source condition*

*Validity of the coding scheme.* Comparing to the final list of romantic relational boredom, in receptor condition, a new category was added to the final list of source condition, teasing and criticism. Over 49% of data (52.7% and 45.9% of the Romanian and the Spanish participants respectively) was codable into one of the 5 categories. Over 42% of the participants (36.8% and 52.1% of the Romanian and the Spanish participants, respectively) mentioned that they did not make their partner to feel this emotion or that they do not know situations in which their partner felt bored because of their actions, behaviors, or during their interactions, while 9% of participants (10.3% and 6.3% of the Romanian and the Spanish participants, respectively) presented situations which were coded in "other category".

The final categories, as well, as examples from each country and their relative percent and ranks categories are presented in Table 2.

*Percentages and ranks of categories by country.* The results depicted in Table 2 revealed both similarities and differences related to categories frequencies across the two cultures. More precisely, there are two categories, which are the most frequent categories across both Romanian and Spanish cultures. Lack of novelty and insistences and obligations categories are the categories in which people experience the most romantic relational boredom. Moreover, one similarity is represented by the fact that different interests was the second most frequent category in eliciting romantic relational boredom across the two cultures. However, within the Spanish participants lack of novelty was also the second most frequent category. Lack of the participant's interest toward their partner and toward their relationship was the third most frequent category within the Romanian sample and the fourth within the Spanish participants. And insistences and obligations was the third respectively the first most frequent category in eliciting romantic relational boredom within the Romanian and the Spanish participants respectively.

Table 2. Coding Scheme of Situations Eliciting Boredom (Source Condition): Category Definitions, Examples, Percentages (and Ranks) by Country

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	% SP
<i>Lack of novelty</i> : lack of excitement; lack of initiatives; routine	“Each day that we are not having activities which my partner considers interesting”/ “all the time when I am not proposing new activities which we could do them together” (“In fiecare zi cand nu faceam lucruri pe care sa le considere interesante”/ “oricand nu vin cu idei noi despre ce am putea face impreuna”)	“Monotony”/ “when we do not break out the routine”/ (Rutina”/ “Cuando no salimos de la rutina”/)	20.7(1)	12.5(2)
<i>Different interests</i> : different hobbies; activities which are not pleasant for both;	“He watched animated movies for me, but fall asleep”/ “When I am going to play football” (“S-a uitat la filme animate de dragul meu si a adormit.”/ “Cand merg la fotbal”)	“When I am speaking about topics which my partners is not interested in”/ “watching me playing football” (“Cuando le hablo mucho sobre un tema que no muestra interés”/“viéndome jugar fútbol.”)	17.2(2)	12.5(2)
<i>Insistences and obligations</i> : doing things, participating at activities because of obligations or because of partner’s insistences.	“When we were at my parents home”/ (“Cand eram la ai mei”)	“Going out with my female friends” (“Llevándole con mis amigas”)	3.4(4)	14.6(1)
<i>Lack of interest toward partner and relationship</i> : lack of commitment; lack of sharing; lack of shared activities; no future for relationship; lack of connectivity between partners.	“When I am not in mood to see him”/ “lack of sex” (“Cand nu am chef de el”/ “lipsa sexului”)	“planning an activity which is not as much interesting for him as for me” (“hacer un plan que no le motiva tanto como a mi”)	8(3)	2.1(3)
<i>Teasing and criticism</i> : criticizing the partner; speaking senseless; teasing the partner	“When I am teasing him” (“cand sunt cicalitoare”)		3.4(4)	

Note: Numbers in parenthesis are categories ranks; RO: Romanian; SP: Spanish.

The data of the Romanian participants was organized in four ranks while the data of the Spanish participants was organized in three ranks. The results of the categories ranks are in line with the categories frequencies results. There are two categories, which had the same ranks across the two cultures (different interests had the second rank within both samples, while lack of the participant’s interest toward their partner and toward their relationship had the third rank). The last rank for the Romanians was criticism and teasing while for

the Spaniards was the lack of the partner's interest toward the participant and their relationship.

In conclusion, in the Romanian case, situations from lack of novelty and different interests elicit romantic relational boredom, while in the Spanish case, situations from insurances and obligations and different interests and lack of novelty categories elicit romantic relational boredom.

*Shared and country specific meanings.* Four out of five categories are common across the two samples. The results of these four categories revealed some similarities and differences. Within three out of the four common categories there are more similarities than differences. More precisely, within the different interests category it can be observed that hobbies which are not pleasant for both partners, speaking about their profession/ majors or having activities which are not interesting for both partners (shopping, sport, movies, football) elicit romantic relational boredom. In addition, within lack of participant's interest toward partner and their relationship, the Romanians and the Spaniards presented situations as not sharing their affection or not being intimately involved in their relationship as reasons for feeling bored. The Romanians also presented situations in which they do not see each other. Next, lack of novelty is the category in which more similarities can be found. Specifically, the Romanian and Spanish participants recalled events as not having new and interesting activities, there were too many routine activities in their relationship, and no one was proposing activities or new activities.

Contrary to these categories, within insurances and obligations category different meanings across the two cultures can be seen. For example, the Romanian participants presented more situations in which they insisted on their partner participating in a meeting with the participant's family or participating in different events with their family, while the Spanish participants recalled events in which they insisted on their partner attending meetings with the participant's friends. Most probably Romanians are more family-oriented than the Spaniards due to their less individualist culture (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010).

*Country specific categories.* Teasing and criticism category was specific to Romanian sample. It seems that the Romanian participants tease and criticize their partner more comparing to the Spaniards.

## Conclusions

Although the comparison of study categories with the preexisting categories is beyond the aim of the present study, we will proceed to certain comparisons between these categories for the purpose of presenting a short overview of romantic relational boredom typologies current point of view.

As it was already mentioned, the typology of Harasymchuk and Fehr (2012) consist of lack of novelty, lack of stimulation, constraint, external causes and destructive. The results of the present study consist of lack of novelty, lack of interest toward partner and relationship, different interests and insistences and obligations categories for receptor condition while for source condition it was added one more category teasing and criticism. These categories add new features to romantic relational boredom typology, by presenting other types of events which are eliciting boredom in the context of romantic relationships. Moreover, although we have one category, which has the same name (lack of novelty), the definitions are different across the two typologies.

In the following, we will present a short overview of study results.

The results depicted in Tables 1 and 2 highlighted similarities and differences for romantic relational boredom across two conditions in two European samples. First, data in receptor condition was coded in four common categories across the two cultures, while data in source condition was coded in five categories; four of them were common across the cultures and one being specific to the Romanian sample.

Over 63% of data was codable into one of the four categories in receptor condition, comparing to 49% of participants responses, which were coded in one of the fifth categories in source condition. Next, in source condition, 30% of participants' responses were coded in NA category comparing to 42% of participants responses in source condition while 7% of data was coded in other category, in receptor condition, respectively 9% of data in source condition.

Overall, there are more similarities across conditions and samples than differences. More precisely, beside one category (insistences and obligations category) all the other four are common across the conditions and samples even if the ranks are different. Lack of novelty was the most frequent category across both samples in receptor condition, while in source condition this category was

the most frequent category only within the Romanian sample. Within the Spanish sample, insistences and obligations is the most frequent category in the source condition.

Concerning the categories ranks, the results reveal some differences. In the receptor condition, data was organized in four ranks for both samples, while in the source condition data was organized in four respectively three ranks for Romanians, respectively for Spaniards.

In addition, the percent for insistences and obligations has increased for the Spanish sample from 2.1% (receptor condition) to 14.6% (source condition), this category being the category with the highest frequency within this sample. It seems that the Spanish participants insist more than their partners. For the Romanian sample, in the source condition, the category with the highest frequency is lack of novelty, the same as in the receptor condition. This may suggest the fail to engage in interesting and novel activities and maybe the awareness of the Romanian participants of the routine's effects on the romantic relationships.

The highest decrement for the Spanish sample is from 35.4% (lack of novelty, in the receptor condition) to 12.5% (in the source condition) and for the Romanian sample is from 20.7% (lack of partner's interest toward the participant and their relationship, receptor condition) to 8% (source condition).

In conclusion, in the receptor condition, lack of novelty category elicited romantic relational boredom across the Romanian and Spanish sample, while in the source condition, insistence and obligations together with lack of novelty categories elicited the most romantic relational boredom within the Spanish participants and within the Romanian participants, respectively.

Some potential limitations need to be mentioned. One of the most important limitations is due to the lowest percent of codable data for relational romantic boredom, in the source condition. This may be due to the difficulty of participants to describe an event in which their partners felt boredom because of their behavior or because of their interactions. Although there is a high percent of NA category, the Spanish participants having a higher percent than the Romanian participants for romantic relational boredom, the results of the present study extend the literature on romantic relational boredom by providing a typology of eliciting events for this emotion. The present study had participants only from two European countries. In the future, it will be

interesting to examine the events which elicit romantic relational boredom having participants from other European countries, which have different historical, social-economics issues (average salary, daily stress, life satisfaction, wellbeing, work-family balance) or different cultural characteristics on individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity-femininity dimensions (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Moreover, it will be interesting to see which are the effects of these eliciting events on romantic relational outcomes as dyadic satisfaction.

In despite of the fact that auto-selection of participants might be another limitation, the present study extends the knowledge on romantic relational boredom by proposing a new typology based on (a) a non-student sample; (b) participants described events which elicited romantic relational boredom in two conditions: receptor and source of emotion; and (c) participants from an underrepresented population (European countries, young adults).

The results of the present study make some important contributions to the literature. We presented a typology of romantic relational boredom based on eliciting events described by Romanian and Spanish participants in two conditions, source and receptor of emotions. The samples used enabled us to bring inputs from some understudied populations while the two conditions enables us to gain in dept knowlegde related to events which elicit boredom in romantic relational contexts.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

All authors gratefully acknowledge the help provided by Octav Candel (PhD student, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, Romania) and Estibaliz Royuela (PhD student, Deusto Stress Research Lab, University of Deusto, Spain) for being the second blind coder in qualitative data analyses.

## References

- Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1986). Getting tired of the other. In A. Aron, & E. N. Aron, *Love and the expansion of self: understanding attraction and satisfaction* (pp. 91-108). New York: NY: Hemisphere Publishing Corp.
- Boiger, M., & Mesquita, B. (2012). The Construction of Emotion in Interactions, Relationships, and Cultures. *Emotion Review*, 221-229.
- Clark, M., & Taraban, C. (1991). Reactions to and willingness to express emotion in communal and exchange relationships. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 27, 324-336.
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1), 37-46.
- Forgas, J. P., & Bower, G. H. (2001). Mood effects on person-perception judgments. *Emotions in social psychology: Essential readings*, 204-215.
- Forgas, J. P., Bower, G. H., & Krantz, S. E. (1984). The influence of mood on perceptions of social interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 20(6), 497-513.
- Fridja, N. (1988). The laws of emotion. *American Psychologist*, 43(5), 349-358.
- Harasymchuk, C., & Fehr, B. (2012). A prototype analysis of relational boredom. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30(5), 627-646.
- Harasymchuk, C., & Fehr, B. (2013). A prototype analysis of relational boredom. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30(5), 627-646.
- Harasymchuk, C., & Fehr, B. (2012). Development of a prototype-based measure of relational boredom. *Personal Relationships*, 19, 162-181.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind. Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Matsumoto, D. (1989). Cultural influences on the perception of emotion. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20(1), 92-105.
- Mesquita, B., & Boiger, M. (2014). Emotions in Context: A Sociodynamic Model of Emotions. *Emotion Review*, 6(4), 298-302.
- Mesquita, B., & Walker, R. (2003). Cultural difference in emotions: a context for interpreting emotional experiences. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 41, 777-793.



- Sanford, K. (2007). The couples emotion rating form: Psychometric properties and theoretical associations. *Psychological Assessment, 19*(4), 411-421.
- Tsapelas, I., Aron, A., & Orbuch, T. (2009). Marital boredom now predicts less satisfaction 9 years later. *Psychological science, 20*(5), 543-545.