

RELATIONAL MODELS THEORY

A Contemporary Overview

EDITED BY
NICK HASLAM

RELATIONAL MODELS THEORY

A Contemporary Overview

This page intentionally left blank

RELATIONAL MODELS THEORY

A Contemporary Overview

Edited by

Nick Haslam
University of Melbourne

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

Copyright © 2004 by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of the book may be reproduced in any form, by photostat, microform, retrieval system, or any other means, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

First published by
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers
10 Industrial Avenue
Mahwah, New Jersey 07430

This edition published 2012 by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire OX14 4RN

Cover design by Sean Trane Sciarrone

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Relational models theory : a contemporary overview / edited by Nick Haslam.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8058-3915-1 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 0-8058-5356-1 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Interpersonal relations. 2. Interpersonal communication. I. Haslam, Nick, 1963-

HM1106.R442 2004

302—dc22

2004046925

CIP

Contents

List of Contributors	vii
Preface	ix
PART I: FUNDAMENTALS	
1 Relational Models Theory 2.0 <i>Alan Page Fiske</i>	3
2 Research on the Relational Models: An Overview <i>Nick Haslam</i>	27
PART II: COGNITION AND CULTURE	
3 Four Modes of Constituting Relationships: Consubstantial Assimilation; Space, Magnitude, Time, and Force; Concrete Procedures; Abstract Symbolism <i>Alan Page Fiske</i>	61
4 Social Expertise: Theory of Mind or Theory of Relationships? <i>Nick Haslam and Alan Page Fiske</i>	147

PART III: JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS

- 5 The Domain of Work in Households:
A Relational Models Approach 167
Jacqueline J. Goodnow
- 6 Hidden Bias: The Impact of Relational Models
on Perceptions of Fairness in Human Resource Systems 197
Debra Louis Connelley and Robert Folger
- 7 Relational Models, “Deonance,” and Moral Antipathy
Toward the Powerfully Unjust 221
Robert Folger and Rebecca Butz

PART IV: EMOTIONS, VALUES, AND MORALITIES

- 8 Proscribed Forms of Social Cognition: Taboo Trade-offs,
Blocked Exchanges, Forbidden Base Rates, and Heretical
Counterfactuals 247
Philip E. Tetlock, A. Peter McGraw, and Orië V. Kristel
- 9 Values and Emotions in the Relational Models 263
Sonia Roccas and Clark McCauley
- 10 The Four Faces of Trust: An Empirical Study of the Nature
of Trust in Relational Forms 287
*Leah D. Houde, Dana M. Sherman, Tiffany B. White,
and Blair H. Sheppard*

PART V: RELATIONAL MODELS IN THE CLINIC

- 11 Depressed Mood as an Interpersonal Strategy:
The Importance of Relational Models 309
Nicholas B. Allen, Paul Gilbert, and Assaf Samedar
- 12 A Relational Approach to the Personality Disorders 335
Nick Haslam
- Author Index 363
- Subject Index 373

List of Contributors

Nicholas B. Allen	Department of Psychology, University of Melbourne, Australia
Rebecca Butz	Department of Psychology, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA
Debra Louis Connelley	College of Business Administration, Touro University International, Cypress, CA
Alan Page Fiske	Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles, CA
Robert Folger	Management Department, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL
Paul Gilbert	Department of Psychology, University of Derby, United Kingdom
Jacqueline J. Goodnow	Emeritus, Department of Psychology, Macquarie University, Australia
Nick Haslam	Department of Psychology, University of Melbourne, Australia
Leah D. Houde	Fuqua School of Business, Duke University, Durham, NC
Orie V. Kristel	The Strategy Team, Ltd., Columbus, OH

Clark McCauley	Department of Psychology, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA
A. Peter McGraw	Postdoctoral research associate, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ
Sonia Roccas	Department of Psychology and Education, Open University of Israel, Tel Aviv, Israel
Assaf Sedar	Department of Psychology, University of Melbourne, Australia
Blair H. Sheppard	Fuqua School of Business, Duke University, Durham, NC
Dana M. Sherman	Independent scholar, Scottsdale, AZ
Philip E. Tetlock	Haas School of Business, University of California, Berkeley, CA
Tiffany B. White	College of Business, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL

Preface

The theory of relational models (RMs) was first proposed by Alan Fiske in the early 1990s. Its ambitions were high and wide. The theory aspired to be nothing less than an account of the fundamental forms of social relations that might be valuable to social and behavioral scientists of many persuasions. In the ensuing years, RM theory has received widespread attention, not only from psychologists, to whom it has most often been pitched, but also from management scholars, anthropologists, sociologists, and cognitive and political scientists. Many theorists and researchers have put the theory of RMs to work, generating a variety of conceptual links and empirical findings and pursuing a diverse range of methodologies.

RMs theory has clearly had a measure of success within the sometimes harsh ecology of social theory. However it has also paid for this success with a kind of intellectual sprawl. Because of its wide-ranging relevance the theory has given rise to a dispersed set of applications, ranging from ethnographic studies in the rainforests of New Guinea and the factories of upstate New York to neuroimaging and priming investigations in the laboratory. Its ramifications have been charted in forbiddingly abstract cognitive science texts and in richly contextualized descriptions of social interaction, in the cool language of evolved cognitive modules and the warm language of emotions and motives.

A consequence of this dispersion of RMs scholarship—disciplinary, methodological, and topical—is that it is very difficult for the newcomer or even the established theorist and researcher to grasp the theory’s possibilities or to survey existing work. In the years since the theory first ap-

peared there has been no attempt to draw this work together and to consider what it adds up to and where it might lead. The present volume is intended to remedy this state of affairs. It attempts to review the theory and the research that it has spawned comprehensively, and to lay out in detail some of the many directions in which theory and research are proceeding in the present. The chapter authors are a diverse group, drawn from a variety of disciplines. They have tried mightily not only to present their work, showing the contribution that RMs theory has made to it, but also to speculate on the theory's implications for their fields and the avenues along which it might be developed further. We hope that the chapters collectively demonstrate the theory's fruitfulness, document the state of RMs research as it enters its teens, and spur on researchers and theorists alike to take their work further still, finding new ways to test the theory's usefulness and validity.

A GUIDE TO THE VOLUME

The book is divided into five parts, containing 12 chapters in total. Part I, on "Fundamentals," begins the book with state-of-the-art summaries of RMs theory and research. It is designed to give readers a working grasp of the basic features of the theory as it is now formulated, and an overview of the RMs-related research conducted to date. Fiske's chapter 1 presents the indispensable concepts of RMs theory and describes the intellectual and historical context of the theory's development. Fiske describes how the theory explains social coordination by positing universal models embodied in culturally specific implementations and combinations, and strongly defends the need for a social psychology that addresses relationships rather than simply perceptions of other individuals. He goes on to discuss the issue of innateness and how the RMs might have evolved, before clarifying some existing confusions about the theory and proposing directions for its future development.

Haslam's chapter 2 surveys the empirical research base of RMs theory in a way that complements Fiske's theoretical discussion. Research on the structure of the RMs, their influence on everyday social and cognitive processes at individual and collective levels, and their conceptual links to other theories is exhaustively reviewed. The author argues that RMs theory has accumulated extensive support for its structural claims, for its explanatory power, and for its capacity to generate new conceptual links and research programs. He notes also that research on the theory is rather thinly spread and in need of consolidation, and must address the development, cross-cultural variation, and concrete implementation of the models in future.

Although Part I lays out fundamentals of RMs theory and research, ideally it will not be bypassed by readers who already have some exposure to this work. Fiske's chapter does not simply rehear the theory as it was first presented, but offers a new version—"Relational models theory 2.0"—that responds to theoretical clarification, exchange, and the changing complexion of social and behavioral science over the past decade. Haslam's chapter provides a broad context for the more detailed presentations in later sections of the book.

Part II, on "Cognition and Culture," addresses the contributions that RMs theory makes to the study of social cognition. Fiske's chapter 3 discusses the important and hitherto neglected issue of how relationships are constituted. Supported by an encyclopedic assortment of ethnographic and other illustrations, Fiske claims that each RM has a distinctive natural medium through which people perceive, represent, communicate, and learn about relationships. For example, people have a proclivity to constitute Authority Ranking relationships in terms of an iconic "social physics" of space, time, magnitude and force, and Communal Sharing relationships in terms of bodily connections (e.g., commensalism, blood rituals, body contact). In perhaps his most far-reaching theoretical extension to date, Fiske proposes that each RM has an integrated "conformation system" that governs how it is cognized, enacted, and culturally reproduced.

Haslam and Fiske's chapter 4 continues the focus on social cognition in culture, issuing a challenge to recent claims that "theory of mind," the capacity to attribute mental states to others, constitutes the singular foundation of human social competence. The authors argue that such "mind-reading" is only one component of our social capability, and that in many respects it is secondary to the sort of relational cognition—thinking about relations between people rather than the contents of other minds—that RMs theory captures. The mentalistic understanding of other individuals, they argue, is neither necessary for complex social interaction and organization nor universally prominent across cultures, and it may be best understood to operate in the service of a more basic form of relational understanding. The enthusiasm with which psychologists have received theory of mind as an encompassing view of social cognition may be symptomatic of its taken-for-granted individualism, which a relational perspective strives to correct.

Part III, "Justice and Fairness," collects three chapters that address justice and fairness, moving away from the more abstract and intrapsychic concerns of the previous section into discussions of discord and negotiation in particular social contexts. Goodnow's chapter 5 opens a revealing window onto the meanings and tensions surrounding household work within families, complete with compellingly drawn examples. She argues

that the RMs offer an integrative account of this domain, whereas many existing approaches to the field tacitly proceed within the terms of one model. Goodnow's chapter is notable for the serious attention it pays to the discord that arises when family members apply or wish to apply discrepant models to their work, a realistically warts-and-all portrait that shows how interpersonal life is not all smooth coordination but involves negotiation and conflict over how relationships are to be configured. Just as important is Goodnow's demonstration and insistence that the putting into practice of RMs depends crucially on settings and situations, and how necessary the concept of "implementation rules" is in this regard. A final virtue of this chapter is that it shows how much developmental considerations enter into the relational framing of household work, and how development remains largely neglected by RMs researchers.

Connelley and Folger's chapter 6 presents another valuable demonstration of the interpersonal tensions that arise when people bring discrepant RMs to bear on their interactions, this time in an organizational context. The chapter reports on a study of a conservative workplace's struggles with internal diversity, and how different groups of workers interpret the organizational culture in starkly different ways based on distinct RMs. The traditional core of White executives understands the nature of their relations to one another and to the company in a communal fashion, which conflicts with the egalitarian expectations of African-American workers and the meritocratic or equity-based preferences of many White women. The result, well captured in quotes from protagonists, is a picture of disharmony and a lesson to managers. Connelley and Folger clearly show how relational discord can be grounded in intergroup differences, and raise the intriguing possibility that the RMs reflect, in part, discursive resources that can be deployed by people in ways that advance the interests of their social position.

Folger and Butz's chapter 7 presents an innovative relational analysis of responses to injustice, focusing on the reactions of third parties to the abusive exercise of authority. They argue that these reactions are powerful emotional tendencies that must be understood in terms of Fiske's Authority Ranking model. Moral antipathy toward abusive authority has evolutionary roots, they suggest, and people are willing to sacrifice their self-interest to punish those who trigger it. Moral outrage such as this has an intrinsic hierarchical component, they speculate, and serves to ensure that power in organizational hierarchies is exercised in legitimate and circumscribed ways. This chapter reinforces the previous chapter's demonstration of how RMs theory can illuminate organizational phenomena, shows how it can be joined to evolutionary theorizing, and presents a good bridge to the next section of the book.

Part IV, on "Emotions, Values, and Moralities," contains three chapters that show how RMs theory can illuminate affective and evaluative proc-

esses. Although it is often presented as a rather formalistic and abstractly cognitive approach, the theory was always intended to account for the warm-blooded dimensions of interpersonal life. Whereas Part III focused attention on collective phenomena in organizations and families, the chapters in this section pay more heed to individuals' experiences of outrage, upset, and retaliation, and their distinctive motivational processes. Tetlock, McGraw, and Kristel's chapter 8 proceeds from an analysis of consistent violations of normative models of judgment. Rather than being intuitive scientists and economists, as normative models imagine, people often act as intuitive theologians, "trying to protect sacred values from secular encroachment." Our moral value commitments make certain kinds of "rational" judgment taboo, inviting moral outrage when breached. RMs theory helps to explain the sharp boundaries that acceptable forms of social judgment cannot cross, as it defines different relational grammars as incommensurable. To put monetary values on communal family bonds, to seek to buy body parts or to sell a gift from a loved one, or to judge individuals on the basis of attributes disproportionately associated with their social group when this conflicts with egalitarian efforts at reform, is to appear depraved and morally contaminated. Tetlock and his colleagues back their original theorizing with some path-breaking empirical work, which has real implications for the framing and presentation of public policy.

Whereas Tetlock and McGraw discussed particular ways in which values linked with particular RMs conflict and elicit moral outrage, Roccas and McCauley's chapter 9 offers a broader mapping of links between RMs, values, and emotions. The authors argue for a variety of associations between the models and a well-established value taxonomy, so that people who "prefer" certain models tend to hold certain broad motivational goals. People choose to engage in relationships of particular sorts because they are compatible with their values, they suggest, and relational experiences also shape personal value orientations. Holding value priorities that are incompatible with an operating RM will tend to produce interpersonal discord and intrapersonal distress. Such mismatches, where behaviors or motives violate relational expectations, may have distinctive affective consequences depending on the RM involved. Roccas and McCauley propose that different moral codes may also be implicated in these emotionally fraught violations.

Chapter 10, by Houde, Sherman, White, and Sheppard, extends its section's focus into the domain of interpersonal trust. Trust comes in different forms, they propose, according to the nature of the relationship involved, such as its degree of depth and interdependence, because different relationships carry different degrees and kinds of risks. They present some empirical evidence to show that people consider different risks to be relevant to different types of relationship, so that the RMs imply different varieties

of and bases for trust and perceptions of trustworthiness. This formulation indicates the problems of viewing trust as a unitary phenomenon, and encourages an understanding of it that is intrinsically relational rather than being grounded in personal attributes or broad contextual features, as in most contemporary research.

Part V, "Relational Models in the Clinic," concludes the volume with two chapters that examine how the RMs help to make sense of psychological disturbance and its treatment. Allen, Gilbert, and Semadar's chapter 11 offers a compelling analysis of depression—the psychological "common cold" of modernity—and in the process demonstrate how RMs theory can contribute to the emerging field of evolutionary psychiatry. They argue that depression, and the causal influences that bear on it, can be understood in relational terms. Although the interpersonal basis of depression is increasingly acknowledged, they note that many interpersonal accounts are framed within a single model. They argue instead that several RMs help to illuminate and explain many features of depressed behavior and cognition (e.g., vigilance for signs of social exclusion and signaling to secure social support), and propose an ambitious "social risk" theory of depressed states. Their theory makes several predictions about how depressed individuals will behave in different relational contexts, which should stimulate an exciting program of research.

Haslam's chapter 12 closes the volume with a relational analysis of personality disorders, enduring conditions that are poorly understood but cry out for some form of interpersonal understanding. He argues that many of these conditions can be conceptualized as reflecting inflexible biases in the implementation of particular RMs. These biases generate predictable forms of interpersonal disruption because they lead disordered individuals to construe relationships in ways that are discrepant with their interactants. Such discrepancies have been discussed in intrafamilial and intergroup contexts in earlier chapters by Goodnow and Connelley and Folger, but may also reflect individuals' interpersonal propensities. Empirical support for this relational account of personality disorders is presented, and the account is compared with some alternative interpersonal theories. Implications for discrepant relational construals in therapy—one of the more complicated forms of interpersonal encounter—are also discussed.

These two chapters show how RMs theory enables new understandings of abnormal psychological phenomena, and can serve as an innovative alternative to the more well-trodden interpersonal models that are currently employed. They also suggest that although the theory has generally been perceived as an account of our shared social-cognitive endowment, it can also make sense of how people differ, whether in adaptive or maladaptive ways. Individual differences in relational tendencies represent a research area in which more work is clearly required.

Together, I hope, the book's 12 chapters present the interested reader with a snapshot of a theory that is very much in motion, and that illuminates a wide variety of phenomena. On the book's evidence, it seems clear that the next decade will see a continuing extension and development of RMs research.

—Nick Haslam

This page intentionally left blank

PART

I

FUNDAMENTALS

This page intentionally left blank

Relational Models Theory 2.0

Alan Page Fiske

Relational models theory is simple: People relate to each other in just four ways.¹ Interaction can be structured with respect to (1) what people have in common, (2) ordered differences, (3) additive imbalances, or (4) ratios. When people focus on what they have in common, they are using a model we call Communal Sharing. When people construct some aspect of an interaction in terms of ordered differences, the model is Authority Ranking. When people attend to additive imbalances, they are framing the interaction in terms of the Equality Matching model. When they coordinate their actions according to proportions or rates, the model is Market Pricing. Everyone uses this repertoire of relational capacities to plan and to generate their own action; to understand, remember, and anticipate others; to coordinate the joint production of collective action and institutions; and to evaluate their own and others' action. In different cultures, people use these four relational models in different ways, in different contexts, and in differing degrees. In short, four innate, open-ended relational structures, completed by congruent socially transmitted complements, structure most social action, thought, and motivation. That's the theory.

These are the four fundamental, innate, human relational proclivities. To signify that they are cognitively modular but modifiable modes of interacting, I call them "mods." However, these open-ended generative potentials are insufficient in themselves to determine action or evaluation, or permit

¹I thank Nick Haslam, Barbara Fiske, and Rick Wicks for helpful comments on this chapter.

coordination. In order to use these mods to act or to interpret others' action, people need socially transmitted prototypes, precedents, and principles that complete the mods, specifying how and when and with respect to whom the mods apply. I use the term "preo" to signify the class of paradigms, parameters, precepts, prescriptions, propositions, and proscriptions that can be conjoined with mods. A mod must be conjoined with a preo that complements it to generate a specific cultural coordination device.

This theory was first set out in primitive form in a 1990 article, and then developed fully in my 1991 book, *Structures of Social Life*, and an article that summarized the core ideas (Fiske, 1992). I expected then that the theory might have to be revised considerably once others had the opportunity to analyze it, and certainly once it was empirically tested. Surprisingly, discussions and extensive tests of the theory have not indicated any need for substantial revision (yet!). However, they have facilitated the development of a somewhat clearer, perhaps more cogent formulation of the theory, which this chapter presents.

THE FOUR ELEMENTARY RELATIONAL STRUCTURES

The Communal Sharing (CS) mod bases sociality on the perception that a set of persons have something in common—something that makes them socially equivalent in some respect. (Typically, people are aware that the set is composed of individuals and subsets who are different in other respects.) The set may include the self, or may be a set of others who are treated as functionally equivalent for certain purposes. To organize any given aspect of a relationship in any given context, people must complete this mod with preos that define what who has in common with whom: "blood" kinship defined by descent through the mother, father, or both; blood consumed in an act of ritual brotherhood; a home and economic or parental responsibilities; religion; employment by a corporation; attendance at a school or college; membership on the same team or being fans of one; being followers of the same leader; nationality, birthplace, or culturally defined "ethnicity"; joint responsibility for a task or group decision; a shared resource such as a home, granary, commons, park, or road system; collective moral responsibility either for each other's acts or for each other's welfare; a type of misfortune or problem (breast cancer, alcoholism, an earthquake, epidemic, or terrorist strike); membership in a secret society; an age-set defined by initiation; or simply the sentiment of belonging together, with a shared past and future. The mod may structure the interaction of a dyad, a group, or an "imagined community" (Anderson, 1983) who never all assemble together and do not know the identities of all the others. People may be motivated

by what they see themselves as having in common with living humans, deceased persons, ancestors, spirits, gods, pets, domestic animals, or other social beings. Everyone has Communal Sharing relations with many primary or reference groups, as well as CS relationships that are less intense and more restricted in significance. Some of the equivalence sets to which a person belongs are wholly included subsets of broader CS groups; others merely intersect.

The Authority Ranking (AR) mod bases sociality on asymmetrical difference, typically transitive and hence linearly ordered. This mod itself does not define how people are ordered with respect to specific social practices or values. Hence people using this mod must complete it with socially transmitted preos which define how to rank people: by age, gender, caste, seniority, promotion system, achievement on a task or test, contest or combat, passage through a ritual, possession of symbolic paraphernalia, bestowal of fiefdom, position determined by divination or revelation, charismatic performance, religious devotion, election, delegation or appointment by higher authority. In most cultures, each person participates in a variety of AR relations with all kinds of tangible and intangible beings. But there is a tendency to assimilate the preos used to rank any given set of persons, creating a single ordering across contexts. However, in some instances people use distinct preos, ranking the same set of persons differently in different contexts or with respect to different issues: for example, by age or seniority for some purposes, but by office for other purposes.

The Equality Matching (EM) mod constructs relations according to additive interval differences, with even balance as the reference point. Examples include turn-taking; lottery or coin-flip; voting; eye-for-an-eye, tooth-for-a-tooth vengeance; rotating credit associations; baby-sitting coops; balanced in-kind reciprocity such as exchange of favors or dinner invitations; matching contributions; distributions divided into equal shares; symmetrical playing fields and even numbers of players in sports; and equal starting points and resources in games and contests. The EM mod defines unit differences as additive and subtractive, but does not specify what constitutes a unit, or, for example, what delay should occur between events. Cultural coordination devices differ as a function of preos that indicate, for example, what constitutes a turn, a favor, a dinner, an episode of baby-sitting, the number of castles on a chess board or the number of minutes available to each player for making moves. Coordination requires socially transmitted preos determining the length of a half in a sporting event, the procedure for assigning teams to ends of the field, and who calls the coin flip. How long should a person wait before offering a return invitation? Is the offer of a bride sufficient restitution for the life taken in a homicide? If a kin group gives a bride to another group, who is entitled to the bride given in return? What sort of bride should they expect, and when? May they state their

claim explicitly, or would that be rude? Who is eligible to vote, and what constitutes a valid vote? The EM mod is necessary for structuring each of these activities, but preos are necessary too. Neither is sufficient—they complement each other, fitting together to provide a definite model for generating, interpreting, coordinating, judging, and motivating coordinated action.

The Market Pricing (MP) mod organizes interaction with reference to ratios or rates. Depending on the preos that complete the mod, it yields such cultural coordination devices as prices, wages, rents, interest, dividends, tithes and taxes, efficiency calculations, and cost–benefit analyses. Money is a common medium for MP, but relationships based on MP often do not involve money, and money is often a medium for relationships based on other mods. When people ask themselves, “Is what I’m getting out of this relationship proportional to what I’m putting into it?” they are using MP to judge relational equity. MP appears in utilitarian moral reasoning when people use a common metric for evaluating aggregate welfare in terms of the greatest good for the greatest number. It appears when the military makes decisions based on ratios of fighter planes lost or on infantry kill-ratios.

To implement the MP mod to coordinate an interaction, people require preos that indicate the factors that determine the specific ratios, as well as the measures for the numerator and denominator: How do you measure rice and labor? What qualities of rice determine its value? How many kilograms of rice does one owe in return for an hour of unskilled labor at harvest time? Does the baby sitter get paid per hour or per child per hour? People also need preos to guide them in determining who is eligible to participate in what kinds of MP entities: Should I pay for the soup my mother fed me? May I sell you one of my kidneys, or my gestational services?

IMPLEMENTATIONS AND COMBINATIONS OF THE FOUR BONDS

Preos indicate how to apply a mod, and they also specify which mod operates among which people with respect to which entities in which domains. Hence the relational mods represent alternative ways of doing anything social. However, the innumerable particular implementations varying across culture, history, and domain reflect just four generative structures. For example, there are four basic ways of making a collective decision: People can decide how to respond to a terrorist attack by consensus, by following a chain of command, by voting, or by cost–benefit analysis. Likewise, there are four basic ways of organizing work: People can clean the beaches by encouraging everyone to take responsibility as a community (perhaps volun-

tarily showing up for the annual cleanup), by assigning the task to subordinates, by dividing the coast into equal strips for each person to clean, or by soliciting bids from waste management companies. Similarly, there are four basic ways of using land to mediate social relations: A lot can be a commons held by all for all to use. It can be a fief granted by the king that constitutes the holder as lord over all vassals resident in it. It can be a homestead of fixed size granted to each citizen who farms it and establishes residence. Or it can be an investment to be rented or developed for profit. Again, there are four basic ways for a culture to organize the temporal aspect of a social interaction: People may take turns, alternating temporal intervals. Alternatively, time may mark precedence: In West African villages, you must offer a libation to the ancestors before drinking, and pass the calabash of beer along according to status, from senior to junior. Time can also be a denominator for remuneration: interest at 6% per annum, rent at \$1,200 a month. In CS relationships, people may think of their relationship as timeless—they feel they have “always” been together and should be together forever.

Obviously there are great cultural differences in the prevalence and ideological valuation of the four relational models, so what is natural in one community, historical epoch, or domain is abhorrent in another. There have been many societies where the sale of land was no more conceivable than the sale of the sun or the ocean, and there were societies in which it was routine to sell sex or slaves.

The indeterminacy of the mods gives them a generative potential to combine with innumerable cultural preos to coordinate social activity in any domain of human life: labor, exchange, contribution, distribution, consumption, collective decision making, political ideology, moral judgment, religion, the interpretation of misfortune, aggression, sports and games, marriage, or the social meaning of time, place, and objects. This means that, for effective, mutually comprehensible social coordination of innumerable types of activities, humans need only the four social mods, along with mechanisms for discerning the cultural preos necessary for implementing the mods as specific cultural coordination devices. Because there are innumerable preos, people generate varied cultures. But because all humans have the same relational mods, children, immigrants, and social scientists are capable of apprehending and participating in any culture.

The core of the theory is this idea that people use the same set of four implicit cognitive schemas to organize all of the diverse domains of sociality most of the time. For example, as the term *Authority Ranking* indicates, relational model theory posits that prestige/value/status hierarchies have the same cognitive basis as legitimate power/control/command. These are obviously distinct implementations of AR, since having greater prestige does not confer the authority to command another. In the one

case, there is a linear ordering of social value, in the other a linear ordering of social control. But analytically, they have relational structures that are formally homologous, and people rely on the same implicit cognitive tools to construct them.

There are four basic forces in the physical universe, structuring interaction among a small set of elementary particles. The complexity and variability of the physical universe result from diverse manifestations and combinations of these few fundamental forces and particles. If relational models theory is correct, the social universe may also be based on just four basic relational bonds. The diversity and complexity of human societies, institutions, and relationships results from diverse manifestations and combinations of the four mods. Indeed, most dyadic relationships, and all stable groups and institutions, are formed out of combinations of models, concatenated or nested. For example, survivors of an attack may seek vengeance in an EM mode, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. At the same time, the CS model structures both group responsibility for wreaking vengeance and the conflating of persons targeted as collectively responsible: The CS model operates when people feel that “we” have to get revenge against “them”—it does not particularly matter who among “us” carries out the counterattack, or which of “them” suffer. Everyone in the in-group is equivalent as victims and agents, so the group is the unit of suffering, justice, and retaliatory action; meanwhile “they” are a relational unit in which all persons are equivalent targets. MP may govern another phase of the event if leaders consider the costs and benefits of alternative means of wreaking vengeance. At the same time, AR may operate in leadership of the strategic decisions and among the military units who carry out the attacks—or in mediating a peaceful settlement.

Likewise, consider a diplomatic or military dinner party. At formal functions where rank is marked, guests should arrive in inverse order of rank (subordinates arriving earlier and awaiting superiors) and leave in order of rank (no one leaving before anyone superior to them). Seating at the table also marks rank. However, the food was purchased and the staff paid in an MP framework. But guests share what they eat and drink—the food and drink is theirs collectively to freely consume. Indeed, eating and drinking together marks and constitutes a bond of solidarity among those who partake. At the same time, participants exchange toasts with one another, matching one-to-one, and may feel obligated to reciprocate the hospitality by later inviting their host to a corresponding dinner. So all four models may operate at the same time or in succession, organizing distinct aspects of the social event. Different implementations, combinations, and sequences of the four elementary models thus generate a complex world full of unique interactions.

“RELATIONSHIPS”

As these examples illustrate, the term “relationship” is confusing in this theoretical context because, for example, it is not exact to state that people are “in” or “have” a CS relationship. This terminology reifies the models as if they were places that enclose persons, or kinds of objects that a set of people can possess, which are misleading metaphors. People may use a single model to coordinate the simplest, most transitory interactions. But generally the various aspects of interactions among a dyad or group are governed by more than one relational model; different aspects of an interaction may be simultaneously construed in terms of different models. Even if a set of people consistently use a single mod, they would have to implement it with somewhat different preos on different occasions. In other words, relational models are cognitive-affective-motivational models of and for aspects of interaction, not necessarily comprehensive or stable properties of sets of people. Nevertheless, if we keep this in mind, it may suffice and it simplifies expression to write or speak of “people in a CS relationship” rather than the more precise “people using the CS mod with certain preos to coordinate a particular aspect of their interaction in one domain at a certain point in time.”

Relational models theory posits that people are inherently sociable, by nature. *Homo sapiens* evolved these relational proclivities because of the benefits all parties tend to reap from participation in coordinated social action. Consequently, the relational models are not merely cognitive capacities: they are intrinsically motivating. People need and seek each of these kinds of relationship, although it seems that the four needs are not equally strong when they emerge in childhood. Furthermore, during development, cultural practices doubtless amplify or attenuate, redirect, and transform relational needs. Moreover, sociomoral emotions guide people to seek, create, sustain, sanction, transform, or terminate relationships (Fiske, 2002). Sociomoral emotions are proxies for the long-term expected adaptive value of relationships. That is, these emotions are motivational representations of the systemic state of relationships, directing people to act in ways likely to promote valuable relationships.² For example, people who lack important or adequate relationships of a particular kind experience specific “appetites” for that type of relationship. Certain emotions reflect the positive value of good relationships, such as love in some CS relationships, awe/rev-

²Most cultures lack clearly defined folk-concepts or lexical representations of many of these emotional experiences, just as they lack surface representations of many other basic psychological and social processes, such as the four mods, or syntactical features of language. We should not expect ethno-psychology to be psychological science, and if the lexicon were a good representation of basic psychological and social phenomena, social science would be just the compilation of dictionaries.

erence in AR (looking up), comradeship in EM, and sense of satisfaction from good MP transactions (“got a good price on that!”). A person who has transgressed an important relationship experiences emotions motivating them to redress that relationship, and so on. Emotions are essential for sustaining social relationships because optimistic and misleading cognitive biases and heuristics, hyperbolic discounting, and the covert nature of many social sanctions would make it virtually impossible for people to reliably learn, or consistently make reflective decisions to act in accord with, their long-term relational interests (Fiske, 2002).

Using the term, *relationships* in the colloquial sense, people often suppose that MP is not a relationship. But MP is, of course, a model—a structure or implicit schema, a syntax—for generating, coordinating, and evaluating interaction. However, it does seem to be true that MP relationships typically have less intrinsic motivational value for participants. And, compared to the other three models, when MP relationships do arouse strong emotions, it appears that, on average, much of the emotional intensity is linked to the extrinsic consequences of people’s actions, rather than being intrinsic to the MP relationships for its own sake. People more often engage in MP relationships largely as means to extrinsic ends; this is much less common in EM and AR, and relatively rare in CS relationships. Economists, of course, generally assume that people interact solely in order to pursue individual self-interest. Nonetheless, it is notable that economists who focus on the advantages and problems of close coordination have discovered three basic types of institutions: markets and hierarchies (Simon, 1981; Williamson, 1975, 1985, 1996), and “clans” (Ouchi, 1980). The institutional approach argues that the form of organization used is the one which minimizes “transaction costs.” Williamson assumes that markets are the default system, and people only adopt other structures when explicit contracts fail to control costly uncertainties. In contrast, Simon analyzes how markets and hierarchies correspond to different ways of using information to make decisions. (Note, however, that by “hierarchy” neither author means a simple linear ordering; they mean a dendritic pyramid kind of vertical integration that involves the inclusion of multiple lower level units under and within each higher level unit.)

I was unaware of the transaction-cost approach to institutions when I developed relational models theory. Furthermore, the transaction-cost economists developed their ideas without being aware of Udy’s (1959, 1970) discovery, based on analysis of a huge sample of ethnographies, of four basic forms of organizing labor in traditional societies. Indeed, my perception of the principal contribution of relational models theory is that it shows researchers in many fields that the systems of coordination they are studying are not limited to any particular domain—and therefore cannot be products of causes specific to any one domain.

The proximity of a set of persons, or their perception of one another, do not, ipso facto, constitute a “social relationship.” Humans who are present in the same space or otherwise aware of another’s physical existence are not necessarily coordinating their interaction with reference to relational models: Desperate to reach her train, a woman running along a sidewalk dodges parking meters, fire hydrants, signs, manikins left on the pavement, dogs, and humans—taking into account the expected trajectories of these obstacles but without necessarily coordinating her movement with reference to an implicitly shared model such as “keep to the right.” This is a “null” relationship: The people are aware of each other’s physical existence, but lack any joint, motivated schema to coordinate and evaluate each other’s actions. Consider another hypothetical example: Two hungry men, strangers from different cultures, discover a troop of gorillas eating fruit from a tall tree on the other side of a river—and they all see each other. The men may establish a relationship, cooperating to cross the river, drive away the gorillas, and then harvest and consume the fruit. Or they may treat each other as mere obstacles to satisfying their own hunger, like the river and the gorillas. In the latter case, they have a null relationship.

Relational models theory claims that there are only four universal, motivated relational models that people are disposed to use for virtually all aspects of every domain of social interaction. People use combinations of relational models to coordinate nearly all social activities. In that sense the relational models are fundamental and basic. However, they are not exhaustive, because people do invent specialized, culture-specific schemas for coordinating particular types of interaction. There are models for coordination in specific situations that do not seem to derive from any relational model: “Drive on the right,” “discard high to signal your partner to lead the suit again,” “wave a white flag to signal desire for a truce,” or “only chiefs may build rectangular houses and place ostrich eggs at the roof corners.”³ Special coordination devices such as these probably were invented once and diffused to certain other cultures but remain limited to one domain. In contrast, coordination devices that are derived from the four relational models are pervasive.

Mods have certain characteristic features that distinguish them from special-purpose cultural coordination devices (adapted and shortened from Fiske, 2000):

- They are extremely widespread across cultures and pervasive within them; that is, a distinctive, consistent structure occurs very widely, gen-

³Such models can be linked to relational models, for example, if a person claims damages in an MP framework from a person who veered to the left across the median. Or a father playing bridge might treat his son’s failure to discard high as an impertinence, violating their AR relationship.

erating indefinitely many specific cultural coordination devices (e.g., many ways of taking turns or reciprocating in-kind).

- They are closely associated with highly structured learning mechanisms that result in reliable development of specific competences, despite highly variable and imperfect cultural input.
- Virtually all adults are capable of using them, despite vast differences in individual experience and general intelligence.
- They are each constituted, communicated, and culturally completed in a semiotically distinct medium corresponding to an homologous mode of cognitive representation (see Fiske, chap. 3, this volume).
- Children characteristically search actively for and take the initiative to engage in these forms of interaction. Children experiment and innovate in ways not readily induced from the input stimuli and make constructive mistakes that could not result from simple associative induction.
- People have focused, oriented motives for forming these types of relationship, along with emotions oriented to sustaining and sanctioning them.
- These types of relationship have significant adaptive advantages and result from plausible processes of natural selection.
- These relationships have neurological substrates characterized by a significant degree of functional modularity.

The four relational mods are the only ones with these features that structure social coordination in all domains of human activity. However, there seem to be other mods that generate ritual (Dulaney & Fiske, 1994; Fiske & Haslam, 1997), language, and taboos concerning sex and food. These mods cross-cut or intersect with the four relational mods and with each other: Language is an important medium for the conduct of relationships, while rituals are important in constituting and transforming relationships.

There are also mods that shape how people construct, evaluate, motivate, and cognize *combinations* of relationships. These meta-relational mods constitute a distinct level of psychology and social relations, not yet adequately characterized by a general theory. Since the 1970s the principal focus of social psychology has been on how people perceive, categorize, and make inferences about other individuals. This research on person perception, stereotyping, and identity investigates how people process a particularly important kind of stimulus: humans (including the self). Relational models theory describes another level of social cognition: how people coordinate interaction. A third level of social cognition and evaluation involves “syntactical” models of how relationships combine with each other: Some sets of relationships imply or constitute other relationships, whereas other

sets of good relationships are mutually incompatible with each other. This is meta-relational cognition.

INNATENESS, AND HOW RELATIONAL MODS MIGHT HAVE EVOLVED

Are these four systems of coordination “in” the mind, or are they emergent arrangements that result from logical or systemic constraints on the possibilities for organizing any social interaction? Would any intelligent agent with sophisticated communicative abilities quickly discover and adopt these four forms of sociality? The universality and pervasiveness of these four forms of relationship does not imply that they are innate. Suppose these models were not prepared cognitive proclivities built in to our neural architecture as it emerges during development. We might still observe these structures in every domain of sociality in every culture because of their functional advantages or because they represent some other kind of stable equilibrium such as an evolutionarily stable strategy (Maynard Smith & Price, 1973).

These four relational structures do seem to have special functional advantages, so people who invent or imitate these forms of organization may benefit from doing so. Under some conditions, insight into these advantages, or cultural group selection, may result in the cultural reproduction and diffusion of forms of organization beneficial to the group (Boyd & Richerson, 2002). Consider, however, how natural selection probably shaped human cognition and motivation to fit advantageous forms of sociality (Fiske, 2000). A system of social coordination that is typically advantageous to all participants is an adaptive niche, an opportunity for enhancing fitness. Natural selection will favor individuals who have heritable tendencies to learn to set up such systems, engage others in them, and participate advantageously. (This kind of evolution is often called “Baldwinian selection” for the assimilation of learned behaviors; for an overview, see Fiske, 2000.) Every time humans invent or stumble into such an arrangement in any domain where it confers benefits, individuals who readily learn and effectively engage in the coordination system will have greater fitness than those who are less capable or less disposed to do so. That is, it will be adaptive to structure and orient general imitative skills, selectively tuning them so people become adept at reproducing adaptive coordination systems observed among others—and inventing new adaptive systems. Moreover, once humans launch a jointly beneficial coordination system in one specific domain, it will be tremendously advantageous for individuals to learn to generalize their acquired capacities to other domains where they will also function advantageously. We would thus expect natural selection

to yield cognitive–emotional proclivities structured enough to facilitate their easy, reliable, sophisticated use, yet flexible enough to permit them to be used in an indefinite variety of domains. People should evolve capacities and motives that are effectively organized but open-ended so they can be readily used to solve novel or locally variable adaptive problems. Indeed, this kind of structured cognitive flexibility permits humans to take advantage of the maximum range of social opportunities and thereby exploit many novel ecological niches. In short, because the same four relational systems work well to coordinate most aspects of social action in innumerable domains of joint activity, it is extremely advantageous to be able to apply them adeptly and flexibly.

Thus asking whether the relational mods are emergent or innate is somewhat like asking whether color is “in” the environment or “in” the perceptual system. Relational mods are mental adaptations to fundamental affordances of social coordination—adaptations to relational niches. Baldwinian theory and the approach of Tooby and Cosmides (1992) explain how and why specialized domain-specific cognitive capacities would evolve. But neurons are metabolically expensive and the birth canal limits the size of the human brain as well, so there are strong costs and constraints to evolving innumerable specialized modules rigidly dedicated to narrow tasks. Rigid, domain-specific modules would impede construction of adaptively flexible social systems and adaptive functioning in them, and would block rapid adaptation to new conditions. Whenever possible, natural selection should thus produce a small number of structured yet flexible, open-ended, generative proclivities that facilitate adaptive social coordination across diverse domains in diverse environments.

However, we know little about the phylogeny of the relational models. (For useful reviews, see Haslam, 1997 on primates and Dugatkin, 1997 on “cooperation” among animals.) Yet many social birds and mammals and some reptiles form dominance hierarchies: Is the human proclivity for AR a direct evolutionary homolog of these social dispositions and cognitions? That is, did phylogenetically deep psychological proclivities to create dominance hierarchies evolve directly into human AR? Or is AR a novel, distinct, analogical adaptation that evolved independently out of other cognitive capacities? Nonhuman dominance hierarchies are constituted by threat–deference asymmetries related to priority of access to desirable resources such as scarce food, nest sites, or (for males) sexually receptive females. Primate dominance consists largely of the subordinate animal conceding defeat when attacked by a dominant individual or coalition, and either ceding a resource when threatened by a superior, or offering an appeasement–deference signal. Human hierarchies sometimes involve this sort of aggressive confrontation resolved by threat, submission, and appeasement.

Also, human AR often does regulate access to resources and mating opportunities. So AR could be a generalization of dominance hierarchies. Eventually, fMRI studies of the functional neuroanatomy of relational models in humans may provide clues about the phylogeny of AR (Jacoboni et al., in press). As of this writing, however, virtually nothing is known about the neuroanatomy of primate dominance hierarchies, so we have nothing to compare the human data to yet.

It seems likely that human CS evolved as a flexible generalization of mammalian parental care, just as parental care seems to have evolved several times into pair bonding in certain birds, a few mammals, and a couple of primates (including Titi monkeys; Manson, 1997). Only a very few mammals actively share food with other adults or share the feeding and care of offspring, notably some species of canids and, more extensively, mole-rats (Bennett & Faulkes, 2000). Many of the callitrichidae (marmosets and tamarins, New World primates) are polyandrous, with multiple males actively cooperating to carry, feed and care for the large twins that are normally born. No other living primate is known to do this, so human CS probably is an independently evolved analog of food-sharing and cooperative proclivities in other taxa. Alternatively, CS may be an evolutionary outgrowth of collective group defense and attack against nongroup members, evident in a number of primates and other mammals (on chimpanzees, especially, see Manson & Wrangham, 1991).

Many people have suggested that Market Pricing, in particular, is not innate—or that if it is an innate, socially specialized capacity, it has little or no inherent motivational force unless this is culturally fostered during development or early adulthood. My hypothesis is that MP is currently in the process of being assimilated into cognitive and motivational proclivities: It is becoming a mod. If so, it provides an opportunity to study an intermediate stage in the progression from invention and transmission based on general cognitive and imitative skills, along the way to assimilation into a structured generative mental proclivity. However, because most learning in most organisms requires comparison of temporal and other rates (Gallistel & Gibbon, 2000), MP may possibly represent a unique case in which a *general* cognitive mechanism is developing an offshoot specialized for social coordination. That is, the capacity to use rates and other proportions to coordinate social interaction may have evolved from general-purpose, non-social capacities to calculate reinforcement ratios. If so, it is not clear why only humans evolved this social capacity, unless MP depends on symbolic representation—as indeed it does (Fiske, chap. 3, this volume).

The question that remains is what permitted humans to evolve these flexibly *generative* relational capacities out of the much more rigid, limited, domain-specific precursors of their ancestors. The most important factors

may have included the synergistic effects of combining language with social relationships, along with the emergence of increasingly abstract cognition, including analogical reasoning.

A PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEORY

Relational models theory has roots in many other theories and research traditions; one of my principal aims in developing the theory was to integrate the classical theories of human sociality. From the beginning, I was committed to the idea that an adequate theory of human sociality must integrate evolutionary, psychological, developmental, social, and cultural processes. This commitment was fostered by my interdisciplinary training: My undergraduate major at Harvard College was Social Relations. When I graduated from Harvard I joined the Peace Corps, working in public health for 4 years in Malawi and the Congo. This experience awakened me to the importance of culture in shaping human life, and nearly steered me into a career in public policy and international development. When I opted to pursue my intellectual interests, I knew I wanted to explore human social psychology from a perspective that incorporated culture. Exploring my options, I entered the Social Science Divisional MA program at the University of Chicago, a flexible program where I specialized in something called "Cross-Cultural Problems." That winter I took a course from Robert LeVine that provided a framework for what I wanted to do: psychological anthropology. I entered the University of Chicago PhD program in the Committee on Human Development.

In Human Development I studied broadly across psychology, anthropology, and evolutionary studies. When Bob LeVine left for Harvard I started working with Richard Shweder; so I am an intellectual grandchild of their Harvard mentors, John and Beatrice Whiting (although unfortunately I took no classes with them as a Harvard undergraduate). My notion of science as a mode of understanding and explanation was (and still is) that it is a search for patterns, an attempt to construct simpler descriptions of regularities in a complex universe. My first efforts along these lines were a series of literature review papers I wrote in several courses, bringing together empirical research in developmental and social psychology and animal behavior. These papers analyzed aspects of what I called "The Group Bond" in humans and other mammals. I looked for diverse evidence for a preadolescent sensitive period when group identity is most salient and labile, out of which adult group identity is likely to crystallize. This work later influenced my conception of Communal Sharing relationships.

The interests that I developed in graduate school became defined by the intersection of two goals: first, understanding how the psyche that all humans share at birth develops into culture-specific commitments and practices; second, understanding how natural selection, cognition–motivation, development, socialization, and other processes result in sociable, generally moral adults. I was skeptical of the socialization theories I encountered. The descriptions of moral thinking in Jean Piaget’s *The Moral Judgment of the Child* captured my interest, although his rationalist–individualist theory did not. Years earlier, I had struggled with Max Weber in an undergraduate political history class, so I was somewhat resistant when Donald Levine (a sociologist on my PhD committee) pointed me toward Weber’s massive unfinished *Economy and Society*; he told me no one could be a social scientist without reading it. Don knew it in the original, but I bought the excellent English translation and spent months working through it, coming to Don occasionally to get help and discuss it. At some point I perceived a congruence between three of Piaget’s stages of moral development and Weber’s typology of forms of legitimation of authority. I was very intrigued by this apparent correspondence between forms of ideology and stages of moral justification. To simplify somewhat, Piaget’s immanent justice, heteronomy, and mutual respect and cooperation seemed to correspond respectively to Weber’s traditional, charismatic, and rational–legal legitimation (although eventually I came to see that traditional legitimation conflated what I later called CS and AR).

A little later, someone (I think a fellow student) recommended to me a book by Paul Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, which dissects the history of Christian theodicy. Ricoeur describes early conceptions of evil as defilement (dread of the impure), supplanted later by sin (rebellion against God), and finally a rationalized ethicization. I was astonished to discover what I perceived as a third congruent typology in this new domain. (Ricoeur was at Chicago, but I failed to avail myself of the opportunity to meet or work with him. The nature of the congruence among these three theoretical taxonomies is discussed more fully in Fiske, 1991, pp. 25–30.)

Bob Levine told me that I couldn’t be an anthropologist without doing fieldwork, and cheerfully rejected my pleas that I didn’t need to do fieldwork because I had just returned from 4 years in Africa as a Peace Corps Volunteer. So I decided my dissertation fieldwork should explore the ethnographic validity and utility of the tripartite theoretical framework that resulted from synthesizing Piaget, Weber, and Ricoeur. I wrote a dissertation proposal and totally rewrote it a score of times. I wanted to study foragers, partly as a change from the farmers I had worked with in the Peace Corps, and partly because my interests in evolution suggested that understanding foragers was far more important than understanding farmers or

pastoralists. But my reading and inquiries indicated that there were no African foragers with intact cultures living independently of farmers and pastoralists (I didn't know of the Hadza). So I decided to study the Samburu, cattle people of northern Kenya. The Social Science Research Council gave me a dissertation grant to do this, but before I left I was unexpectedly offered a chance to be a Peace Corps country director. Excited by the prospect of international development policy formulation and programming, I accepted the offer, chose Upper Volta as the most challenging and rewarding of the openings, abandoned the Samburu, postponed my fieldwork, and went to Ouagadougou. My plan was to study the largest culture in Upper Volta, the Moose ("Mossi") after my term as country director. So in Ouagadougou I studied the Moore language and, in 1979, went with my wife and infant daughter to live and conduct my fieldwork in a village for 2 years. Once I picked a field site, I lived and worked without an interpreter or assistant, trying to immerse myself in everyday village life; it was the most confusing, overwhelming, exciting, and rewarding intellectual experience of my life. Working among the Moose, I found not just the three relational structures I was looking for, but important social practices that just did not match any of those three. When I returned to write my dissertation, I formulated the concept of Equality Matching to encompass these observations.

To my surprise, I was hired by the University of Pennsylvania Department of Psychology, so I quickly finished my dissertation and then began to think about a book. Despite my fieldwork, I lacked confidence in my quadri-form theory. I could readily see how to incorporate Töniés' *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* and Durkheim's mechanical and organic solidarity, but I still wondered whether I was just projecting into all these theories, and into Moose life, what I wanted to see. So, to test my inferences, I started reading about other domains of social life, deductively testing my emerging theory on the literature: If indeed people had four fundamental ways of organizing social relations, the four structures should be evident in any well-studied domain. Soon after, I came to Karl Polanyi's analysis of the basic forms of exchange: householding (clearly CS), redistribution (by chiefs, AR), reciprocity (EM), and markets (MP). Then I found Udy's two comprehensive surveys of how people recruit labor and organize production: familial (CS), custodial (AR), reciprocal (EM), contractual (MP), and voluntary (null). I began to be less skeptical about my synthetic theory: I had the eerie feeling that these congruencies could only be the result of four fundamental forms of human social cognition. Influenced by Geertz's extension of Ryles' theory of culture as "models of and for" action, and by Roy D'Andrade's emerging theory of cognitive models and schemas with directive force, I named these entities "relational models."

I was so excited about my assimilative synthesis that I wrote much of the book before it even occurred to me that this theory had to explain the *differ-*

ences in the manifestations of the four elementary models across different domains: How could the same models be used to organize such disparate practices? This led to my formulation of the concept of implementation rules or, as the idea developed, preos. I am still thinking about this problem, focusing on three issues: First, how do children (and adult outsiders) discover how to implement their mods in ways that permit them to coordinate in locally appropriate and meaningful ways? Second, what is the cognitive form in which each relational model is represented in the human mind? Third, what are the relative advantages of specialized domain-specific modules versus flexible generative capacities that are effective in diverse, varying, and novel domains? My most recent conceptualization of the first two issues is in the third chapter in this book; the third issue is explored in Fiske, 2000.

I wrote *The Elementary Structures of Social Life* (Fiske, 1991) for my own intellectual pleasure, and of course for a general social science audience. But I also had in mind my colleagues in the University of Pennsylvania Department of Psychology—a group of smart people that I expected to be cogently skeptical of such broad claims. The book was also implicitly an argument with the relativistic cultural constructionists who were dominant in the Department of Anthropology when I was a graduate student in Human Development. I had many challenging University of Chicago-type arguments with Anthropology faculty and graduate students there, most of whom regarded psychological and biological explanations as anathema. I hoped (futilely, no doubt) to convince them that it was possible for universal evolved mechanisms to generate cultural diversity and uniqueness—and to show why.

A theory is intellectual poetry, and a good theory has a beautiful esthetic purity. I didn't want to pollute my theory by bringing it into contact with dirty data. Yet I knew psychologists would never take this synthetic-inductive theory seriously without deductive hypothesis-testing. I didn't really *want* to test the theory—there are so many good reasons why data might fail to support a valid theory! But I knew I had to. So, intrigued by the experience of my children occasionally calling me “Mom,” I launched a series of studies of naturally occurring social errors, working with Kathryn Mason (the “Mom” whom the kids sometimes called “Dad”), and hiring an unassumingly brilliant student, Nick Haslam. Nick was very skeptical, but he took the job and went to work on the study. We were all somewhat surprised when the data came in clearly supporting the theory—in study after study. Nick then thought up the idea (entirely on his own, while I was spending a quarter at UCSD) of testing the book's even more implausible claim that the four models were discrete cognitive categories, rather than being cognized in a continuous dimensional space. This was such a fundamental tenet of the theory that if I had known what Nick was up to 2,800 miles away, I wouldn't have let him get away with seriously jeopardizing the

already-supported theory. But he did it, ingeniously adopting Meehl's taxonomic methods to this new domain, with clear results that surprised us all again in their support of the theory.

When I gave job talk and then other colloquia on the theory, I did so with trepidation. Surely someone would raise a hand at the end and suggest an obvious fifth relational model; perhaps the audience would come up with dozens! They never did. The core of the talk was the claim that the same four structures were evident in many different social domains, so I always wondered if someone would show that the structures in different domains were, in fact, basically different. So far, no one has.

ISSUES AND CONFUSIONS

My conceptions of the relational models have developed somewhat since the early 1990s. My approach in the 1991 book was very assimilative, as I attempted to find connections across diverse theories and research. However, as the book neared completion I realized that I had been somewhat indiscriminate, or at least theoretically vague, in my enthusiasm to find homologies among the many theories I was attempting to integrate. I realized that I should try to discern the defining features of each model, distinguishing these universal mods (as I have come to call them more recently) from the infinitely diverse cultural coordination devices that grow out of them. Hence I suggested that the core of MP is the use of ratios to coordinate interaction. Other authors define similar constructs in terms of selfishness, individualism, maximization, competitiveness, contractualism, and other attributes. I argued that these features, though perhaps correlated with using ratios to coordinate interaction, were nonessential implementations that vary across domains and cultures.

Similar questions arise with regard to CS. The most parsimonious definition is that it is an equivalence relationship—a relationship organized with respect to something that people perceive they have in common that makes them collectively distinctive. This means that positive feeling and mutual altruism, although typically strongly associated with CS, are not essential features of the underlying mod. Similarly, the orientation of action and affect toward “need” is not a defining feature. If people treat a resource as a jointly held commons, they do not necessarily utilize it according to need: One person's use of the resource is, in principle, equivalent to any other person's use of it.

Reviewing the original statement of relational models theory, Turner (1992) and Whitehead (1993) cogently characterized its principal deficiency, the limited account of conflict, aggression, coercion, exploitation, and dysfunction. The theory was developed partly as an antidote to the asocial,

selfish economic/behaviorist or Machiavellian views of human sociality. So, despite some discussion of how the models organize aggression and conflict (see the master table in Fiske, 1991 and 1992), it did indeed present an overly rosy account of harmonious sociality. Whitehead's lengthy review essay provided some of what was missing, pointing out especially that people may impose the use of a relational model on others. To this I would add that people are disposed to get angry and punish those who violate the models that they themselves are using, but the targets of such sanctions often do not acknowledge that that particular model applies, or that their acts were transgressions, so they perceive the intended sanctions as illegitimate aggression. This may launch rounds of mutual recrimination or violence.

Furthermore, from a theory of the basic forms of social relationships it is possible to make inferences about potential sources of social dysfunction; Nick Haslam and I have, in fact, developed several implications of the theory for psychopathology. Social problems are likely to arise when participants in an interaction use different models, implement the models with different preos, or apply the models too strictly and inflexibly. If a person uses a model excessively, underuses a model, or consistently uses a model in ways that are discrepant with the cultural preos that others around them are using, that person will experience persistent relational difficulties that are likely to be diagnosed by a clinician as personality disorders (Haslam, chap. 12, this volume).

THE NEXT STEPS

Relational models are structures for constructing and construing social action. Beyond relational models, there is another major level of social cognition, evaluation, and motivation: People use meta-relational models to combine models or keep them separate. That is, people have strongly motivated models to understand, coordinate, and evaluate *combinations* of relationships. These meta-relational models are powerful constraints on when, where, how, and with whom people use the relational models.

At the level of relationships, developmental studies and cultural comparison will eventually identify the universal features that constitute the mods and distinguish these from the preos that inform variable cultural implementations. Theoretical questions remain, however, about whether there is a hard, clear line between mods and preos. Clearly some cultural implementations of a given mod are much, much more common than others. This suggests that different mods lend themselves most readily to different implementations and are prone to be used in particular domains, perhaps because mods are selected for their advantages in those typical implementa-

tions. That is, although each relational model can be used in indefinitely many ways to structure any domain, there may be psychological propensities, functional advantages, or systemic factors that make some implementations more prevalent than others. There are some obvious patterns:

CS among close co-resident kin (the “household”) is virtually universal, while more distant kinship involves lesser degrees of CS. Furthermore, the consumption of cooked food, drink, and other comestibles tends to be communally organized everyday, and commensalism may be more inclusive at rituals, although other models come into play to lesser extents. These patterns may reflect the links between CS and inclusive fitness of individuals sharing a high proportion of genes.

AR is pervasively organized according to age, gender, and descent categories such as “race” and caste. In traditional societies, at least, men tend to be more actively involved than women in AR activities outside the household.

EM typically involves people of roughly corresponding age and social role. Also, it seems that violence is most likely to be structured in terms of EM as vengeful retaliation.

MP becomes more prevalent the greater the number of parties and kinds of entities involved, the more transient the transactions, and the less the certainty of sustained interactions across any particular dyad.

In its current form, relational models theory is a descriptive theory, characterizing how people think about sociality. But the theory would be much more powerful (and interesting) if we could deduce why and when people implement particular models. Ideally, these deductions should be based on the characteristics of the relational models themselves and the differences between them. In the immediate encounter, clearly people are obliged to use the models pretty much as their predecessors and associates use them, by virtue of the social transmission that results in local cultures. Otherwise, people could not coordinate. In novel situations, people probably use analogies from other important domains. But what affects the selection of models in the long term? Presumably there are functional constraints and potentials that affect the prevalence of the models in different social domains—each model has weaknesses and strengths for organizing a given domain, if we can define appropriate performance criteria. These “capacities” of the models also should be evident in the consequences (e.g., the kinds of problems) that are typical of implementations in particular domains. Certain combinations of the models may be more functional and stable than others because those sets of models perform complementary functions. If we understood where and how different relational models “work” and the nature of the problems they produce, the theory could be applied prescriptively. However, if we aim

to explain when and why people use particular models, determining the consequences of using each model is not sufficient. For an explanatory theory, we need to analyze when and how functional effects of the models become causes of processes that select among them.

The relative functional advantages of each relational model are probably related to the differential costs of collecting and storing the information necessary to use each model, the differential costs of making the calculations necessary to use each model, and the differing degrees of specificity of the preos that have to be negotiated in order to achieve smooth coordination with different models. For example, to utilize a resource in the CS mode, people merely need a preo that defines who has access to that resource. The University of California gives faculty, staff, and students unlimited access to athletic facilities; others are excluded. They just have to make sure each person seeking access is in the user group. However, if people allocate a resource according to AR, they must have a preo that specifies the ranking of each person, they must keep track of the ranks of users who seek access to the resource, and they must agree about whether the precedence accorded does correspond to personal rank. For example, if faculty had priority of access to the gym according to seniority, and faculty had precedence before students, then whenever a person sought access to, say, a tennis court, someone would have to determine if a court was free, and if not, whether any current user had a lower rank than the person seeking the court. This requires collection of more information, more processing of that information, and possibly more negotiation.

Access structured according to EM would require preos determining what counted as a unit of use, and how long people could delay taking a turn before losing their priority. There would have to be a mechanism to record and compare everyone's utilization and make that information available so people would know when they were entitled to use the facility. And people would have to agree that these preos were properly implemented and the mechanisms correctly applied. The use of MP would require definition of an auction mechanism or price scheme, along with bookkeeping and billing. Then, with MP, people would have to agree about what had been used and what payments were owed and had been made. With each successive model, things get more complicated: more information to collect and store, more calculations to make, more details to be negotiated. As the terms of interaction become more quantitatively specific, the negotiations are likely to become more arduous.

Balanced against these information and transaction costs are the advantages—and disadvantages—of exactly structured coordination. At one end, these benefits may be greatest toward the MP end of the series, where the coordination is most precisely structured. But there are countervailing advantages of the wider latitude or indeterminacy toward the CS end. CS per-