

EDITOR

Amy Hillman
Arizona State University
amy.hillman@asu.edu

July 7, 2011

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Jean-Philippe Bonardi
University of Lausanne
jean-philippe.bonardi@unil.ch

Mason Carpenter
University of Wisconsin at Madison
mcarpenter@bus.wisc.edu

Adelaide Wilcox King
University Of Virginia
amrking@virginia.edu

David Lepak
Rutgers University
amrlepak@smlr.rutgers.edu

Jeffery LePine
University of Florida
jeffery.lepine@cba.ufl.edu

Gerardo Okhuysen
University of Utah
gerardo@business.utah.edu

Roy Suddaby
University of Alberta
amrsuddaby@bus.ualberta.ca

SENIOR MANAGING EDITOR

Susan Zaid
Academy of Management
amr@aom.pace.edu
914-923-2607

**PRODUCTION & COPY
EDITOR**

Sandra E. Tamburrino-Hinz
Forest Hill, Md
sthinz@clearviewcatv.net

Dear Professor Ballinger:

The reviews of your manuscript submitted to *Academy of Management Review*, "Chutes versus Ladders: A Punctuated-Equilibrium Perspective on Social Exchange Relationships" (Manuscript #09-0093) are now complete. The reviewers and I believe you have some interesting and useful ideas here in regards to the role of anchoring events in determining social relationships. For example, Reviewer 2 notes, "This manuscript addresses an important topic, and has the potential to contribute to the social exchange literature. I really like the big picture idea, which suggests that exchange relationships may not be based on an equal weighting of multiple interactions." We all appreciate how your theory attempts to account for punctuated shifts and stickiness of relationships that social exchange theory doesn't appear to account for very well. Drawing from the literature on decision-making and human memory as a basis for your theorizing also was well received. For example, Reviewer 3 comments that your theory "represents some interesting and plausible generalizations from one research area to another and the authors are to be commended for making that link."

However, despite the generally positive reaction toward your topic and theoretical approach, all of us have significant concerns regarding several aspects of the theory, and ultimately, its potential contribution to the literature. Moreover, the reviewers and I are unsure whether these concerns can be overcome with a revision. Nevertheless, I am inviting you to revise and resubmit your manuscript for further consideration by *AMR*. I made this decision based primarily on the strength of the core ideas outlined in the model, and you will see from the comments below that a substantial revision will be required in order to succeed. Given these concerns, I view this as a high-risk revision.

In my opinion, you have received three conscientiously prepared reviews. The reviewers have given you many specific comments and suggestions that you can read at your own leisure. In this letter, I focus mainly on the principal issues that will need to be addressed in order for your revision to have a good chance of being successful.

1. **Clarify and support the unique contribution.** Although we all appreciate what you are trying to accomplish, the reviewers and I have concerns about how your theory contributes to our understanding of social relationships.
 - a. Like Reviewer 3, for example, I wonder how anchoring events are fundamentally different than reciprocal exchanges. “The notion that big events change relationships in a big way, whereas small events shape a relationship in a small way really does not refute reciprocally-oriented models of social exchange. One could even argue that big events have a stronger impact on affective reactions and memory than small events, and this would still be in line with reciprocally-oriented models” (comment 3). Reviewer 1 (comments 1a-c) makes a similar point about the uniqueness of your theory relative to what can be explained by reciprocity.
 - b. We also wonder why your particular theoretical perspective is needed for some of the propositions. For example, Propositions 1 and 2 appear to be straightforward extensions of existing theory on decision-making. As another example, Reviewer 2 notes, “[p]ropositions 6 and 7 seem to add little to the manuscript. As they currently stand, they seem to imply merely that positive events lead to positive outcomes while negative events lead to negative outcomes” (comment 2f).
 - c. Reviewer 2 is also concerned that significant aspects of your theory have already been examined in the organizational justice literature. “According to fairness heuristic theory (and its successor uncertainty management theory), justice judgments exhibit primacy effects such that when treatment is inconsistent, earlier treatment determines the justice judgments while later treatment is “explained away”...This proposition is similar to that of proposition 3, which suggests that positive or negative events occurring earlier in a relationship should be more durable than later events...Fairness heuristic theory also suggests that justice judgments can change over time, despite developing fairly quickly. Specifically, a substantial deviation from expectations should cause one to re-evaluate and re-visit the fairness judgment, causing a “phase-shift”. This is similar to proposition 1, as well as the definition provided for the concept of an “anchoring event” (comment 1). Although I’m not sure it is necessary to integrate the justice literature in your theory, you should at least explain how the perspectives and predictions are distinct.
 - d. In summary, a successful revision needs to convey clearly how your research provides a unique perspective on the issue of social exchange, not only in terms of how your theory accounts for noteworthy events, but also how the theory leads to predictions that differ as compared to those that could be made using existing theory. In essence, the paper needs to convince readers that your theory provides a superior and unique understanding of social exchange.
2. **Account for the development and nature of the existing relationship.** Another major concern has to do with the lack of attention given to the existing relationship as a factor that impacts the association between the anchoring event and reaction. Although accounting for

the existing relationship may complicate your theory somewhat, the existing gaps in the theory are too important to ignore.

- a. For example, Reviewer 3 notes that you are “too dismissive of the cumulative effects of numerous small exchanges that lean in a particular direction, especially over long time periods. The research on intuitive decision making makes it clear that “classical conditioning” can often result in sub-conscious feelings regarding stimuli based upon repeated exposure and it is not just huge salient events that trigger affective reactions...any theory such as this that is grounded in feelings and affective reactions needs to recognize intuitive recognition processes that play out over long time periods (comment 2).
 - b. Reviewer 2 comes at the same issue from a somewhat different angle; “I know that I would personally react differently depending on the colleague responsible for the event. My response would likely depend on how much good will that colleague had built up in previous exchanges (and the longer I have known said colleague, the more goodwill they would likely have)” (comment 2d).
 - c. Reviewer 1 suggests that attributions for the actor’s behavior (which are context driven) may play a non-trivial role in the how noteworthy events are interpreted. “Beyond violation of expectation (good or bad), the attribution the recipient/victim makes seems to be critical. It is entirely possible that the recipient of an exceptionally good deed knows or thinks that the actor did not commit the good deed willingly, and the action is thus unlikely to affect the nature of the relationship. Likewise with a negative expectation violation—if the victim doesn’t ultimately blame the actor, then it’s unlikely that the violation will affect the nature of the relationship...This is all to say that it seems that the recipient/victim’s interpretation of the event/action is more important than simply whether the recipient/victim’s expectation was violated” (comment 2).
- 3. Account for complexities in the process.** In the previous point I outlined how it may be necessary to consider the nature of the existing focal relationship more explicitly in your theory. However, as Reviewer 3 suggests, your theory could also account for the idea that the process of social exchange occurs in the context of other ongoing social relationships of which both parties are aware, and that these other relationships may play an important role in determining how exchange events are interpreted and how people respond to them. “This model is also very dyadic in nature, and does not incorporate the role of people outside the focal relationship when generating predictions about reactions. For example, many social exchange theories employ the notion of a “reference person” to whom the current relationship is being compared to, and in some cases, this has a dramatic effect on reactions” (comment 6). Here again, the additional complexity of considering other exchange relationships may be worthwhile to the extent that it addresses theoretical gaps and provides for a richer explanation of the phenomenon.
- 4. Clarify the nature of anchoring event.** The reviewers believe that you could improve the manuscript by clarifying the nature of the anchoring event.

- a. Although your definition of anchoring event accounts for whether the expectation is exceeded positively or negatively, there seems to be a qualitative difference as to whether the expectation is grounded in an existing relationship that is on the way up or on the way down (in a ladder sense). For example, a very positive noteworthy event in a good social relationship might be unexpected, but this isn't the same thing as a very negative noteworthy event in a good social relationship. To a large degree, this concern relates to Reviewer 3 suggestion that you consider "possible interactions between the trajectory of the relationship based upon prior reciprocal exchanges, and the anchoring event...one can imagine that, in the face of a slowly but generally declining relationship, a specific event can become an anchor that would not have been an anchor if it had occurred in the midst of generally positively ascending relationship. This kind of "straw-that-broke-the-camel's-back" model would seem to create better opportunities for integrating this model with reciprocally-oriented models, as opposed to setting them up as alternatives" (comment 5).
- b. On p. 7 you discuss anchoring events in terms of social and organizational norms for exchanges. From this discussion one could gather that noteworthy events would include either (a) negative exchanges of any type, or (b) exchanges that are extraordinarily positive. Is this what you intended?
- c. The definition of anchoring event seems to include its consequence. Why not focus on the event/interpretation of the event itself and affective response separately? This approach would allow investigation of linkages between various types of noteworthy events and affective responses.
- d. Third, I wonder about the nature of the affective response in the definition. Do you mean strength of positive and negative emotions, or do you mean other types of emotions, or even reactions that are more cognitive in nature?

Although I've outlined what I consider to be the most important issues that need to be resolved, the reviewers provided many other excellent suggestions that you should consider in preparing your revision. For example, Reviewers 1 and 2 suggested that you clarify inconsistencies between the text and the Figure. As another example, Reviewer 3 suggested that you bolster your discussion of applied and methodological implications. As you can see, successfully addressing our concerns will require a great deal of effort and a fair degree of risk. However, we all like the basic idea of what you are trying to do, so I encourage you to revise and resubmit your manuscript. I should also mention that a real strength of your manuscript is that it is well written, logically structured, and concise. I understand that we are asking you to do quite a bit and that some of our suggestions may complicate your model. However, my hope is that your revision has the same strengths as the initial submission.

Resubmission Instructions

Assuming that you indeed decide to revise your manuscript, please log into <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/amr> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number will have been modified to denote a revision. You will be

unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center. *IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.*

As you revise your manuscript, please consider each reviewer comment carefully, since even relatively minor comments can sometimes trigger large improvements in a manuscript. In revising your manuscript, please carefully consider each reviewer comment and pay particular attention to the points mentioned below in this decision letter. We ask that you deal with all issues raised by the reviewers and the action editor while revising your manuscript and that you provide point-by-point responses to explain how you have done so. We believe that having you explicitly respond to all the issues raised by the reviewers and action editor puts you in the best possible position to achieve a favorable outcome. However, *concisely* explaining the actions you have taken is desirable in that such explanations save reviewers' time while ensuring that your responses highlight the actions you have taken to deal with their concerns. The type of responses we are requesting from you means that extended discussions of tangential issues should be avoided as should reproductions of large blocks of text from the paper within the responses document. While not imposing a page limit for the responses, it's a good rule of thumb that the responses should not be longer than the manuscript ☺! To this end, if the same point is raised by the action editor and/or one or more reviewers, you should provide a detailed response only once and then refer the other readers (i.e., the action editor and/or the reviewers) to the initial response you provided regarding a particular (and commonly-shared) issue or concern. *Please note that the responses to reviewers' document should appear at the end of the revised manuscript beginning on a separate page.*

Because we are trying to facilitate timely revision of manuscripts submitted to AMR, please upload your revised manuscript within 4 months of today or contact me in advance to negotiate an alternative deadline.

Thank you for submitting to *AMR* and best of luck with the revisions!

Warm regards,

Jeff LePine

Associate Editor

Academy of Management Review

Comments of Reviewer 1

Your theory regarding how “anchoring events” determine the nature of relationships is generally well-written and compelling. I do, however, have several questions and suggestions. I hope that you find the comments below to be useful.

1. Please provide clarification for the following points.

a. Are Propositions 1-5 specifically regarding dyads or are they also meant to represent more complicated relationships?

b. On page 5, you define altruism as an attempt of one person to maximize another’s outcomes. However, you later indicate that altruism would be prompted by the other party doing something to exceed one’s expectations (as if the original recipient wants to repay the favor; see p. 10). How can you distinguish altruism from reciprocity? Later (p. 19), you characterize altruism as viewing “...the other’s gains as the relationship’s gains.” How does altruism differ from group gain (defined on p. 5 as a person acting “...to maximize the total gain of both parties in the exchange”)?

c. On page 5, you define revenge as an attempt to harm others. However, you later indicate that revenge would be prompted by the other party doing something to disappoint one’s expectations (as if the original victim wants to respond in kind; e.g., see page 20). How can you distinguish revenge from reciprocity?

d. Why does Figure 1 include three decision rules in the bottom half of the figure (rationality, competition, and revenge), but only two letters (C and D). I don’t fully understand to which rules C and D refer, or why there is not a rule labeled E.

2. Beyond violation of expectation (good or bad), the attribution the recipient/victim makes seems to be critical. It is entirely possible that the recipient of an exceptionally good deed knows or thinks that the actor did not commit the good deed willingly, and the action is thus unlikely to affect the nature of the relationship. Likewise with a negative expectation violation—if the victim doesn’t ultimately blame the actor, then it’s unlikely that the violation will affect the nature of the relationship. For example see Schweitzer et al. (2006)—the same behavior is interpreted quite differently when deception is involved compared to when it is not. This is all to say that it seems that the recipient/victim’s interpretation of the event/action is more important than simply whether the recipient/victim’s expectation was violated. You do mention attributions on page 7, however, I don’t quite understand what you’re saying: “...since A’s attributions that B is obligated to engage in the exchange make it more likely that A will attribute B’s actions to external, rather than internal, causes...” If A makes an external attribution regarding B’s actions, wouldn’t the actions be unlikely to affect the nature of the relationship?

3. Your argument for Proposition 2 could be strengthened by including more of the research in psychology indicating that negative events are more thoroughly (cognitively) processed, are better remembered, etc. Although it’s a few years old at this point, see Baumeister et al. (2001) for a very extensive review.

4. If negative anchoring events are more durable than positive anchoring events (Proposition 2), is the implication that competition, revenge, and rationality are more likely than altruism and group gain? More generally, how does Proposition 2 advance your theory?

5. The argument leading up to Proposition 3 confounds tenure in the organization with the length of a particular (I assume, dyadic) relationship. Your proposition specifically implicates the length of a particular relationship to be the issue not tenure in the organization. [You can be long tenured in an organization, yet embark on a new relationship with another person.] I think your argument would be stronger if you concentrate on explaining why the length of a particular relationship matters.
6. The arguments leading up to Propositions 4 and 5 could be strengthened. Regarding Proposition 4, if a negative event is more durable than a positive event (Proposition 2), why would a gradual process towards a negative non-reciprocal relationship be harder to move away from a negative non-reciprocal relationship reached via an arguably decisive anchoring event? In other words, if a negative event is durable, why wouldn't a single anchoring event be decisive? Regarding Proposition 5, I don't understand your rationale.
7. How does Proposition 6 relate to the more general claim you make that positive anchoring events will lead to altruism or group gain? For instance, it seems that identification with social categories shared with the other party might be a mediating mechanism between a positive anchoring event and altruism/group gain. Also, how does OCB-I differ from altruism? On the surface at least, they seem to be very similar concepts.
8. How does Proposition 7 relate to the more general claim you make that negative anchoring events will lead to competition, rationality, or revenge? How do conflict and deviant behaviors differ from revenge, for instance?
9. Can you explain why a positive anchoring event would lead to altruism rather than group gain, or vice versa? Similarly, can you explain why a negative anchoring event would differentially lead to competition, rationality, or revenge?

Minor Issues

10. There are instances of noun-pronoun disagreement throughout the paper.
11. Since you refer to the victim/recipient and actor as "A" and "B" respectively, it might be better in terms of clarity not to use the same letters in Figure 1. Further, why use any shorthand in Figure 1 to represent the decision rules you've also named in the figure (altruism, group gain, etc.)?

References

- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. 2001. Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 5 (4): 323-370.
- Schweitzer, M. E., Hershey, J. C., & Bradlow, E. T. 2006. Promises and lies: Restoring violated trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 101: 1-19.

Comments of Reviewer 2

In this manuscript, the authors provide a theoretical explanation for non-reciprocal exchange relationships. This manuscript addresses an important topic, and has the potential to contribute to the social exchange literature. I really like the big picture idea, which suggests that exchange relationships may not be based on an equal weighting of multiple interactions. That said, there are several aspects of the manuscript that limit its contribution in its current form. I have outlined a number of ideas and issues below.

1. Theoretical contribution

Some of the most theoretically interesting aspects of this manuscript are discussed in the justice literature. According to fairness heuristic theory (and its successor uncertainty management theory), justice judgments exhibit primacy effects such that when treatment is inconsistent, earlier treatment determines the justice judgments while later treatment is “explained away” (Lind, 2001). This proposition is similar to that of proposition 3, which suggests that positive or negative events occurring earlier in a relationship should be more durable than later events. Previous research is consistent with this proposition (e.g. Lind, Kray, & Thompson, 2001).

Lind, E. A. 2001. Fairness heuristic theory: Justice judgments as pivotal cognitions in organizational relations. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.) *Advances in organizational justice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lind, E. A., Kray, L., & Thompson, L. 2001. Primacy effects in justice judgments: Testing predictions from fairness heuristic theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 85: 189-210.

Fairness heuristic theory also suggests that justice judgments can change over time, despite developing fairly quickly. Specifically, a substantial deviation from expectations should cause one to re-evaluate and re-visit the fairness judgment, causing a “phase-shift”. This is similar to proposition 1, as well as the definition provided for the concept of an “anchoring event” (“social exchange whose resolution differs, either positively or negatively, from that person’s expectation given the decision rules they applied prior to the event”). Although there is not a lot of previous research on phase-shifting events, there is some. For example, Lind, Greenberg, Scott, and Welchans (2001) demonstrated that treatment during termination had over twice the effect of treatment during employment in predicting who would consider taking legal action.

Lind, E. A., Greenberg, J., Scott, K. S., & Welchans, T. D. (2000). The winding road from employee to complainant: situational and psychological determinants of wrongful-termination claims. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 557-590.

Perhaps the authors should incorporate the fairness heuristic theory literature into their manuscript. The justice literature relies heavily on the social exchange literature, so using fairness heuristic theory to discuss social exchange relationships seems very logical and appropriate. Despite the conceptual overlap between this manuscript and the work on fairness heuristic theory, the authors can improve the contribution made by specifying the process leading to phase-shifting events. Although the authors try, currently the manuscript falls short of explaining (and predicting) the process behind shifts in exchange relationships. In general, the central constructs aren’t clearly

defined, nor are the underlying causal mechanisms behind proposed relationships explained very clearly.

2. Propositions

a. I found myself having to re-read some of the propositions a few times to make sure I was following them accurately. To clarify some of the propositions, I'd recommend that the authors break them down further. I found it helpful to make the following simplistic outline of the propositions:

<u>Initial relationship established</u>	<u>Anchoring event</u>	<u>New relationship</u>
- Positive anchoring event	+ Negative event	= worse relationship
- Positive gradual process	+ Negative event	= ?
- Negative anchoring event	+ Positive event	= ?
- Negative gradual process	+ Positive event	= better relationship
-		

b. My confusion may also stem from the inconsistency between the propositions and figure one. Unlike figure 1, the propositions presented do not seem to distinguish between the non-reciprocal decision rules (altruism vs group gain, competition s. revenge) but these are clearly different types of rules that may differentially affect outcomes. The authors do mention that the decision rules used (altruism vs. group gain) depend on the context of the relationship, but this needs further explanation.

c. Proposition 1 states that the durability of anchoring events is determined in part by the intensity of the affective response during the event. Is the emotional response to the event a cause of the durability or vice versa? In other words, are durable anchoring events so severe that they elicit a strong emotional response, or does a strong emotional response lead to better memory encoding and therefore a more durable event? It sounds as though the authors argue the latter, but I suspect this would be difficult to tease apart empirically.

d. Relatedly, I am not sure I agree that the impact anchoring events have on the future relationship is not determined by time or number of exchanges (see p. 11). If one holds anchoring event constant, I know that I would personally react differently depending on the colleague responsible for the event. My response would likely depend on how much good will that colleague had built up in previous exchanges (and the longer I have known said colleague, the more goodwill they would likely have). I suspect my skepticism is due to the definition of anchoring events. As they are currently described, there is no way of knowing whether or not an event will be durable before the change in the relationship occurs. Instead, the durability of an event is recognized after a change in the relationship. This is clearly an issue that needs to be resolved if the proposed model is going to have any predictive validity. At times the authors do seem to discuss variables that may affect either the emotional response or failed expectations, but these discussions are very piecemeal and often occur in the discussion section (e.g. trait affectivity may affect experienced emotional states). Instead, they should be built into the model.

e. Proposition 4 suggests that how a relationship reached its negative form subsequently affects the likelihood the relationship can revert back to a reciprocal relationship. This proposition seems to suggest that a gradual process leading to a negative relationship is better (more likely to go to reciprocal rules or better) than a negative relationship caused by an anchoring event. If my

interpretation is correct, isn't it likely that one might see a series of gradual negative exchanges as a pattern and therefore expect that future events are not likely to change? For example, let's say that my supervisor consistently fails to meet my expectations, in small ways. Why wouldn't my burden of proof be just as high as with a negative anchoring event? I think again, the issue lies in the conceptualization of the negative anchoring event.

f. Propositions 6 and 7 seem to add little to the manuscript. As they currently stand, they seem to imply merely that positive events lead to positive outcomes while negative events lead to negative outcomes. Moreover, the overall lack of citations in this section resembles logical speculation more than actual theorizing. I'd recommend removing these two propositions.

I wish you the best of luck with your work in this area!

Comments of Reviewer 3

This manuscript develops the concept of “anchoring” in social relationships, and discusses how this view of relationship development differs from, and informs, current models of social exchange in organizations. The basic notion is that certain critical exchanges, due to their expectation-defying nature, are powerful in terms of generating strong affective reactions, and are thus easy to recall from memory. Ease of recall, then leads to these events to have a defining role in setting the “default value” for the nature of relationship, which is then resistant to changes in over time despite subsequent exchanges that would have otherwise altered the relationship had it not been for the defining event.

1. The idea of anchoring and adjustment in decision making is pretty-well established, and since deciding what the nature of a relationship is can be conceived of as a decision, it is not too much of a stretch to suggest that this kind of process might take place in the realm of relationship building. In this case, “anchoring” as the authors use the term, also seems to subsume what decision-making researchers refer to as “availability bias” because of its reliance on memory systems, but this too is a well-established process in the decision-making literature. Thus, this represents some interesting and plausible generalizations from one research area to another and the authors are to be commended for making that link.

2. In terms of limitations, however, the authors are perhaps too dismissive of the cumulative effects of numerous small exchanges that lean in a particular direction, especially over long time periods. The research on intuitive decision making makes it clear that “classical conditioning” can often result in sub-conscious feelings regarding stimuli based upon repeated exposure and it is not just huge salient events that trigger affective reactions. We have all had an experience of dread when certain people come around the corner, not necessarily because they ever harmed us in a large way, but rather each and every encounter was negative in affective tone, and hence we “learn” to feel a way the minute the person appears. I do not believe that this totally negates the value of what the authors are talking about here, but any theory such as this that is grounded in feelings and affective reactions needs to recognize intuitive recognition processes that play out over long time periods.

3. The authors also need to be clearer regarding how the nature of anchoring events is “qualitatively” different from reciprocal exchanges once the level of exchange goes beyond a certain range. The notion that big events change relationships in a big way, whereas small events shape a relationship in a small way really does not refute reciprocally-oriented models of social exchange. One could even argue that big events have a stronger impact on affective reactions and memory than small events, and this would still be in line with reciprocally-oriented models. The key argument the authors have to make is with respect to the “stickiness” of the evaluation once it is anchored. That is, in Figure 1, once stops seeing any “steps” after the anchoring event and this is the critical hypothesis that has to be supported. The authors need to leverage existing evidence on “stickiness” much more than they currently do.

4. The argument for asymmetry in the nature of the movements is also interesting, but not well-supported via existing literature and theory. In fact, even the authors’ own Figure 1 displays a very symmetrical figure that does not seem to vary above versus below the mid-point. I think this is an intriguing idea that makes the concept more interesting, but it is not well developed via the literature review and not reflected throughout the paper very well. Thus, as with the case for stickiness, the also need to leverage existing evidence on “asymmetry” much more than they currently do

5. The authors also need to address possible interactions between the trajectory of the relationship based upon prior reciprocal exchanges, and the anchoring event. Currently they are treated like alternatives, but one can imagine that, in the face of a slowly but generally declining relationship, a specific event can become an anchor that would not have been an anchor if it had occurred in the midst of generally positively ascending relationship. This kind of “straw-that-broke-the-camel’s-back” model would seem to create better opportunities for integrating this model with reciprocally-oriented models, as opposed to setting them up as alternatives.
6. This model is also very dyadic in nature, and does not incorporate the role of people outside the focal relationship when generating predictions about reactions. For example, many social exchange theories employ the notion of a “reference person” to whom the current relationship is being compared to, and in some cases, this has a dramatic effect on reactions. For example, if a particular supervisor routinely treats all staff members in a particular way, the distinctiveness of any event that involves that supervisor and one staff member, will be moderated by these other relationships. I may not expect a supervisor to lose his temper with me, but if I see this person do this routinely with everyone else, and in fact, his outbursts with me seem tame by comparison, it could mute the effects of the event relative to what would be predicted from purely dyadic models.
7. This paper is relatively light on applied implications, and one that might need to be considered is the use of apologies as a means of converting what might be an “anchoring event” into just another negative event. If a supervisor admits that a critical event harmed a staff member, and took responsibility, but was able to argue it is not representative of the past or future relationship, then he or she may be able to de-anchor the relationship just by convincing the staff member that he or she saw it the same way. Also, creating memory inducing events or promoting certain memories becomes a critical managerial action based on this model. For example, celebrating anniversary events with pictures of the relationship in good times increases the salience of positive exchanges in ways that leverages these positive experiences to their maximum impact.
8. The paper is also rather light on the methodological changes that one would need to see in typical social exchange studies relative to what one sees now. Although there is a mention of diaries and event sampling methods, much of the approach to data analysis would seem to change due to the temporal and non-linear nature of some of the effects that are being proposed here. This needs to be given much more attention, in the sense that it was not clear exactly how one would test for and detect this specific model, while at the same time refuting alternative reciprocally-oriented models.