
Theses and Dissertations

2010

Personality antecedents of the experience and expression of romantic jealousy

Brian Kenneth Gehl
University of Iowa


Copyright 2010 Brian Kenneth Gehl

This dissertation is available at Iowa Research Online: <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/672>

Recommended Citation

Gehl, Brian Kenneth. "Personality antecedents of the experience and expression of romantic jealousy." PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) thesis, University of Iowa, 2010.
<http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/672>.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

PERSONALITY ANTECEDENTS OF THE EXPERIENCE AND EXPRESSION OF
ROMANTIC JEALOUSY

by
Brian Kenneth Gehl

An Abstract

Of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Doctor of
Philosophy degree in Psychology
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

July 2010

Thesis Supervisor: Professor David Watson

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the role of personality as an antecedent factor to jealousy experience and expression utilizing Guerrero and Andersen's (1998) Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression. Whereas personality constructs have been commonly examined as correlates or concomitants of jealousy there has been relatively little empirical work examining the role of personality in the context of this model, which highlights the distinction between jealousy experience and expression. The present study addresses this issue by examining the relation between the components of the model and well-established measures of adult attachment, the Five-Factor Model of personality, and specific maladaptive personality traits in two samples. The first sample is composed of 400 undergraduate students and the second sample is composed of 184 married community residents who have reported experiencing jealousy in their romantic relationships. Additional analyses evaluate the relation between jealousy experience and expression as well as the relation between relationship satisfaction and jealousy. While adult attachment dimensions tend to be the strongest predictors of the elements of jealousy experience and expression, other personality variables exhibited important and meaningful relations as well. The majority of these other personality variables tended to contain elements of negative emotionality at their core. The present study also provided replication of several relations between elements of the componential model of jealousy.

Abstract Approved: _____
Thesis Supervisor

Title and Department

Date

PERSONALITY ANTECEDENTS OF THE EXPERIENCE AND EXPRESSION OF
ROMANTIC JEALOUSY

by

Brian Kenneth Gehl

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Doctor of
Philosophy degree in Psychology
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

July 2010

Thesis Supervisor: Professor David Watson

Graduate College
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

PH.D. THESIS

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Brian Kenneth Gehl

has been approved by the Examining Committee
for the thesis requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy
degree in Psychology at the July 2010 graduation.

Thesis Committee: _____
David Watson, Thesis Supervisor

Leslie Baxter

Grazyna Kochanska

Erika Lawrence

Irwin Levin

To my wife and family for their support in every endeavor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, David Watson, for his guidance and support. I would also like to thank Erika Lawrence for valuable experience involving interviewing and dyadic research and Jatin Vaidya for valuable insight as a co-author on multiple additional studies examining the nature of jealousy.

I would like to acknowledge the many other researchers attempting to tackle the study of jealousy who have provided guidance through their own work, at conferences and over e-mail. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the contribution of the many participants who have contributed to my research. Their time and commitment is the essential component that makes it all possible.

Partial funding was obtained from the University of Iowa Executive Council of Graduate and Professional Students.

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the role of personality as an antecedent factor to jealousy experience and expression utilizing Guerrero and Andersen's (1998) Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression. Whereas personality constructs have been commonly examined as correlates or concomitants of jealousy there has been relatively little empirical work examining the role of personality in the context of this model, which highlights the distinction between jealousy experience and expression. The present study addresses this issue by examining the relation between the components of the model and well-established measures of adult attachment, the Five-Factor Model of personality, and specific maladaptive personality traits in two samples. The first sample is composed of 400 undergraduate students and the second sample is composed of 184 married community residents who have reported experiencing jealousy in their romantic relationships. Additional analyses evaluate the relation between jealousy experience and expression as well as the relation between relationship satisfaction and jealousy. While adult attachment dimensions tend to be the strongest predictors of the elements of jealousy experience and expression, other personality variables exhibited important and meaningful relations as well. The majority of these other personality variables tended to contain elements of negative emotionality at their core. The present study also provided replication of several relations between elements of the componential model of jealousy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
INTRODUCTION	1
A Brief Historical Survey	3
Conceptualization and Measurement of Jealousy.....	5
The Relation of Personality and Jealousy.....	7
Personality within Conceptualizations of Jealousy	7
Personality as Related to Jealousy.....	8
The Componential Approach to the Assessment of Jealousy.....	16
Jealousy Experience	19
Jealousy Expression.....	24
Empirical Relations between Jealousy Experience and Expression.....	30
Antecedent Factors	35
Relationship Satisfaction	38
The Present Study	40
Basic Design.....	40
Personality as an Antecedent to Jealousy Experience and Expression	46
Relation between Jealousy Experience and Expression.....	50
Relation between Jealousy and Relationship Satisfaction.....	52
METHOD	62
Undergraduate Sample Participants and Procedure.....	62
Community Resident Sample Participants and Procedure	64
Measures	65
Demographic, Personality and Relationship Measures	65
Jealousy Measures	68
Data Analyses	70
Preliminary Analyses of Personality Measures	70
Preliminary Analyses of Jealousy Measures	70
Mean-Level Differences within and between Samples	71
The Relation between Personality and Jealousy	71
The Relation between Jealousy Expression, Experience, and Related Goals.....	72
The Relation between Relationship Satisfaction and Jealousy	72
RESULTS	74
Preliminary Analyses of Personality Measures	74
Preliminary Analyses of Jealousy Measures	75
Multidimensional Jealousy Scale-Cognitive	75
Affective Elements of Jealousy	76
Jealousy-related Goals.....	78
Communicative Responses to Jealousy.....	78
Mean-Level Differences between and within Samples	86
The Relation between Personality and Jealousy.....	88

The Relation between Personality and Jealousy Experience	88
The Relation of Personality to Jealousy-related Goals.....	91
The Relation between Personality and Jealousy Expression.....	93
The Relation between Jealousy Expression, Experience, and Related Goals	95
The Relation between Jealousy Experience and Expression.....	95
The Relation between Jealousy Expression and Jealousy-related Goals.....	98
The Relation between Relationship Satisfaction and Jealousy.....	100
DISCUSSION	339
The Experience and Expression of Jealousy in the Current Study	340
Personality as an Antecedent to Jealousy	342
Personality and Jealousy Experience.....	342
Personality and Jealousy-related Goals	346
Personality and Jealousy Expression.....	348
The Relation between Jealousy Expression, Experience, and Related Goals	350
Jealousy Experience and Expression.....	350
Jealousy-Related Goals and Jealousy Expression	352
Jealousy and Relationship Satisfaction.....	354
Integration and Implications	356
Limitations	359
Self-selection of Participants	359
Self-reported Recall and Fatigue	360
Number and Choice of Variables Measured	361
Future Directions	364
Conclusion	366
REFERENCES	367
APPENDIX A-CRJ.....	373
APPENDIX B-DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION	376
APPENDIX C-3VDI.....	377

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Empirical Relations between Cognitive Experience of Jealousy and Jealousy Expression	53
Table 2	Empirical Relations between Affective Experience of Jealousy and Jealousy Expression	54
Table 3	Empirical Relations between Jealousy-Related Goals and Jealousy Expression.....	56
Table 4	Conceptual Categorizations of Previous Research Examining Jealousy Expression.....	57
Table 5	Bivariate Correlations between BFI and SNAP-2 Temperament Scales	102
Table 6	Bivariate Correlations between SNAP-2 Trait Scales	103
Table 7	Bivariate Correlations between 3VDI, ECR and SES Scales	105
Table 8	Bivariate Correlations between (a) BFI and SNAP-2 Temperament Scales and (b) SNAP-2 Trait Scales-Undergraduate Sample	106
Table 9	Bivariate Correlations between (a) BFI and SNAP-2 Temperament Scales and (b) SNAP-2 Trait Scales-Community Resident Sample.....	108
Table 10	Bivariate Correlations between (a) BFI and SNAP-2 Temperament Scales and (b) the 3VDI, ECR and SES-Undergraduate Sample	110
Table 11	Bivariate Correlations between (a) BFI and SNAP-2 Temperament Scales and (b) the 3VDI, ECR and SES-Community Resident Sample	111
Table 12	Bivariate Correlations between SNAP-2 Trait Scales and the 3VDI, ECR and SES-Undergraduate Sample	112
Table 13	Bivariate Correlations between SNAP-2 Trait Scales and the 3VDI, ECR and SES-Community Resident Sample.....	113
Table 14	Bivariate Correlations between Personality Composites and Scales-Undergraduate Sample.....	114
Table 15	Bivariate Correlations between Personality Composites and Scales-Community Resident Sample	116
Table 16	Descriptive Statistics for Non-Jealousy Measures-Undergraduate Sample.....	118
Table 17	Descriptive Statistics for Non-Jealousy Measures-Community Resident Sample.....	120
Table 18	Factor Loadings for Eight-Item Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Undergraduate Sample	122

Table 19	Factor Loadings for Eight-Item Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Undergraduate Sample.....	123
Table 20	Factor Loadings for Eight-Item Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Community Resident Sample.....	124
Table 21	Factor Loadings for Eight-Item Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Community Resident Sample.....	125
Table 22	Factor Loadings for Six-Item Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Undergraduate Sample	126
Table 23	Factor Loadings for Six-Item Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Community Resident Sample.....	127
Table 24	Factor Loadings for Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Affective Items-Undergraduate Sample	128
Table 25	Factor Loadings for Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Affective Items-Community Resident Sample	133
Table 26	Factor Loadings for Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Affective Items-Undergraduate Sample	138
Table 27	Factor Loadings for Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Affective Items-Community Resident Sample	143
Table 28	Factor Loadings for Four-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the reduced set of 58 Affective Items-Undergraduate Sample.....	148
Table 29	Factor Loadings for Four-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the reduced set of 58 Affective Items-Community Resident Sample.....	151
Table 30	Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Experience and Jealousy-Related Goals	154
Table 31	Factor Loadings for Five-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Jealousy-related Goals-Undergraduate Sample	156
Table 32	Factor Loadings for Six-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Jealousy-related Goals-Undergraduate Sample	158
Table 33	Factor Loadings for Five-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Jealousy-related Goals-Community Resident Sample.....	160

Table 34	Factor Loadings for Six-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Jealousy-related Goals-Community Resident Sample.....	162
Table 35	Fit Indices for Three-Factor CRJ Model.....	164
Table 36	Factor Loadings for Scale-Level Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ-Undergraduate Sample	165
Table 37	Factor Loadings for Scale-Level Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ-Community Resident Sample.....	166
Table 38	Factor Loadings for Item-Level Five-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ-Undergraduate Sample	167
Table 39	Factor Loadings for Item-Level Six-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ-Undergraduate Sample	171
Table 40	Factor Loadings for Item-Level Six-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ-Community Resident Sample	177
Table 41	Bivariate Correlations between Prescribed CRJ Scales.....	182
Table 42	Bivariate Correlations between Derived Jealousy Expression Measures (CRJ items)	184
Table 43	Loadings for Item-Level Eight-Component Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ Interactive Responses-Undergraduate Sample.....	185
Table 44	Loadings for Item-Level Five-Component Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ General Behavioral Responses-Undergraduate Sample.....	190
Table 45	Loadings for Item-Level Eight-Component Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ Interactive Responses-Community Resident Sample	193
Table 46	Loadings for Item-Level Five-Component Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ General Behavioral Responses-Community Resident Sample	198
Table 47	Descriptive Statistics for Jealousy Measures-Undergraduate Sample.....	201
Table 48	Descriptive Statistics for Jealousy Measures-Community Resident Sample.....	203
Table 49	MANOVA Personality Variables by Sample	205
Table 50	MANOVA Jealousy Variables by Sample	207
Table 51	MANOVA Personality Variables by Sex-Undergraduate Sample	208

Table 52	MANOVA Personality Variables by Relationship Status-Undergraduate Sample.....	210
Table 53	MANOVA Personality Variables by Distance from Partner-Undergraduate Sample.....	212
Table 54	MANOVA Personality Variables by Sex-Community Resident Sample.....	214
Table 55	MANOVA Jealousy Variables by Sex-Undergraduate Sample	216
Table 56	MANOVA Jealousy Variables by Relationship Status-Undergraduate Sample.....	217
Table 57	MANOVA Jealousy Variables by Distance from Partner-Undergraduate Sample.....	218
Table 58	MANOVA Jealousy Variables by Sex-Community Resident Sample	219
Table 59	Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy Experience Measures – Undergraduate Sample	220
Table 60	Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy Experience Measures – Community Resident Sample	223
Table 61	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Suspicion of Partner-Undergraduate Sample.....	226
Table 62	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Worry over Rival-Undergraduate Sample	228
Table 63	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Anger-Undergraduate Sample	230
Table 64	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Fear-Undergraduate Sample.....	232
Table 65	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Guilt-Undergraduate Sample	234
Table 66	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Joy/Sexual Arousal-Undergraduate Sample	236
Table 67	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Suspicion of Partner-Community Resident	238
Table 68	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Worry over Rival-Community Resident Sample.....	240
Table 69	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Anger-Community Resident Sample	242
Table 70	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Fear-Community Resident Sample	244

Table 71	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Guilt-Community Residents Sample	246
Table 72	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Joy/Sexual Arousal-Community Resident.....	248
Table 73	Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy-Related Goals – Undergraduate Sample	250
Table 74	Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy-Related Goals – Community Resident Sample.....	253
Table 75	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Relationship Maintenance-Undergraduate Sample.....	256
Table 76	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Self-Esteem Preservation-Undergraduate Sample.....	258
Table 77	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Reducing Uncertainty about Rival-Undergraduate Sample.....	260
Table 78	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Relationship Re-assessment-Undergraduate Sample.....	262
Table 79	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Equity Restoration through Retaliation-Undergraduate Sample	264
Table 80	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Relationship Maintenance-Community Resident Sample	266
Table 81	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Self-Esteem Preservation-Community Resident Sample	268
Table 82	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Reducing Uncertainty about Rival-Community Resident Sample	270
Table 83	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Relationship Re-assessment-Community Resident Sample	272
Table 84	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Equity Restoration through Retaliation-Community Resident Sample	274
Table 85	Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy Expression – Undergraduate Sample	276
Table 86	Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy Expression – Community Resident Sample.....	279
Table 87	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Undergraduate Sample	282
Table 88	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Rival Communication-Undergraduate Sample.....	284

Table 89	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Violence & Threats-Undergraduate Sample.....	286
Table 90	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Withdrawal-Undergraduate Sample.....	288
Table 91	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Undergraduate Sample	290
Table 92	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Undergraduate Sample.....	292
Table 93	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Community Resident Sample.....	294
Table 94	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Rival Communication-Community Resident Sample	296
Table 95	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Violence & Threats-Community Resident Sample.....	298
Table 96	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Withdrawal-Community Resident Sample	300
Table 97	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Community Resident Sample	302
Table 98	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Community Resident Sample	304
Table 99	Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Expression and Jealousy Experience – Undergraduate Sample.....	306
Table 100	Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Expression and Jealousy Experience – Community Resident Sample	307
Table 101	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Undergraduate Sample.....	308
Table 102	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Rival Communication-Undergraduate Sample.....	309
Table 103	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Violence & Threats-Undergraduate Sample	310
Table 104	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Withdrawal-Undergraduate Sample	311
Table 105	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Undergraduate Sample.....	312
Table 106	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Undergraduate Sample	313

Table 107	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Community Resident Sample.....	314
Table 108	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Rival Communication-Community Resident Sample	315
Table 109	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Violence & Threats-Community Resident Sample	316
Table 110	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Withdrawal-Community Resident Sample.....	317
Table 111	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Community Resident Sample.....	318
Table 112	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Community Resident Sample.....	319
Table 113	Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Expression and Jealousy- Related Goals – Undergraduate Sample	320
Table 114	Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Expression and Jealousy- Related Goals – Community Resident Sample.....	321
Table 115	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Undergraduate Sample.....	322
Table 116	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Rival Communication-Undergraduate Sample.....	323
Table 117	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Violence & Threats-Undergraduate Sample	324
Table 118	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Withdrawal-Undergraduate Sample	325
Table 119	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Undergraduate Sample....	326
Table 120	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Undergraduate Sample	327
Table 121	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Community Resident Sample.....	328
Table 122	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Rival Communication-Community Resident Sample	329
Table 123	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Violence & Threats-Community Resident Sample	330
Table 124	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Withdrawal-Community Resident Sample.....	331

Table 125	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Community Resident Sample.....	332
Table 126	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Community Resident Sample.....	333
Table 127	Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Experience and Jealousy Expression and Relationship Satisfaction.....	334
Table 128	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Expression & Experience Predicting Relationship Satisfaction-Undergraduate Sample.....	335
Table 129	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Expression and Jealousy Experience Predicting Relationship Satisfaction-Community Resident Sample.....	337

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Guerrero and Andersen's Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression	60
Figure 2	Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression.....	61
Figure 3	Guerrero and Anderson's Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression and Study Measures.....	73

INTRODUCTION

The relation between jealousy and violence, including homicide, in interpersonal relationships is evidence enough to argue that jealousy is a worthy area of study (Daly, Wilson & Weghorst, 1982; Puente & Cohen, 2003). Additionally, achieving a better understanding of jealousy may help deal with less extreme, but more common problems with which it is also associated. Even if it does not lead to overt violence, the presence of jealousy within a romantic relationship can be quite distressing, both for the jealous individual and the partner (de Silva, 1997). For these reasons, a number of researchers and clinicians have attempted to gain a better understanding of jealousy by asking a multitude of questions. Foremost among these is simply, “What is jealousy?” A primary concern among jealousy researchers has been to define, conceptualize, and operationalize the construct in a meaningful way to integrate existing research and guide future research. A second important question has been, “Why do we get jealous?” or “What causes jealousy?” In attempts to answer these questions, researchers have posited several models and sources, or antecedent factors, of jealousy. Proposed antecedent factor categories include biology (evolution), culture, personality, relationship characteristics, situational factors and strategic moves (Guerrero & Andersen, 1998). The present study utilizes one such model to examine the role of personality constructs as antecedent factors of jealousy.

The goal of the current study is to investigate the role of personality as an antecedent factor of jealousy experience and expression utilizing Guerrero and Andersen’s (1998) descriptive Componential Model of Jealousy (see Figure 1). Whereas personality constructs have been commonly examined as correlates or concomitants of jealousy there has been relatively little empirical work examining the role of personality in the context of this model, the primary exception being adult romantic attachment (Guerrero, 1998). While Guerrero and Andersen suggest possible relationships between

their model and proposed antecedent factors, the current studies attempt to explicitly link the antecedent factor of personality to the components of their model (see Figure 2).

Personality may be the most important antecedent factor to investigate for several reasons. First, it is evident within many conceptualizations of jealousy; in fact, one approach to conceptualizing jealousy is termed “dispositional.” Structural analyses of jealousy measures have revealed factors that have evident dispositional aspects (Gehl & Watson, 2003). Second, measures of adult attachment have shown that interpersonal patterns of relating to others, in particular, romantic partners, can be operationalized as individual differences and have utility. Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick (1997) have identified several similarities between jealousy and adult attachment. Finally, research examining the personality disorders, in particular, borderline personality disorder, has shown meaningful relations with jealousy (Dutton, 1998; Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, & Bartholomew, 1994; Dutton, van Ginkel & Landolt, 1996; Holzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman & Stuart, 2003). The unhealthy manner in which some individuals express jealousy may further be related to maladaptive personality traits. However, up to this point, no one has examined a model of jealousy in relation to a comprehensive measure of maladaptive personality, such as the SNAP (Clark, 1993). This is the primary contribution to the literature that this study provides. This study investigates personality as an antecedent factor in the context of Guerrero and Andersen’s model, expanding beyond adult attachment to include measures of maladaptive personality traits, the Five Factor Model of personality, self-esteem and dependency.

The present day empirical approach to conceptualization and operationalization of jealousy can be traced back to the late 1970s and early 1980s when researchers began to develop definitions and corresponding measures of jealousy which they could then relate to various demographic and individual difference variables. Over the course of time, through a growing body of research, these definitions led to models of jealousy in which researchers attempted to both describe concomitants of, and explain causal processes

within, the jealousy experience. Guerrero and Andersen (1998) built upon models and work of previous researchers (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989; White & Mullen, 1989) to propose a descriptive Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression (see Figure 1).

The following sections provide a brief overview of early jealousy research, continuing with some conceptualizations and operationalizations of jealousy, with a focus upon the dispositional approach as it is most relevant to the current study. Additionally, previous research that has examined personality correlates of jealousy is discussed. Finally, componential models of jealousy, in particular, Guerrero and Andersen's model (1998) which is utilized in the current study are described.

First, it should be clarified that the focus of this study is romantic jealousy, that is, jealousy that occurs in the context of a romantic relationship. This is distinct from other types of jealousy and/or envy, which researchers both have -- and have not -- chosen to distinguish (see Bringle & Buunk, 1985; Salovey & Rodin, 1986; Parrott, 1991; Parrott & Smith, 1993; Haslam & Bornstein, 1996 for a more in depth discussion of these distinctions).

A Brief Historical Survey

Musings on jealousy have been evident for centuries, from Shakespeare's *Othello* and Bizet's adaptation of *Carmen* to popular songs by Bobby Charles and John Lennon. However, research examining jealousy has had a much more scattered history. Freud (1922; as cited in Clanton & Smith, 1977) and later psychoanalytic researchers formulated theories of jealousy based upon case studies. Mead (1931/1977) formulated a definition of jealousy based upon a review of anthropological evidence. Most early work on jealousy, like that of Freud, focused on clinical analyses of pathological jealousy (Bringle & Buunk, 1985). Probably in part because of this lack of research on "normal" jealousy, Clanton and Smith (1977) conducted a review of the popular media to get an idea as to how people have "experienced, expressed, and interpreted jealousy" (Clanton

& Smith, 1977, p. 15). They noted that from the time of WWII into the late sixties, most magazine articles about jealousy were directed toward women and suggested that some jealousy is a normal part of love. These articles suggested that jealousy should be kept under control so as to not become unreasonable. Women were advised to avoid situations that may provoke jealousy in their husbands, but that slight jealousy by their husbands should be interpreted as a sign of his love. Clanton and Smith noted that these lay articles on jealousy began to disappear, only finding one between 1966 and 1973, probably not coincidentally corresponding to historical shifts in sexual equality.

When the articles began to reappear, jealousy seemed to have taken on a new form. It was no longer interpreted as a natural part of love but instead as a potentially problematic component in a relationship. Guilt began to be associated with feelings of jealousy. Bringle and Buunk (1985) point out that at about this same time, new empirical research examining jealousy began to appear, taking on this same view that jealousy may not be an appropriate part of personal relationships. Many researchers independently began to empirically investigate jealousy with the goals of conceptualization and measurement and a significant portion of this research was presented at conferences and symposia and involved the development of measures.

The empirical study of jealousy received another boost when books began to appear addressing the concept. White and Mullen (1989) presented their text addressing theoretical, empirical, and clinical work dedicated to the understanding of jealousy. Their presentation has served as the organizing structure for a considerable amount of the subsequent work on jealousy. Salovey (1991a) released an edited volume featuring chapters by a majority of the major researchers who revitalized the study of jealousy in the late 70s and early 80s. Several of these authors reviewed and expanded their earlier empirical work that, in some cases, had previously only been presented at conferences. Almost a decade later, D. M. Buss (2000) presented his views on jealousy, which were rooted in evolutionary theory. He suggested that jealousy should not solely be viewed as

something dysfunctional in relationships; instead, it has served a very important function in determining evolutionary success. From this, he argued that therapies directed at eliminating jealousy are problematic, especially when considering the functional nature of jealousy and its “deep roots” (D. M. Buss, 2000, p. 183).

Conceptualization and Measurement of Jealousy

The first step of psychological research is aimed at defining the concept of interest, first conceptually and then operationally. This has been a primary problem in jealousy research. Several conceptual definitions and models of jealousy have been proposed since the empirical revival of the late 1970s. Additionally, the field has witnessed the development of a wide array of measures aimed at operationalizing jealousy. In their appendix, White and Mullen (1989) discuss several measures of jealousy and the conceptual approaches from which they were constructed. While these conceptualizations and measures have similarities, the differences are considerable. As many researchers simply develop their own scales, often reflecting somewhat different theoretical views, generalizing findings across studies is nearly impossible. Therefore, any review of previous research findings must be cautious in generalization and integration. In short, jealousy has been conceptualized in a myriad of ways; it has been viewed as a defense mechanism (Freud, 1922 cited from Baumgart, 1990), as situationally specific (Hupka, 1984), as an individual difference construct (Bringle, 1981), as a prototypic emotion concept (Sharpsteen, 1993), as an evolved mechanism (D. M. Buss, 2000), and as a complex of interrelated emotions, cognitions and behaviors in response to a perceived threat (White & Mullen, 1989). The measurement of jealousy has, across several studies, reflected many of these views.

Jealousy has been measured as both a unidimensional construct (Mathes & Severa, 1981; White, 1981) and as a multidimensional construct (Bringle, 1981; Hupka & Rusch, 1977 as cited in White & Mullen, 1989; Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989; Rosmarin,

Chambless, & LaPointe, 1979 as cited in White & Mullen, 1989). Some measures directly ask individuals how jealous they are (White, 1981) while others specifically avoid using the term itself (Mathes & Severa, 1981). Jealousy measures also use varying item and response formats, influencing what specifically is being asked by that particular measure (see Gehl & Watson, in preparation, for additional discussion).

When jealousy has been measured as a multifactor construct, the factor structure tends to vary considerably. Some measures develop factors from a specific theoretical approach, such as the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989), which contains factors based upon an ABC (affect, behavior, cognition) distinction. The Self-Report Jealousy Scale (Bingler, 1981) attempts to assess dispositional jealousy (and envy) by asking individuals about social, sexual, family, and work situations. Additional multifactor measures such as the Interpersonal Relationship Scale (Hupka & Rusch, 1977 as cited in White & Mullen, 1989) and the Survey of Interpersonal Reactions (Rosmarin, Chambless, & LaPointe, 1979 as cited in White & Mullen, 1989) obtain factors through factor analyses of large item pools. This approach typically leads to several factors that are reported as elements or concomitants of the jealousy experience. For example, a scale may be reflective of sexual possessiveness (e.g. "I want my lover to enjoy sex only with me"), suspicious beliefs (e.g. "If partner had the chance, s/he'd cheat on me"), or dependency (e.g. "I often feel I couldn't exist without him/her"). Clearly, the factors are dependent upon which items are included in the analyses.

In order to address this wide variety in the assessment of jealousy, Gehl and Watson (2003) examined the structure of jealousy through factor analyses of nine jealousy and envy scales. Analyses revealed three factors defining the structure of jealousy: Reactive Jealousy, Interpersonal Insecurity, and Anxious Suspicion. Reactive Jealousy reflects the level of distress in reaction to varying levels of perceived infidelity by the partner (e.g. engaging in sex with someone else or smiling at someone else in a friendly manner). High scorers react with more distress to more situations. Interpersonal

Insecurity reflects a low threshold for perception of threat. High scorers are threatened by their partner's friends and outside activities. They constantly need reassurance as their sense of self and meaning are highly dependent upon their partner. They interpret jealousy in themselves and their partner as a sign of true love. High scorers on Anxious Suspicion know they are jealous and are suspicious of, and do not trust, their partner. Their worries lead them to be vigilant at interrogating and investigating their partner regarding fidelity. They tend to be self-deprecating, envious, and resentful of others to the point of hostility. The dispositional nature of jealousy begins to become evident when examining these factors, in particular the latter two. Interpersonal insecurity and anxious suspicion tend to exhibit stronger correlations with personality constructs than reactive jealousy, in particular, with negative affectivity, aggression, mistrust, and self-esteem. These patterns suggest further examination of the link between personality and jealousy, especially its individual components, is indeed a worthy endeavor.

The Relation of Personality and Jealousy

The study of jealousy in the context of personality has a relatively long history when historical personality research is considered as Freud examined jealousy in the context of his Oedipus complex and sibling rivalry (White & Mullen, 1989). While jealousy is defined to a great extent by the situation in which it arises, as revealed earlier, individual difference factors are evident throughout conceptualizations of jealousy. In the following sections additional research highlighting personality within conceptualizations of jealousy is discussed followed by a discussion of the relation between personality and jealousy.

Personality within Conceptualizations of Jealousy

A number of jealousy researchers have taken the perspective that jealousy is a characteristic of the individual. This view is labeled dispositional jealousy – that is, there are individual differences in the likelihood that someone will behave in a jealous manner

across certain situations. Furthermore, one may say that there are individual differences in the manner in which someone will behave across jealousy-evoking situations.

Dispositional factors are also evident in White and Mullen's (1989) classification system of three types of jealousy developed for utility purposes in clinical contexts, (normal reactive, pathological reactive, and symptomatic). The first type, normal reactive jealousy, is elicited in a situation of actual or suspected infidelity; thus, the relationship is the focus of therapy. The remaining two types fall into the category of what researchers and clinicians have termed *morbid jealousy* (de Silva, 1987; Marks & de Silva, 1991; Keenan & Farrell, 2000). The definition of morbid jealousy differs across researchers but usually requires extreme levels of frequency or intensity, or the presence of certain abnormal characteristics, such as delusions of infidelity. Pathological reactive jealousy also requires a reactive component; however, in this type of jealousy, an individual's behaviors are inappropriate and deviant to the point that they suggest disordered functioning. The distinction is then between "normal" and pathological, a debate that is still pursued in the realm of psychopathology as a whole. In a situation of pathological jealousy the individual is the focus of therapy. Finally, symptomatic jealousy is characterized as a manifestation of some other type of psychopathology. In this case, the jealousy is addressed through treatment of the underlying disorder. White and Mullen (1989) consider delusions of infidelity to be characteristics of both pathological reactive jealousy as well as symptomatic jealousy. Acknowledging the continuity between these types of jealousy, they suggest re-assessment from time to time.

Personality as Related to Jealousy

Researchers have also examined the relation between measures of jealousy and specific individual difference dimensions. Most of these studies have utilized unidimensional scales to assess jealousy. A wide array of constructs have been examined

as potentially relating to jealousy, including self-esteem, neuroticism, social anxiety, emotional dependency, possessiveness, adult attachment, and love styles.

Self-esteem

Self-esteem has received a considerable amount of attention in the area of jealousy research. Conceptualizations of jealousy frequently define it as a reaction to a perceived threat to either the relationship or to one's self-esteem. Considering this crucial role of self-esteem in conceptualizations of jealousy, one may expect that research has consistently shown evidence of a relation between these two constructs; however, results have yielded inconsistent or minimal relations between self-esteem and jealousy (White & Mullen, 1989; Guerrero, Spitzberg, & Yoshimura, 2004). Part of these inconsistencies may be due to the nature of self-esteem exhibiting both trait- and state-like qualities, either as an antecedent or consequence of jealousy. White and Mullen (1989) note that the correlations increase in strength under two conditions: first, when self-esteem is conceptualized as relationship specific, such as perceived inadequacy as a partner, and second, when factor analytic methods have been used to derive face-valid jealousy scales. Gehl and Watson (2003) found relatively weak correlations between trait self-esteem and their factors of reactive jealousy and interpersonal insecurity, whereas anxious suspicion was moderately correlated with self-esteem. Buunk (1997) has reported weak to moderate negative correlations between self-esteem and his three jealousy scales. When this analysis was repeated separately for each gender, the effects were only replicated among women. Additionally, Buunk (1982) reported a moderate negative correlation between self-esteem and avoidance as a jealousy coping style among women whose spouse had extramarital involvement. He speculated this may have been a remnant of traditional views of how women should react to infidelity. Therefore this effect may not be replicable. In summary, research examining the relation between jealousy and self-esteem has been inconsistent. The role of self-esteem as an antecedent

factor to jealousy may be better understood if it is examined in relation to discrete elements of jealousy experience and expression.

The Five Factor Model

Few studies have examined the relation between jealousy and the Big Five factors of personality (neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). Two studies that have examined this relationship report moderate to strong correlations with neuroticism (Buunk, 1997; Gehl & Watson, 2003). Buunk (1982) also reported positive relations between neuroticism and the coping styles of avoidance and reappraisal among participants whose spouse had extramarital involvement.

Extraversion has shown weak negative correlations with Gehl and Watson's (2003) factors of anxious suspicion and interpersonal insecurity. Buunk's (1997) jealousy scales revealed weak to moderate correlations with a social anxiety scale similar to conceptualizations of low extraversion. Weak to moderate negative correlations were also reported between the jealousy factors and agreeableness and openness (Gehl & Watson, 2003); the strongest association was between agreeableness and anxious suspicion ($r = -.37, p < .001$), potentially due to the hostile nature of that particular factor. Buunk (1997) reported moderate correlations between rigidity and his measures of jealousy. Finally, conscientiousness was weakly negatively correlated with anxious suspicion and interpersonal insecurity but was not related to reactive jealousy (Gehl & Watson, 2003). While the relation between jealousy and neuroticism is relatively consistent, the relation between jealousy and the other four factors is less clear. Additional research needs to be conducted examining jealousy and the Five-Factor Model of personality; however, a better understanding may be obtained through an examination of more specific trait measures, particularly traits that are considered more maladaptive in nature.

Disordered Personality and Related Traits

There is growing evidence that jealousy may be related to some forms of disordered personality. For example, diagnostic criteria for Paranoid Personality Disorder as outlined in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edition*, include pathological jealousy (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). White and Mullen (1989) also suggest jealousy may be related to narcissistic tendencies in males and histrionic tendencies in females.

Research examining the personality types of abusive males has suggested that jealousy is related to Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD) (Dutton, 1998; Dutton et al., 1994; Dutton et al., 1996; Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2003). Dutton and colleagues have conducted a considerable amount of research examining what they term *the abusive personality* (Dutton, 1998). This abusive personality, which is primarily characterized by BPD characteristics, jealousy and anger, has also been linked to fearful and preoccupied attachment styles (Dutton et al., 1994; Dutton et al., 1996), the former of which they argue could be called “angry attachment.” This line of research, which focuses on abusive males, describes them as disguising feelings of jealousy and dependency with anger and demands for control in their intimate relationships. Dutton et al. (1996) has also related this profile to self-defeating, avoidant, and passive-aggressive tendencies.

Additional research in non-clinical samples has supported the link between jealousy and anger or hostility described by Dutton (1998) in abusive men. Gehl and Watson (2003) found moderate to strong relations between their factor of anxious suspicion and two measures of hostility (Aggression Questionnaire, A. H. Buss & Perry, 1992; PANAS-X, Watson & Clark, 1994). Hostility was also moderately related to interpersonal insecurity and weakly related to reactive jealousy. Buunk (1997) has also reported moderate correlations between hostility and his measures of possessive and anxious jealousy.

Additional studies have also found links between violence, dependency, and jealousy. In a longitudinal study assessing the consistency of marital violence, Holzworth-Munroe et al. (2003) found that borderline-dysphoric men exhibited higher levels of jealousy and spouse-specific dependency than did low-level antisocial men, generally violent-antisocial men, and family-only violent men (characterized by low levels of violence only within the family and minimal to no evidence of psychopathology). Researchers have also compared violent men with non-violent men. Murphy, Meyer, and O'Leary (1994) found that men who had physically assaulted their partner, while exhibiting similar levels of jealousy, were more likely to exhibit high levels of interpersonal dependency than both happily and unhappily married men who did not assault their partner. Barnett, Martinez, and Bluestein (1995) compared similar groups of men and found that happily married, non-violent men exhibited lower levels of jealousy than both maritally violent men and unhappily married non-violent men. However, the maritally violent men were distinguished from the unhappily married non-violent men by higher levels of emotional dependency. These studies suggest that dependency, when combined with jealousy, may be an important factor in determining the types of responses in which an individual is likely to engage.

In summary, these studies suggest that jealousy is related to several trait dimensions of maladaptive personality (e.g. dependency, aggression, mistrust, manipulateness, self-harm, entitlement, exhibitionism, and impulsivity) that are reflective of borderline, dependent, histrionic, narcissistic, avoidant and passive-aggressive tendencies.

The Schedule of Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality – Second Edition (SNAP-2; Clark, 1993; Clark, Simms, Wu, & Casillas, in press) provides dimensional measures of 12 traits related to the categorical personality disorders (Mistrust, Manipulateness, Aggression, Self-Harm, Eccentric-Perceptions, Dependency, Exhibitionism, Entitlement, Detachment, Impulsivity, Propriety, and Workaholism). Gehl and Watson (2003)

examined the relation between SNAP Mistrust and Dependency and their three jealousy factors. Anxious suspicion, a primarily cognitive factor, was moderately correlated with both traits. Interpersonal insecurity was moderately correlated with Mistrust and weakly related to Dependency. Both SNAP scales were weakly correlated to reactive jealousy. Considering the evidence relating jealousy to BPD and characteristics of other personality disorders, it is likely that additional SNAP-2 scales and the various discrete elements of jealousy experience and expression would exhibit theoretically meaningful relations.

Adult Attachment

Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980) has provided an important framework for researchers interested in jealousy and adult romantic relationships. Attachment theory provides an integration of the influence of evolution (the origin of the attachment system) and the influence of experience (the emergence of attachment styles). The attachment system is proposed to have been evolutionarily advantageous because it created a bond with, and increased the likelihood that an infant would be in close proximity to, a primary caregiver who could provide protection from various types of harm. Individual differences in attachment styles are argued to arise through the early attempts to form and maintain this bond and the emotional responses by the caregiver after periods of separation.

Hazan and Shaver's (1987) conceptualization of romantic love as an attachment process has stimulated a large volume of research in recent years and provided a very novel means of examining many aspects of adult romantic relationships. Whereas initial formulations of adult attachment had utilized a three category model adapted from infant attachment, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) presented a four category approach to adult attachment that is rooted in working models of the self and other. Brennan, Clark, & Shaver (1998) noted the dimensions of anxiety and avoidance discriminate between

attachment styles. These dimensions correspond with the working models, in that anxiety corresponds with views of the self and avoidance with views of the attachment figure. The four attachment styles can be conceptualized based upon combinations of these working models (positive or negative views of the self and other) and dimensions (high or low levels of anxiety and avoidance). Secure individuals are characterized by low levels of both anxiety and avoidance. Fearful individuals are characterized by high levels of anxiety and avoidance; they have negative views of themselves (as unlovable) and others (as untrustworthy). Preoccupied individuals also have negative views of themselves but positive views of others and are therefore not avoidant, instead seeking acceptance from others. Dismissing individuals have a positive view of the self, but view others as untrustworthy, avoiding disappointment by maintaining independence and dismissing the need for a relationship.

Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick (1997) note that jealousy and attachment share several characteristics, primarily that they both (a) address relationship maintenance, (b) are triggered by threat of separation, (c) involve similar emotions, and (d) involve individual differences in distress levels that can be quantitatively examined. In addition, they suggest that (e) similar to attachment, jealousy can be expressed or experienced in qualitatively different ways.

When jealousy is measured as a single construct or as a subscale within an attachment measure it typically exhibits strong correlations with the anxiety dimension and tends to be unrelated to the avoidance dimension (Brennan et al., 1998), though a few studies have found weak to moderate relations (Gehl & Watson, 2003; Knobloch, Solomon and Cruz, 2001).

When considering mean differences between attachment styles in the three category model, anxious individuals tend to report higher levels of jealousy than secure or avoidant individuals (Buunk, 1997; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and report higher levels of emotional experience in response to a jealousy-evoking situation (Sharpsteen &

Kirkpatrick, 1997). Within the four category model, preoccupied and fearful individuals report higher levels of cognitive jealousy than secure and dismissive individuals (Guerrero, 1998). Guerrero also found that preoccupied individuals report higher levels of fear and sadness than do dismissive individuals as part of their jealousy experience. Dismissive individuals also report less fear as part of their jealousy experience than do secure individuals. Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick (1997) reported secure individuals are more likely to feel anger towards their partner than fear or sadness and are likely to express it; whereas, anxious individuals feel anger somewhat intensely but are less likely to express it. Fear and insecurity tend to be more prominent for anxious individuals as well. In short, it appears that jealousy is primarily related to the anxiety dimension of attachment, however, the avoidant dimension does distinguish secure and dismissive individuals for some findings.

Differences in communicative and coping responses to jealousy have also been found between attachment styles (Guerrero, 1998). Secure and preoccupied individuals are more likely to disclose thoughts and feelings to the partner and calmly ask the partner about his/her thoughts, feelings, and behavior (utilize integrative communication). They are also more likely to attempt to increase their attractiveness, display affection, and spend more time with their partner than usual (utilize compensatory restoration). However, they are less likely to remain silent and deny their jealous feelings to their partner (utilize avoidance / denial) than are dismissive and fearful individuals. Preoccupied individuals are also more likely to let the partner know, through displays, that they are sad, hurt, frustrated or insecure (utilize negative affect expression) as well as spy on their partner, look through their partner's belongings and restrict their partner's access to a rival (utilize surveillance) than secure, dismissive and fearful individuals.

Adult Attachment as Related to Disordered Personality

Dutton et al. (1994) found relatively strong links between measures reflecting their abusive personality and fearful and preoccupied attachment styles. This is not surprising as there is a considerable amount of evidence linking these attachment styles to disordered personality, in particular, BPD (Barone, 2003; Brennan & Shaver, 1998; Fonagy et al., 1996; Fossati et al., 2005). Indeed, Agrawal and colleagues (Agrawal, Gunderson, Holmes, & Lyons-Ruth, 2004), reviewed thirteen relevant studies and reported a robust, strong association between insecure attachment styles and BPD. Brennan and Shaver (1998) suggested that future research should examine the possibility that insecure attachment and personality disorders may share similar developmental antecedents. Fossati and colleagues (2005) tested competing models linking adult attachment patterns and borderline personality disorder. They found that attachment patterns act as indirect risk factors for BPD due to their relationship with aggressive and impulsive personality traits.

Given the links between disordered personality (BPD in particular), associated maladaptive personality traits (e.g. aggression, impulsivity), adult attachment, and general measures of jealousy, in addition to the relations between adult attachment and communicative responses to jealousy, it would be expected that these maladaptive personality traits would exhibit meaningful relations with specific jealousy responses.

The Componential Approach to the Assessment of Jealousy

As this study utilizes Guerrero and Andersen's Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression to achieve its goal of examining the relation between jealousy and the antecedent factor of personality, a more in depth examination of this approach to jealousy assessment is in order.

White and Mullen (1989) state that jealousy scales can easily become "scattered collections of behaviors, thoughts, and feelings" (p. 304). They argue that discrete

elements of the jealousy complex should be measured instead. White and Mullen proposed a procedural model of jealousy outlining these discrete elements. Drawing from related theories and previous research, they proposed a model for the jealousy process. This model has provided the conceptual framework for much of the jealousy research since its publication. Their definition of romantic jealousy attempts to avoid labeling it as a specific “thing” or “entity” because White and Mullen argue that reification has become a problem in the field. Instead they define jealousy as:

a complex of thoughts, emotions, and actions that follows loss of or threat to self-esteem and/or the existence or quality of the romantic relationship. The perceived loss or threat is generated by the perception of a real or potential romantic attraction between one's partner and a (perhaps imaginary) rival (White & Mullen, 1989, p. 9).

White and Mullen's (1989) procedural model of jealousy draws from Lazarus' Cognitive Appraisal Theory. Three individuals are incorporated in their model, the jealous individual, the partner or “beloved,” and the rival (real or imagined). Each of these individuals contributes their own mix of affect, cognition and behavior to the situation and may influence this same mix in one another. White and Mullen identify four categories of stable causal conditions: P (the jealous individual), O (others, including the partner and/or rival), P x O (the relationship), and E soc (the social environment). These conditions influence -- and can be influenced by -- the interpersonal relationships of the three involved individuals. Please see White and Mullen (1989, p. 31) for a pictorial representation.

The affective component of the model consists of emotions, moods, and feelings. The cognitive component of the model, as in Lazarus' model, is divided into primary appraisal, secondary appraisal, and cognitive coping efforts. Primary appraisals are directed at recognizing the presence of a threat. Secondary appraisals are aimed at developing options to cope with the threat, planning which options will be used, and evaluating their success. Cognitive coping efforts involve changing beliefs or

interpretations of the threat, essentially engaging in a reappraisal process. Behaviors are categorized as either information gathering or behavioral coping processes. Within their model, information gathering behaviors are directly linked to appraisal, as they are aimed at gathering information about the existence, level, and nature of the threat.

As mentioned before, White and Mullen (1989) argued that:

advances in the field will come from measuring discrete elements of the jealousy complex, such as various emotions, coping strategies, and beliefs about the nature of the threat posed by the rival (primary and secondary appraisal), and then from linking these variables (or patterns of these variables) to antecedent events or theoretical variables (p. 303-304).

A potential drawback of this model and the componential approach is the apparent lack of parsimony. However, parsimony should be invoked only when other important criteria are relatively equal. The primary advantage of White and Mullen's (1989) definition is that it encompasses many previous views that have attempted to explain jealousy in terms of more specific elements. Additionally, their procedural model can also account for many of the current empirical findings regarding these elements. Finally, their model has led to, and has the potential to continue to lead to, a considerable amount of empirical hypotheses that can be tested.

Guerrero and Andersen's (1998) descriptive Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression is a model of the *individual's* experience and expression of jealousy (see Figure 1). They argue that an understanding of the experience and expression of the jealous individual must first be understood before an examination of the more complex interaction patterns between the individual, their partner, and the rival can be effectively assessed. Consistent with most conceptualizations of jealousy, Guerrero and Andersen include a perceived threat as the instigating mechanism of their model. This threat can result from a multitude of factors such as witnessing the rival and partner interact, paranoid suspicions, or finding evidence of an infidelity by the partner. It is also this threat that leads to what Guerrero and Andersen term jealousy experience, which

consists of emotion and cognition. The emotions and cognitions then guide the formation of jealousy goals, which in turn influence the specific communicative responses or jealousy expression. Additionally, this componential model incorporates six categories of antecedent factors that influence each component of their model.

While similar in some respects to White and Mullen's (1989) model, the Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression (Guerrero & Andersen, 1998) makes several important contributions. First, it outlines additional specific categories of antecedent conditions that previous research has demonstrated to be important to the study of jealousy. Second, it makes the distinction between jealousy experience and jealousy expression. Jealousy experience refers to the intrapersonal cognitive and affective elements of the jealousy complex, whereas jealousy expression is operationalized as communicative responses to jealousy; both behavior and emotional expression fall into this category. Finally, their model draws from multiple perspectives to expand the goals or functions of jealousy expression beyond those of relationship and self-esteem maintenance.

Jealousy Experience

White and Mullen's (1989) conceptualization avoids labeling jealousy as a specific "thing." Therefore, this section focuses on features or concomitants of what Guerrero and Andersen (1998) refer to as jealousy experience. They describe two components of jealousy experience: cognition and emotion. When individuals are asked to describe their jealousy they will use statements that begin with "I felt..." or "I thought..." suggesting affective and cognitive elements. These are also the types of statements that are commonly included in measures of jealousy. Cognitive and affective elements, as well as the coping behaviors discussed in the following section do not consistently follow a specific temporal path, but can influence each other through feedback loops.

For example, a man may find flowers in his wife's car and perceive this as threatening, signaling the possibility of a rival (primary appraisal). He may become fearful of losing his wife (emotional reaction). He also may become suspicious of his wife, assuming she secretly accepted flowers from someone and tried to keep it from him (cognitive reaction). He may then begin to engage in surveillance activities (coping behaviors), searching for evidence of infidelity. As a result of this surveillance, he may stumble across an explicit love note from another man among his wife's possessions. He may then interpret this as evidence of an affair and reappraise the situation as more threatening than he had initially (reappraisal). He may then openly confront his wife about the affair (coping). This example could have, of course, taken a divergent path at several points. For example, perhaps the man's cognitive reaction would not be primarily one of suspicion and his coping behaviors were, instead of surveillance, showing additional signs of affection toward his wife.

Affective Features

Previous research has suggested that most of the affective and emotional features associated with jealousy can be categorized into six groups: anger, fear, sadness, guilt, envy, and sexual arousal or passion (White & Mullen, 1989). Researchers examining jealousy as a prototype are interested in the many features that make up emotion scripts or emotion events in people's minds. Aspects of the prototype analyses pertaining to affect identify a wide array of features associated with jealousy beyond those that tend to be strictly defined as emotions. These include feeling threatened, upset, insecure, betrayed, rejected, possessive, hopeless, defeated, confused, frustrated, shocked, overwhelmed, sick, tense, agitated, and hurt (Sharpsteen, 1993; Fitness & Fletcher, 1993). Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick (1997) had participants sort these jealousy features into piles that would "represent the emotions involved in romantic jealousy" (p. 633). Hierarchical cluster analysis revealed four clusters which were identified as sadness, fear,

anger, and what they referred to as idealized-jealousy. This suggests that people can identify and distinguish between these three emotions within jealousy when asked, but there are also features that are distinct from these emotions within the experience of jealousy. The affective features for this distinct fourth cluster, idealized jealousy, included envious, threatened, untrusting, paranoid, possessive, cheated, betrayed, and shocked. If we relate these data to the six emotion categories identified by White and Mullen (1989) the envious item appeared in the idealized-jealousy cluster, whereas the item most closely related to guilt, "blame yourself," was incorporated into the fear cluster. There did not appear to be any items that were reflective of White and Mullen's affective element of sexual arousal / passion within the jealousy prototype of Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick's participants. Additional studies examining specific jealous-related emotions have found factors that combine envy with fear and guilt remains distinct (Guerrero, Trost & Yoshimura, 2005).

The role of envy as a jealousy-related emotion should be addressed further as a considerable amount of research has attempted to differentiate between the two constructs through several approaches (Salovey & Rodin, 1986; Parrott, 1991; Parrott & Smith, 1993; Haslam & Bornstein, 1996). One of the reasons postulated as why these two constructs are viewed as similar is that they both have social comparison processes involved in their experience (Salovey, 1991b). Envy, by definition, involves social comparison because it requires the presence of another who, in some way, is in an advantageous position in relation to the self. Jealousy, according to White and Mullen's (1989) conceptualization, involves the presence of a real or imagined rival. One may engage in social comparison with the rival assuming that the partner may be engaging in comparison processes as well. Therefore, it has been argued, the experience of one may contribute to the experience of the other. If one is jealous due to the threat posed by a rival, then one may begin to compare oneself to the rival; thus, becoming aware of several desirable characteristics in the rival that one is lacking, and experience envy as a

result. Parrott (1991) argues that the presence of an envied other can also lead to the interpretation that the individual is a rival for one's mate and a threat to the relationship, thereby leading to jealousy.

Cognitive Features

In their model, White and Mullen (1989) differentiated between several types of cognitive appraisals that occur within the experience of jealousy. Primary appraisal focuses on the potential for, existence of, or level of harm posed by, a rival relationship. Secondary appraisals include considering possible coping strategies, deciding which will be used, and evaluating their effectiveness afterward. Four categories of secondary appraisal have been described by Kelley (1983). These categories are 1) motives assessment, 2) social comparison, 3) alternatives assessment, and 4) loss assessment.

Motives Assessment. This refers to the attempt to determine the motives of one's partner. Attribution theory has been applied when considering motives assessment, including the variables of locus of causality (internal or external), stability (long-term vs. transient causes), controllability, and intentionality. Motive assessment aims to determine reasons for the partner's actions as well as the needs and desires of the partner in order to evaluate how well one can meet them as opposed to a rival. This is related to a second category of secondary appraisals, social comparison.

Social Comparison. Social comparison in the context of jealousy refers to the comparison of one's self to the rival. The jealous individual is motivated to gain information about the rival to determine if he/she would be more successful at meeting the partner's needs.

Alternatives Assessment. In alternatives assessment, an individual speculates what will happen to one's self if the partner leaves the relationship. It includes evaluating the likelihood of developing new relationships if the partner were to leave. Frequently,

the jealous individual assesses their own commitment to the relationship through these types of appraisals.

Loss Assessment. Finally, loss assessment is concerned with evaluating what has been, or could be, lost. During this assessment, individuals consider the implications for the self.

Guerrero, Eloy, Jorgensen, & Andersen (1993) utilized a modified version of Pfeiffer and Wong's (1989) measure of cognitive jealousy, creating two subscales. This version conceptualizes cognitive jealousy experience as cognitive suspicion of a partner's interest in others and cognitive worry over rivals' interest in one's partner. This distinction may have important implications as an individual may be experiencing one type of cognitive jealousy to a much greater extent than the other type.

Jealousy-related Goals or Functions

While jealousy goals, or functions, are not part of the jealousy experience, they are conceptually related to the cognitive elements of jealousy experience and provide a useful framework for predicting jealousy expression (Guerrero & Afifi, 1998, 1999). Guerrero and Andersen (1998) identified six jealousy-related goals or functions. The first two goals, maintaining the primary relationship and preserving self-esteem, are taken from Bryson's (1991) dual motivation model of jealousy. The second two goals, reducing uncertainty about the primary relationship and the rival relationship, are derived from work examining the role of uncertainty in jealousy and the cognitive appraisal model of jealousy (Afifi & Reichert, 1996; White & Mullen, 1989). The fifth goal, re-assessing the relationship, is also based on White and Mullen's model of romantic jealousy. This goal is primarily concerned with deciding whether or not to stay in the relationship. Finally, equity restoration through retaliation is the final jealousy-related goal. This goal typically involves the jealous individual making the partner feel bad through tactics such as guilt or jealousy induction.

Jealousy Expression

Guerrero and Andersen's (1998) conceptualization of jealousy expression includes responses to jealousy that are communicative in nature, specifically, behaviors and emotional expression.

Previous Conceptualizations related to Jealousy Expression

Early research assessing jealousy expression focused on the coping strategies of individuals when faced with what was considered a jealousy-evoking situation. Bryson (1991) states that on deterministic grounds "one could argue that any behavior that regularly or consistently occurs after exposure to a particular stimulus is a response to that stimulus. Thus, if we agree that certain situations are jealousy-evoking, then any behavior that becomes more likely in those situations is by definition a jealousy response" (p. 194). A problem with this viewpoint is that it assumes researchers can agree on what constitutes a jealousy-evoking situation. At its most extreme, this statement could be interpreted to mean that the entire realm of jealousy experience and expression is considered a jealousy response. Several researchers have attempted to define and assess jealousy responses because improved understanding of these responses would lead to examination of the effectiveness of each in dealing with the experience of jealousy.

To better understand how individuals cope with jealousy, Buunk (1982) examined the frequency of coping responses in 50 Dutch married couples who had experienced infidelity by at least one of the partners. A factor analysis of his thirteen coping items revealed three factors labeled Avoidance, Reappraisal and Communication. Avoidance responses were characterized by avoiding the situation, considering leaving the spouse, and various types of wishful thinking (e.g. for revenge, for the end of the affair). Reappraisal involved self reproach as well as attempts at getting the jealousy under control and viewing it as unreasonable. Finally, Communication was defined by

communicating with both the partner and the rival “as open as possible” (p. 16). While this study was an important first step in understanding the coping strategies associated with jealousy, it was not comprehensive for the entire range of jealousy-evoking situations. As Buunk was interested in examining coping strategies in response to a spouse’s actual extramarital affair, this conceptualization and measure do not contain the wide variety of strategies jealous individuals use when they simply perceive or suspect such a threat.

Salovey and Rodin (1988) also examined the frequency of different jealousy and envy coping styles. They, however, examined responses to jealousy and envy in various life domains: school/work, family, friends, and romance. For each domain, participants reported its level of importance, the frequency with which they experience jealousy-provoking situations, the amount of jealousy experienced, and other experienced affect. Participants were then provided with three domain specific jealousy-evoking scenarios for each of the four domains and asked how likely they would be to use each of 15 coping strategies. Results indicated that participants reported experiencing jealousy-provoking situations significantly less often in the domains of family and romance. Suspecting that participants would more frequently base responses in these domains on imagined situations, researchers only included the school/work and friends domains in all further analyses. Factor analyses revealed three factors: self-reliance, self-bolstering and selective ignoring. Self-Reliance involved refraining from feeling negative emotions, becoming more committed to the goal and refraining from asking advice. Self-Bolstering included thinking about good qualities of the self and doing something nice for the self. Selective Ignoring was defined by a single strategy, “deciding it isn’t so important.” Since Salovey and Rodin only utilized data from the school/work and friends domains, these factors were primarily based upon what many researchers label envy and non-romantic relational jealousy, not strategies used in a romantic context. Therefore, while informative, this structure is less relevant in an examination of romantic jealousy.

Bryson (1991) has also outlined his approaches to understanding responses to jealousy-evoking situations. As his earlier quote would suggest, he was inclusive and included behaviors as well as emotions reported by a sample of undergraduate students. His measure was composed of the 24 most frequently reported emotions and the 24 most frequently reported behaviors. These 48 items were presented to another sample of undergraduates and submitted to factor analyses resulting in eight factors. A modified version of this scale was examined across five different countries: France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and the United States. After noting congruency between individual factor analyses for each country, an overall analysis was conducted and resulted in nine factors (compared to the previous eight). Five factors were replicated across both studies: Emotional Devastation (e.g. "Feel less able to cope with other aspects of my life"), Impression Management (e.g. "Try to make my partner think I don't care"), Reactive Retribution (e.g. "Flirt or go out with other people"), Intropunitiveness (e.g. "Feel guilty about being jealous"), and Social Support Seeking (e.g. "Talk to close friends about my feelings"). The additional three factors in the first study were Arousal, Confrontation, and Anger. These three factors and some additional items composed the four factors in the international study: Relational Improvement, Aggression, Monitoring, and Reaction to Betrayal. Arousal was renamed Relational Improvement (e.g. "Become more sexually active with my partner"). Anger, with the addition of some Confrontation items became Aggression (e.g. "Threaten the other person"). The remainder of the Confrontation items as well as some new items composed the Monitoring factor (e.g. "Question my partner about his/her activities"). Reaction to Betrayal is a somewhat heterogeneous mix of items that convey overt, non-aggressive anger toward the partner (e.g. "Feel betrayed," "Doubt my partner").

Bryson (1991) characterized his responses as part of a dual motivation model in which the focus on the relative goals of maintaining the relationship or maintaining self-esteem would be predictive of which coping strategies one would engage. Four

categories of responses are evident: those that preserve the relationship at the expense of self-esteem, those that preserve self-esteem at the expense of the relationship, those that preserve both, and those that preserve neither. Internal consistencies for some of these categories were extremely poor (Rich, 1991). Guerrero and Afifi (1998) tested this model using a measure of jealousy expression (CRJ, Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg, & Eloy, 1995) to be discussed below. While they found that these motivations do influence responses to jealousy, most of Bryson's specific hypotheses were not supported.

Rich (1991) characterized jealousy responses as either partner-enhancing or partner-attacking based upon Bryson's (1991) distinction of relationship maintaining or self-esteem maintaining responses. Responses aimed at preserving the relationship tended to be partner-enhancing whereas those aimed at preserving self-esteem tended to be partner-attacking. Both drawing items from Bryson's work and generating novel items, Rich (1991) developed a two-factor measure of jealous responses operationalizing these two categories that exhibited better psychometric properties than Bryson's four measures.

D. M. Buss (1988), working from an evolutionary perspective, conducted a series of studies examining mate retention tactics. A sample of undergraduates listed acts in which they, or people they know, have engaged in order to retain their partners. They listed acts used by males and females separately. These acts were then categorized into 19 clusters using a rational approach. The clusters were then divided into tactics directed at one's mate (intersexual) and tactics directed at a rival (intrasexual). Finally, within each of these two categories, the tactics were further grouped. Intersexual tactics were grouped into Direct Guarding (e.g. vigilance, concealment of mate, and monopolization of mate's time), Negative Inducements (e.g. punishing mate's infidelity threat, derogating competitors, and various types of manipulation) and Positive Inducements (e.g. resource display, enhance appearance, love and caring, and submission). Intrasexual tactics were

grouped into Public Signals of Possession (e.g. verbal and physical signs as well as possessive ornamentation) and Negative Inducements (e.g. derogation of mate to competitor, intrasexual threats, and violence). D. M. Buss claimed this should be viewed as a preliminary taxonomy and that further testing is essential; however, the same taxonomy was later utilized in a study of married couples (D. M. Buss & Shackelford, 1997).

Communicative Responses to Jealousy

In their description of jealousy expression, Guerrero et al. (1995) chose to focus on responses to jealousy that are communicative in nature. In doing so, they incorporated behavioral responses and emotional expressions (manifested in behavior), but not internal cognitive coping strategies. This may appear problematic and not comprehensive as it excludes cognitive coping strategies; however, this decision is consistent with White and Mullen's (1989) model, in which cognitive coping strategies are considered reappraisals and should therefore be assessed as part of the cognitive jealousy experience. Guerrero and colleagues developed the Communicative Responses to Jealousy (CRJ) Scale through an iterative process of (a) a qualitative sorting of 962 responses generated by a sample of 200 undergraduates, (b) the creation of two superordinate categories based upon the distinction between interactive and general behavioral responses, (c) the generation of 67 items to assess the categories resulting from the sort, (d) exploratory factor analyses for each of these two superordinate categories ($N = 363$), (e) a comparison with other measures of jealousy experience and expression, and (f) confirmatory factor analyses for each superordinate category ($N = 141$).

The first factor analysis, incorporating items representing interactive responses, resulted in a 30 item, six-factor measure. Factors include Active Distancing, Negative Affect Expression, Integrative Communication, Distributive Communication, Avoidance/Denial, and Violent Communication/Threats. Active Distancing involves

decreasing contact, communication, and affection with the partner. Negative Affect Expression refers to letting the partner know, through displays, that one is sad, hurt, frustrated or insecure. Integrative Communication involves disclosure of thoughts and feelings to the partner and calmly asking the partner about his/her thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. Distributive Communication refers to yelling, cursing, and accusing the partner. Avoidance/Denial involves being silent and denying jealous feelings to the partner. Finally, Violent Communication/Threats is threatening to harm the partner or displaying physical violence toward the partner.

The second factor analysis, incorporating general behavioral responses, resulted in a 21-item, five-factor measure. These include Surveillance/Restriction, Compensatory Restoration, Manipulation Attempts, Rival Contacts, and Violent Behavior. Surveillance/Restriction refers to spying on the partner, looking through his/her belongings, and restricting his/her access to a rival. Compensatory Restoration involves attempts to increase attractiveness, displaying affection, and spending more time with the partner than usual. Manipulation Attempts involve inducing guilt or jealousy in the partner and trying to get revenge. Rival Contact includes threatening the rival and telling her/him to stay away from the partner. Violent Behavior, in this case, is violence directed at objects (e.g. slamming doors).

Guerrero et al. (1995) noted three categories of responses that did not appear in their final measure that had both been in their original qualitative analyses as well as in D. M. Buss' (1988) study of mate retention tactics previously discussed (Rival Derogation, Relationship Threats, and Signs of Possession). Guerrero has since developed items to assess these factors, has collected data utilizing these items with intentions of further establishing their validity, but as of last communication has not yet examined these data (Guerrero, 2004; personal communication, October 28, 2005). See Appendix A for the CRJ with item content sorted by the 14 communicative responses.

Guerrero et al. (1995) report that these categories can also be conceptually distinguished as responses that are destructive in nature and those that may be constructive for the relationship. While most of the responses fall into the destructive category, three (Integrative Communication, Compensatory Restoration, and Negative Affect Expression) may potentially be constructive, or help maintain the relationship.

Guerrero and colleagues have related these communicative responses, in meaningful ways to other important relationship variables such as attachment style differences (Guerrero, 1998), relational satisfaction (Andersen, Eloy, Guerrero, & Spitzberg, 1995), emotional frequency and intensity, and the six jealousy related goals proposed by Guerrero and Andersen (1998; Guerrero & Afifi, 1999).

Empirical Relations between Jealousy Experience and Expression

White and Mullen (1989) explicitly stated a point that cannot be stressed enough. This being, that if jealousy research were to advance, it would be achieved through measuring discrete elements of the jealousy complex, how they relate to one another, and how they relate to various antecedent conditions. Researchers have begun to assess the relation between jealousy experience and expression utilizing measures that are aimed at measuring the discrete elements of the jealousy complex in order to determine if this distinction is valid and useful in the understanding of jealousy. Having discussed the elements of the jealousy complex, what Guerrero and Andersen (1998) referred to as jealousy experience and expression, we now turn to research addressing the second step proposed by White and Mullen, that is, examining how these elements relate to one another.

Guerrero and colleagues (Guerrero & Afifi, 1999; Guerrero et al., 1995; Guerrero et al. 2005), utilizing regression analyses, have reported several relations between measures of jealousy experience and their measure of jealousy expression, the CRJ.

Cognitive Experience and Jealousy Expression

In their initial study presenting the CRJ, Guerrero et al. (1995) reported that cognitive elements of jealousy experience were associated with domains of jealousy expression. Specifically, cognitive suspicion of the partner's interest in a rival was predicted by Active Distancing and Surveillance/Restriction, while cognitive worry over rivals' interest in the partner was predicted by Avoidance/Denial, Surveillance/Restriction, and Compensatory Restoration. In a separate sample, Guerrero (Guerrero et al., 2005) assessed participants' perceived level of threat with a four-item measure, finding it predictive of Surveillance/Restriction and negatively associated with Integrative Communication in a regression analysis that included several additional specific emotion predictors as well. Although this measure of general threat was included as a covariate with specific emotion measures, it may still be conceptualized as a cognitive appraisal. All three measures of cognitive jealousy utilized were related to surveillance and restrictive responses to jealousy. Other significant relations were specific to each cognitive measure. See Table 1 for a summary.

Emotional Experience and Jealousy Expression

In Guerrero et al.'s (1995) initial study, the frequency of emotional jealousy, as measured by a modified version of Pfeiffer and Wong's (1989; Guerrero et al., 1993) scale, was predicted by Active Distancing, Negative Affect Expression, and Surveillance/Restriction. Guerrero and Afifi (1999) also reported the use of a measure of emotional frequency as well as a measure of emotional intensity in their regression analyses predicting communicative responses from the six jealousy goals or functions discussed above. The measure of frequency of jealousy emotion predicted Distributive Communication, Active Distancing, and Surveillance/Restriction. The general measure of emotional intensity was predictive of Surveillance/Restriction, Negative Affect Expression, Distributive Communication, and Rival Contacts.

Guerrero et al. (2005) reported two independently conducted studies examining the relation between jealousy-related emotions and jealousy responses. The first study coded the presence of jealousy responses from open-ended descriptions and utilized a combination of items taken from White and Mullen's (1989) list of jealousy-related emotions as well as items from the Mood Adjective Checklist (Nowlis, 1965). The second study utilized the CRJ (Guerrero et al., 1995), items from White and Mullen's list, and the four-item measure of general degree of threat mentioned previously.

Regression analyses within the first study revealed hostility to be predictive of negative affect expression, distributive communication, and surveillance behavior, while it was negatively associated with avoidance/denial. The second study also found hostility to be predictive of a number of communicative responses including distributive communication, violent communication/threats, active distancing, surveillance behavior, manipulation attempts, violent behavior, and rival contacts. It was also negatively associated with compensatory restoration. Interestingly, irritation emerged independent of hostility in the factor analyses conducted for the second study. The milder measure of irritation was also predictive of distributive communication and active distancing, but also avoidance/denial, negative affect expression, and integrative communication. In the first study, fear was negatively associated with avoidance/denial, whereas in the second study, fear and envy emerged as the same factor and were predictive of negative affect expression, surveillance behavior, and compensatory restoration. Guilt showed a positive relation with avoidance/denial and a negative relation with surveillance behaviors in the first study and was negatively associated with violent communication/threats in the second study. Finally, the second study also found that passion (sexual arousal) was predictive of rival contacts.

Taken together, these findings have led these researchers to draw a few conclusions which provide the basis for hypotheses in the proposed study. First, the experience of anger within the context of jealousy may be distinguished by the level of

intensity (i.e. irritable vs. hostile) and this distinction may have implications for what types of responses occur. The more intense emotion of hostility was predictive of a wider array of destructive responses, especially those of a violent nature, whereas irritation was predictive of fewer destructive responses. Additionally, irritation was predictive of the potentially constructive response of integrative communication. Guilt revealed theoretically meaningful relations in that it was negatively associated with Violent Communication/Threats and Surveillance/Restriction, responses an individual feeling guilty in the context of their feelings of jealousy would not be likely to exhibit, instead responding with Avoidance/Denial, or denying the jealous feelings and pretending nothing is wrong. The expression of Compensatory Restoration, a potential constructive response to jealousy, was predicted by the combination of fear and envy as well as low levels of hostility. Guerrero et al. (2005) state that this combination suggests that individuals experiencing envy and fear as a result of comparing themselves to a rival will engage in behaviors to increase their own relative worth to the partner, but only when feelings of hostility are low. See Table 2 for a summary.

Jealousy Goals or Functions and Jealousy Expression

Guerrero and Afifi (1999) reported additional regression analyses for nine of the CRJ scales. In these analyses the predictor variables included scales measuring the six jealousy-related goals (or functions), as well as the measures of emotional intensity and frequency discussed previously in the context of emotional experience. Integrative communication was associated with the goal of reducing uncertainty about the primary relationship. Compensatory restoration was associated with the goal of maintaining the relationship. Negative Affect Expression was predicted by reducing uncertainty about the primary relationship, emotion intensity, self-esteem preservation (-), and relationship maintenance. Distributive communication was predicted by equity restoration through retaliation as well as the intensity and frequency of jealous emotion. Active distancing

was also associated with equity restoration through retaliation as well as relationship re-assessment and emotional frequency. The goals of self-esteem preservation and relationship re-assessment were predictive of avoidance/denial jealousy responses. Surveillance/restriction as a jealousy response was predicted by equity restoration through retaliation, reducing uncertainty about the rival, emotion frequency, self-esteem preservation (-), and emotional intensity. Manipulation attempts were predicted by equity restoration through retaliation and relationship re-assessment. Finally, rival contacts were predicted by emotion intensity, reducing uncertainty about the rival, equity restoration through retaliation, and were negatively related to self-esteem preservation.

In summary, individuals interested in maintaining the relationship engage in compensatory restoration and negative affect expression; the relationship is valued by them so they appear hurt when it is threatened and try to make themselves more valuable to their partner. On the other hand, individuals primarily interested in maintaining self-esteem tend to avoid responses that may either signal jealousy to others (e.g. negative affect expression, rival contacts, and surveillance behavior) or threaten the self (i.e. they are more likely to avoid the partner). Individuals expressing the goal of reducing uncertainty about the primary relationship are most likely to engage in integrative communication and negative affect expression (straightforward discussion of concerns and feelings). Individuals desiring more knowledge about the rival relationship are, as one might expect, more likely to contact the rival and engage in surveillance behaviors. Individuals interested in re-assessing their relationship used indirect methods (avoidance/denial, active distancing, and manipulation attempts). Guerrero and Afifi (1999) list three possible explanations for these associations. First, individuals may need time to re-assess the relationship and these indirect methods give them this time. Second, these methods could be viewed as tests for the partner, gaining additional information regarding the partner's feelings. Third, these responses create a situation in which the partner is in a position where they are expected to make the next move and the burden of

communication is not on the jealous individual. Finally, the goal of equity restoration through retaliation was associated with several destructive responses to jealousy, which is not surprising since this is essentially aimed at hurting the partner. See Table 3 for a summary.

Antecedent Factors

Antecedent factors to jealousy represent an extremely broad and heterogeneous group and, as a result, will most likely pose the greatest difficulty for an integrative understanding of the origins and determinants of jealousy. Several of the factors considered as antecedents to the jealousy experience have been the focus of empirical studies examining the correlates of jealousy. Guerrero and Andersen (1998) conducted a review of studies examining antecedent factors that are associated with the jealousy experience and categorized these factors into six groups: biology/evolution, culture, personality, relationship characteristics, situational factors, and strategic moves by the partner. As the antecedent factor of personality is the primary focus of this paper and has already been discussed, a brief description of the five additional antecedent factors will follow. The interested reader is referred to Guerrero and Andersen (1998) for additional discussion of these five antecedent factors.

Biology / Evolution

This antecedent factor to jealousy is difficult to study. It cannot be manipulated in an experimental setting and individuals do not have insight into their own evolutionary history. The primary means through which this factor is studied is through the discovery of cross-cultural universals and examining sex differences in the activation of jealousy, the experience of jealousy and responses to jealousy (D. M. Buss, 2000; Harris, 2003). These studies have led to the differentiation between the constructs of sexual and emotional jealousy as well as sexual and emotional infidelity. The primary problem in dealing with these constructs is their inherent co-existence. Studies examining reports of

actual jealousy reveal this co-existence, whereas studies attempting to manipulate the presence of one factor in the absence of the other result in hypothetical scenarios that seem extremely unlikely or, for that matter, unrealistic to many participants when considering real-life possibilities. Given the nature of this antecedent factor, examining sex differences is our best approximation for the role of biology and evolution in the experience and expression of jealousy. Outside of robust findings utilizing a forced-choice paradigm introduced by D. M. Buss and colleagues (D. M. Buss, Larsen, Westen, & Semmelroth, 1992), sex differences in jealousy have been fairly inconsistent. Differences begin to appear more consistent when specific elements are examined (White & Mullen, 1989), but the majority of these effects are far from robust with several inconsistent findings still reported (Aylor & Dainton, 2001; Gehl & Vaidya, 2004; Guerrero et al., 1993; White & Mullen, 1989). In general, females tend to exhibit similar or slightly elevated levels of emotional jealousy. Findings examining jealousy responses tend to support evolutionary hypotheses (D. M. Buss, 1988; Guerrero, 2004) with males more likely to engage in resource display and contacting the rival and females more likely to engage in enhancement of their appearance. However, these findings are not consistently found across all studies.

Culture

Often the alternative explanation to evolution in explaining behavior related to jealousy (Buunk & Hupka, 1987), cultural antecedents require cultural diversity in the sample(s) being studied. Cultural factors such as beliefs, values, and norms have all been examined as potential factors influencing the experience and expression of jealousy. These variables have been studied both cross-culturally and historically as they change within a given culture (Hupka et al., 1985; Clanton & Smith, 1977). Guerrero (2004) and colleagues have noted current or upcoming projects to examine this antecedent factor in the context of their model.

Relationship Characteristics

This category of antecedent factors primarily involves demographic characteristics (e.g. relational type) (Aylor & Dainton, 2001) or key variables that are the focus of the secondary appraisal process (White & Mullen, 1989) directed at evaluating the commitment level in the relationship (e.g. intimacy, relationship uncertainty, distribution of power, level of investment, etc.) (Guerrero & Andersen, 1998). Findings have suggested that individuals involved in dating relationships tend to experience greater jealousy than individuals in married relationships (Aylor & Dainton, 2001; Guerrero et al., 1993). Aune and Comstock (1997) reported linear increases on brief measures of jealousy experience and expression in a cross-sectional analysis of college students. Guerrero et al. (1993) argues that as relationships grow and love increases, so does jealousy; however, the increased security of a marriage helps decrease jealousy. In contrast, Aylor and Dainton (2001) reported lower levels of cognitive jealousy among serious daters than casual daters, suggesting that some types of jealousy may not follow the pattern argued for by Guerrero et al. (1993). This suggests it may be important to examine jealousy experience and expression separately in these types of samples before broad generalizations are proposed. Additionally, in a sample of 101 individuals, Melamed (1991) found that correlations between jealousy and measures of self-esteem and neuroticism were more apparent among dating couples than married individuals.

Situational Factors

This category of antecedent factors is primarily examined through manipulation of the type and amount of information individuals are given about a jealousy-inducing situation. Researchers have achieved this through presenting *jealousy scenarios* in which they manipulate certain details across experimental conditions. These details can be cues to infidelity, specific behaviors in which the partner is engaging with a rival, specific

characteristics of the rival her/himself, or extenuating circumstances surrounding the infidelity.

Strategic Moves

Sometimes jealousy is simply the result of a specific attempt by the partner to induce it. This may be done to achieve certain goals (e.g. gaining information, testing commitment) and can be achieved through several different tactics (Baxter & Wilmot, 1984; Guerrero & Andersen, 1998). Fleischmann, Spitzburg, Andersen, and Roesch (2005) developed a model of jealousy induction that incorporates goals (relational reward or relational revenge) and the tactics used to achieve them (relational distancing, flirtation façade, relational alternatives).

Relationship Satisfaction

While examinations of jealousy and relationship satisfaction have often found an inverse relation, such findings are not consistent. Reviewing this literature, White and Mullen (1989) report studies finding this inverse relation, no relation and a curvilinear relation with those moderately satisfied reporting less jealousy than those with high or low satisfaction. Bringle (1991) additionally notes that the inverse correlations between satisfaction and jealousy tend to be small to moderate. Gehl and Watson's (2003) factor of Anxious Suspicion (in part comprised of cognitive jealousy measures) exhibited a moderate negative correlation with a relationship satisfaction item. In his argument for the necessity of jealousy, D. M. Buss (1988) argues that it can have positive benefits for the relationship such as igniting sexual passion or increasing the amount of attention one partner pays to the other. However, he acknowledges that attempting to arouse jealousy in a partner to achieve these goals can backfire.

Andersen et al. (1995) provide an additional argument that feelings of jealousy may not necessarily lead to dissatisfaction, but that it is instead how the jealousy is expressed that influences such an outcome. For example, those who value and want to

maintain their relationships may engage in constructive, instead of destructive, communication about jealousy with their partner, which in turn may not lead to significant reductions in satisfaction. Utilizing an earlier version of the six interactive scales of the CRJ, Andersen and colleagues tested these ideas. A reparameterized regression model revealed that certain communicative responses to jealousy predicted satisfaction beyond cognitive jealousy experience and relationship type. Specifically, partial correlations revealed positive associations with integrative communication and negative affect expression and a negative association with distributive communication. As the bivariate correlation between negative affect expression and satisfaction revealed an inverse relationship, suppression is occurring within the context of the regression. Guerrero (2004) observes that negative affect expression, when combined with integrative communication can exhibit positive relations with satisfaction, but when combined with destructive responses, such as distributive communication, then inverse relations appear. An earlier study by Buunk (1982) reported similar findings in that individuals reporting higher levels of satisfaction are more likely to report open communication with their partner and less likely to engage in destructive responses such as avoidance.

One consideration that must be made when examining the relation between jealousy and satisfaction is that these correlations do not reveal the direction of causality. Specifically, is it that jealousy within a relationship leads to lower levels of satisfaction, or that unsatisfied individuals are more likely to become jealous? This applies to responses to jealousy as well. Do constructive responses such as integrative communication lead to higher levels of satisfaction or are satisfied individuals more likely to engage in this type of communication because they are satisfied and value their relationship? These questions cannot be examined outside the context of a longitudinal study utilizing cross-lagged correlations or similar analyses, and even within that context, doubt still remains with regard to the direction of causality.

The Present Study

The main goal of the present study is to examine the role of personality as an antecedent factor to jealousy experience and expression as proposed by Guerrero and Andersen (1998). The following sections (a) outline the basic design of the present study including hypotheses regarding the structural analyses of the jealousy measures, (b) discuss hypotheses regarding the relation between personality and jealousy experience and expression, (c) discuss hypotheses regarding the relation between jealousy experience and jealousy expression, and (d) discuss hypotheses regarding the relation between relationship satisfaction and jealousy experience and expression.

Basic Design

The first sample is composed of undergraduate psychology students who are “currently dating or have ‘romantically seen’ someone at least twice and expect to see him/her again soon.” The second sample is composed of married individuals recruited from the Midwestern United States. The participant samples and recruitment methods are discussed further in the methods section. The basic design that follows is applicable to both studies. Distinctions are made when necessary.

Participants completed a series of personality measures including the Big-Five Inventory (BFI, Benet-Martinez & John, 1998), the SNAP-2 (Clark, 1993; Clark et al., in press), the 3 Vector Dependency Inventory (Pincus & Wilson, 2001), Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale (1965), and Brennan et al.’s (1998) Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) scale. Although the role of personality has been evident in research examining jealousy for a considerable amount of time, relatively little work has examined this relation while making the important distinction between jealousy experience and expression. With the primary exception of adult romantic attachment, well-established personality measures have not been employed in studies making this specific operational distinction. This study is a significant step toward addressing that lacuna.

Specifically, this study incorporated a well-established measure designed to assess both “normal” and “abnormal” personality. The SNAP-2 includes twelve scales that measure lower-order maladaptive trait dimensions representative of the underlying structure of the DSM-IV (APA, 1994) personality disorders and three scales representative of the Big-Three model of personality. Previous studies examining the role of personality disorders (primarily borderline) and other characteristics of violent or abusive men, or those with an abusive personality (Dutton, 1998), have reported jealousy and dependency as important correlates. By incorporating trait measures reflective of these disorders in the present study, it is hoped that the relation between maladaptive traits and jealousy will be evident in non-clinical samples. Although this aspect of the present study is exploratory in its specific aim, hypotheses can still be formed based upon this literature. Intercorrelations among antecedent factors, such as those between adult attachment and trait measures related to disordered personality, also guide the formation of hypotheses.

The 3 Vector Dependency Inventory (3VDI; Pincus & Wilson, 2001) was included as a supplemental measure of dependency. Using factor analytically derived scales, it assesses submissive, exploitable, and love dependency. Love dependence is related to adaptive functioning and is concerned with acquiring and maintaining relationships with nurturant others. Individuals characterized as love dependents are more likely to classify themselves as securely attached than are submissive dependents. Exploitable dependence is concerned with acquiring and maintaining acceptance and appreciation from others while avoiding conflict. Finally, submissive dependence is concerned with obtaining instrumental support from others. Submissive dependents compulsively seek this support and become angry when they do not receive it. Submissive dependents are more likely to characterize themselves as fearfully attached than are love dependents. While not focusing on dependency specific to the spouse or partner, these scales provide a more comprehensive assessment of distinct types of

dependency and have shown convergent (all three are related to neuroticism) and divergent patterns (the above mentioned relations to attachment) with other jealousy-related variables.

The BFI (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998) was included as a measure of the Five-Factor Model of personality, as it is the familiar conceptualization of the five higher-order dimensions under which most specific traits of personality fall. Although it is expected to be related to neuroticism, a measure of trait self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965) was included as it is hoped that some of the inconsistencies in the literature regarding the relation of self-esteem and jealousy can be better understood when jealousy is measured as distinct elements. Finally, a measure of adult attachment (ECR; Brennan et al., 1998) was included given the similarities between attachment and jealousy as outlined by Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick (1997) and the utility of this system in explaining adult romantic relationships.

A brief measure of relationship satisfaction, Norton's Quality Marriage Index (QMI, 1983), was included to examine its relation with jealousy experience and expression.

Participants completed several measures to assess the elements of jealousy experience and jealousy expression outlined in Guerrero and Andersen's model (1998). As in previous research, the cognitive elements of jealousy experience were measured by the cognitive items from the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). Guerrero et al. (1995; Guerrero, 1998) reported an alternate scoring for this scale as two subscales. The distinction between whether an individual is primarily suspicious of their partner's intentions or worried about the intentions of rivals may be an important one to make, as these types of cognitions have been differentially related to measures of jealousy expression. These cognitions may be differentially related to personality traits as well (e.g. suspicion of one's own partner may be more characteristic of high levels of

mistrust). If the subscales can be effectively scored, they are preferred to explore these distinctions.

The emotional elements of jealousy experience were assessed by an adapted version of the PANAS-X (Watson & Clark, 1994) and supplemental items utilized in previous research (Guerrero, 1998; White & Mullen, 1989). Structural analyses are necessary to examine the structure of jealousy-related affect as measured by these items. It is hypothesized that within negative affectivity, four factors representing four of the emotions primarily associated with jealousy (anger / hostility, fear, sadness, and guilt) will be the primary factors that emerge. Guilt is expected to emerge independently as it is the fourth specific negative affect scale that composes the PANAS-X. Previous research examining other affective elements of jealousy has been inconsistent (Guerrero, 2004; Sharpsteen & Kirkpatrick, 1997). The elements of envy and sexual arousal may or may not emerge as distinct factors. Envy may combine with other negative affectivity items; for example, Guerrero et al. (2005) reported a factor composed of fear and envy. Sexual arousal may potentially combine with items reflecting positive affectivity or may remain distinct. This possibility has yet to be assessed in the literature as Guerrero et al. (2005) assessed positive affectivity only in their first study and sexual arousal only within their second study.

H #1: Four factors reflecting anger, fear, sadness and guilt will emerge from an EFA of jealousy-related affect items.

H #2: Sexual Arousal / Passion will load with positive affect items in the EFA of jealousy-related affect items.

Previous research examining jealousy experience and expression has utilized an 18-item measure of jealousy-related goals that was also included in the present study. This measure serves as a conceptual link between the cognitive elements of jealousy experience and jealousy expression. Exploratory factor analyses are necessary to ascertain whether or not the six jealousy-related goals emerge. Previous research has

revealed that five factors emerge cleanly. Items reflecting the goal of reducing uncertainty in the primary relationship, however, tend to split across the other factors. Given the nature of this goal, it seems as though it should commonly co-occur with the other goals, as it is concerned with addressing if there is a reason to be jealous or not. This could potentially explain the cross-loadings. For scoring purposes, the behavior of the three items will determine whether or not they are retained as a scale; specifically, do they exhibit reasonable internal consistency and load on a forced sixth factor despite significant cross-loadings?

Finally, jealousy expression was measured utilizing the CRJ. As previously described, the initial construction of the CRJ was an iterative process involving data collection utilized for item generation, a theory-based rational sort, and factor analytic methods. Since its original publication, revisions have been made to the measure. In an attempt to increase the reliability of individual scales, additional items have been included. Also, to increase the content validity of the measure as a whole, three additional scales have been added. Despite being utilized twice in the literature (Aylor & Dainton, 2001; Carson & Cupach, 2000), structural analyses of the revised measure, incorporating the new items and scales, has not been reported. Therefore, exploratory factor analyses of the entire measure in the undergraduate sample are necessary to devise scoring techniques.

Although initial construction of the measure incorporated two independent factor analyses, one for each of the rationally sorted categories of interactive and general behavioral communicative responses, the present study examines the structure of the CRJ as a whole. A factor structure indicative of the prescribed scales would support the validity of this measure as assessing important and relatively distinct responses to jealousy. It is expected, however, that this factor structure will not emerge. After a failed EFA among the preliminary items of their second study, Guerrero et al. (1995) conducted an overall EFA of their study three items and found that several of the items merged into

factors inconsistent with their scales. If it is indeed the case that the factor structure does not emerge in the present study, alternative scoring procedures for the CRJ will be evaluated. Given previous research examining measures of jealousy expression or jealous responses, it could be predicted that a 3-factor structure may emerge: (a) a factor representative of the avoidance and denial items, (b) a factor representative of responses constructive to the relationship, and (c) a factor representative of responses destructive to the relationship, including the various types of manipulation. See Table 4 for a conceptual grouping of previous findings into these three categories. Additional items that reflect approaching the rival may load on their own factor or combine with destructive responses. Negative affect expression items may fall out of the analyses, splitting across the factors. If several small factors emerge in the item-level EFA of the CRJ items, scale level EFA could be conducted to examine the possibility of a higher-order structure. A priori hypotheses in the next sections reflect the 14 prescribed scales of the CRJ. However, further analyses involving the CRJ will be conducted utilizing factor-analytically derived scoring procedures. In the case that the prescribed scales do not emerge, hypotheses will be evaluated by examining which derived factor(s) comprise the relevant content for each hypothesis. Secondary analyses involve conducting two separate factor analyses reflecting the distinction between interactive and general behavioral responses to assess whether or not the prescribed scoring techniques can be replicated with the methodology used in original scale construction. It is expected that these factor structures will replicate in this context.

H #3: The prescribed CRJ scales will not emerge as the structure of jealousy expression in the overall EFA of jealousy responses, but will emerge in secondary analyses involving separate EFAs for the two categories of responses.

Personality as an Antecedent to Jealousy Experience and Expression

The following sections discuss the primary objective of the present study, examining the manner in which personality relates to jealousy experience, jealousy-related goals, and jealousy expression.

Relation between Personality and Jealousy Experience

RQ #1: How do personality antecedents relate to measures of jealousy experience?

It is expected that Guerrero's (1998) finding, that individuals with attachment-based negative models of the self will report higher levels of cognitive jealousy than individuals with positive models of the self, will be replicated.

H #4: Individuals with a negative model of the self (preoccupied and fearful or high ECR Anxiety) will report higher levels of cognitive jealousy, and jealousy-related sadness and fear than individuals with a positive model of the self (secure and dismissive or low ECR Anxiety).

Previous research has shown weak to moderate relations between low self-esteem and cognitive elements of jealousy (Gehl & Watson, 2003). Jealous situations may force individuals with low self-esteem to engage in social comparison processes; therefore, they may be more likely to worry about rivals and experience fear and envy as part of their jealousy.

H #5: Self-esteem will be negatively correlated with cognitive worry about a rival's interest in the partner as well as jealous feelings of fear and envy.

Measures assessing the higher order traits of the three- and five-factor models of personality have not frequently been used in jealousy research with the exception of studies focusing on neuroticism. Based upon the available studies and the relation

between jealousy and specific-lower order traits that comprise the higher-order factors of neuroticism and agreeableness, certain predictions can be made. Specifically:

H #6: BFI Neuroticism and SNAP-2 Negative Temperament, primarily due to their focus on anxiety, will be associated with cognitive measures of jealousy and jealous feelings of fear, sadness, and hostility.

H #7: Agreeableness will be associated with jealous feelings of anger and hostility, though negatively.

Relations between jealousy and disordered personality are primarily informed from the literature examining samples that include individuals diagnosed with specific personality disorders (e.g. BPD) and/or violent individuals (e.g. abusive husbands) who are compared to controls. The present study examines whether similar relations will be exhibited in samples of college students and married individuals. Brief measures of jealousy have been incorporated into studies examining violence among male borderline patients and men with dependent characteristics. Aggression, impulsivity, and self-harm are traits characteristic of BPD and should be related to increased levels of emotional jealousy. The studies examining dependent characteristics often use measures assessing dependency that tends to be restricted to the primary relationship and therefore jealousy may not reveal as strong relations with measures of general dependency. As previously described, a supplemental measure of three types of dependency has been included to further explore this relation with greater specificity.

As discussed previously, DSM-IV lists jealousy as part of a specific sub-type of delusional disorder that is primarily distinguished from paranoid personality disorder by the presence or absence of psychotic symptoms, respectively (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Mistrust, as an important component of this disorder, should be related to levels of cognitive jealousy. This specific effect has been reported previously (Gehl & Watson, 2003).

Finally, White and Mullen (1989) suggested a link between jealousy and narcissistic tendencies among males and histrionic tendencies among females. This possibility can be explored such that measures of entitlement, exhibitionism, and manipulateness as defining features of these disorders should be related to measures of jealousy.

H #8: SNAP-2 measures of negative temperament, primarily mistrust and self-harm, will be related to cognitive measures of jealousy experience.

H #9: SNAP-2 measures of aggression, impulsivity, and self-harm will be related to emotional measures of jealousy experience.

H #10: Jealousy measures will show significant relations with measures of entitlement, exhibitionism, and manipulateness.

Relation between Personality and Jealousy-Related Goals

RQ #2: What measures of personality will be predictive of the six different jealousy-related goals or functions?

This particular research question is exploratory in nature. However, two broad predictions will be explored. It is expected that individuals exhibiting high levels of negative temperament, mistrust, manipulateness and aggression will be more likely to endorse items reflecting equity restoration through retaliation as a goal related to their jealousy. It is also expected that individuals low on these traits will be more likely to endorse items reflective of maintaining the primary relationship.

Relation between Personality and Jealousy Expression

RQ #3: How do personality antecedents relate to measures of jealousy expression?

In an attempt to replicate previous findings by Guerrero (1998) regarding categorical attachment styles, it is hypothesized that individuals with attachment-based positive models of others (secures and preoccupieds) are more likely than individuals

with negative models of others (dismissives and fearfuls) to report using integrative communication and compensatory restoration while being less likely to use avoidance/denial. Guerrero's findings that preoccupied individuals are more likely to use expression of negative affect and surveillance behavior than any of the other three categories are also expected to replicate.

H #11: Individuals with positive models of others (low ECR Avoidance) will engage in more integrative communication than individuals with negative models of others (high ECR Avoidance).

H #12: Individuals with positive models of others (low ECR Avoidance) will engage in more compensatory restoration than individuals with negative models of others (high ECR Avoidance).

H #13: Individuals with negative models of others (high ECR Avoidance) will engage in more avoidance/denial than individuals with positive models of others (low ECR Avoidance).

As stated previously, beyond attachment, established measures of personality have not been utilized in studies focusing on the distinction between jealousy experience and expression. However, although this aspect of the present study is exploratory in nature, general predictions can still be made. Individuals exhibiting high levels of mistrust are expected to engage in behaviors reflecting this mistrust such as surveillance behaviors of their partner. Individuals exhibiting high levels of manipulateness, entitlement, and exhibitionism are expected to report engaging in active distancing, manipulation attempts and relationship threats. These tactics tend to involve punishing the partner by removing or threatening to remove aspects of the relationship generally perceived as rewarding (e.g. sex, communication) or to end the relationship itself.

Finally, individuals exhibiting high levels of aggression and impulsivity are likely to engage in destructive responses to jealousy reflecting these traits, such as distributive communication, violent communication, violent behavior, and rival contacts. It is also

expected that these traits will be negatively related to the constructive responses of integrative communication and compensatory restoration.

H #14: Mistrust will be correlated with surveillance responses to jealousy.

H #15: Manipulativeness, entitlement and, to a lesser extent, exhibitionism are expected to show significant relations with active distancing, manipulation attempts and relationship threats.

H #16: Aggression and impulsivity are expected to exhibit overall patterns of moderate to strong correlations with destructive responses to jealousy, specifically distributive communication, violent communication/threats, violent behavior, and rival contacts, while exhibiting negative correlations with the constructive responses of integrative communication and compensatory restoration.

Relation between Jealousy Experience and Expression

RQ #4: Will a theoretically meaningful pattern of relations between jealousy experience and expression be replicated in the current sample?

This research question is somewhat supplementary in nature as it does not directly address the primary research goal of the study, but instead involves replicating previous findings regarding the relations between jealousy expression (as measured by the CRJ) and measures of jealousy experience. Replication would lend support to the notion that these operationalizations of jealousy can be used to show theoretically meaningful and consistent relations between these constructs.

Previous research has shown high levels of anger or hostility to be predictive of most of the destructive responses to jealousy (Guerrero et al., 2005). This pattern is expected to replicate in the proposed study.

H #17: Anger/hostility will be related to the majority of destructive responses including distributive communication, violent

communication/threats, surveillance, manipulation attempts, violent behavior, negative affect expression, active distancing, and rival contacts while negatively related to avoidance/denial and the constructive response of compensatory restoration.

Cognitive measures and specific measures of jealousy-related emotions, in particular, fear and envy tend to be related to surveillance (Guerrero et al., 1995; Guerrero et al., 2005). It is understandable that individuals experiencing intense levels of fear and who are worried about the fidelity of their partner would engage in such behaviors.

H #18: Surveillance behaviors will be related to measures of cognitive jealousy, fear, and envy.

High scores on the subscale assessing cognitive worry over a rival's interest in the partner as well as the emotional experience of envy may suggest the jealous individual is engaging in social comparison processes (Parrott, 1991; Salovey, 1991b). Therefore, it is expected that they would engage in responses aimed to increase their partner's perceptions of their relative value over a rival. Such responses include compensatory restoration and derogation of the rival.

H #19: Cognitive worry over a rival's interest in the partner will be related to compensatory restoration and derogation of the rival.

H #20: Feelings of envy will be related to compensatory restoration and derogation of the rival.

Previous research has found that feelings of guilt are positively related to avoidance/denial and negatively associated with surveillance and violent communication/threats (Guerrero et al., 2005). Individuals who feel guilt as a result or part of their jealousy experience are less likely to overtly express their jealousy or engage in behaviors that would make their jealousy salient to themselves or others, instead denying their feelings.

H #21: Feelings of guilt will be positively correlated with avoidance/denial and negatively correlated with violent communication/threats and surveillance.

Several of the communicative responses to jealousy appear to be related to achieving specific goals, such as the six proposed by Guerrero and Andersen (1998). For example, equity restoration through retaliation is specifically aimed at making the partner feel bad, which is most likely achieved through destructive responses to jealousy (Guerrero & Afifi, 1999). It is expected that meaningful relations such as this and those described previously (also see Table 3) will be replicated.

Relation between Jealousy and Relationship Satisfaction

As described earlier, findings are inconsistent, but jealousy and satisfaction tend to be inversely related to one another; however, these correlations tend to be small to moderate. It is expected that satisfaction will be negatively related to the cognitive measures of jealousy as previous research has found similar results (Gehl & Watson, 2003). When examining the relation between satisfaction and specific elements of jealousy expression, previous researchers have found some consistent results (Andersen et al., 1995; Buunk, 1982). It is expected that these findings will be replicated in the proposed study. Specifically, integrative communication will be positively related to satisfaction while destructive responses such as distributive communication and avoidance will be inversely related to satisfaction.

Table 1 Empirical Relations between Cognitive Experience of Jealousy and Jealousy Expression

Cognitive Experience	Jealousy Expression
Cognitive Suspicion (of partner's interest in a rival) ^a	Active Distancing Surveillance/Restriction
Cognitive Worry (over rival's interest in the partner) ^a	Avoidance/Denial Surveillance/Restriction Compensatory Restoration (-)
Perceived Level of General Threat ^b	Surveillance/Restriction Integrative Communication (-)

^aDependent variable. Source: Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg & Eloy, 1995.

^bPredictor variable. Source: Guerrero, Trost, & Yoshimura, 2005, study 2.

Table 2 Empirical Relations between Affective Experience of Jealousy and Jealousy Expression

Affective Experience	Jealousy Expression
Hostility	Negative Affect Expression ^c
	Distributive Communication ^{c, d}
	Violent Communication/Threats ^d
	Active Distancing ^d
	Surveillance Behavior ^{c, d}
	Manipulation Attempts ^d
	Violent Behavior ^d
	Rival Contacts ^d
	Avoidance/Denial (-) ^c
	Compensatory Restoration (-) ^d
Irritation	Distributive Communication ^d
	Active Distancing ^d
	Avoidance/Denial ^d
	Negative Affect Expression ^d
	Integrative Communication ^d
Fear	Avoidance/Denial (-) ^c
Fear/Envy	Negative Affect Expression ^d
	Surveillance Behavior ^d
	Compensatory Restoration ^d

Table 2—continued

Affective Experience	Jealousy Expression
Guilt	Avoidance/Denial ^c
	Surveillance Behavior (-) ^c
	Violent Communication/Threats (-) ^d
Passion (Sexual Arousal)	Rival Contacts ^d
Frequency of Jealous Emotions	Active Distancing ^{a,b}
	Negative Affect Expression ^a
	Surveillance ^{a, b}
	Distributive Communication ^b
Intensity of Jealous Emotions	Negative Affect Expression ^b
	Distributive Communication ^b
	Surveillance/Restriction ^b
	Rival Contacts ^b

^aPredictor variable. Source: from Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzburg, & Eloy, 1995.

^bDependent variable. Source: Guerrero & Afifi, 1999.

^cDependent variable. Source: Guerrero, Trost, & Yoshimura, 2005, study 1.

^dDependent variable. Source: Guerrero, Trost, & Yoshimura, 2005, study 2.

Table 3 Empirical Relations between Jealousy-Related Goals and Jealousy Expression

Jealousy-Related Goals ^a	Jealousy Expression ^b
Maintaining the Primary Relationship	Compensatory Restoration Negative Affect Expression
Preserving Self-Esteem	Avoidance/Denial Rival Contacts (-) Surveillance/Restriction (-) Negative Affect Expression (-)
Reducing Uncertainty about the Primary Relationship	Integrative Communication Negative Affect Expression
Reducing Uncertainty about the Rival Relationship	Surveillance/Restriction Rival Contacts
Relationship Re-Assessment	Active Distancing Avoidance/Denial Manipulation Attempts
Equity Restoration Through Retaliation	Distributive Communication Active Distancing Surveillance/Restriction Manipulation Attempts Rival Contacts

^aDependent Variable.

^bPredictor Variable. Source: Guerrero & Afifi, 1999.

Table 4 Conceptual Categorizations of Previous Research Examining Jealousy Expression

Study	Avoidance / Denial	Constructive Responses	Destructive Responses
Guerrero et al. (1995/2004)	Active Distancing Avoidance / Denial	Integrative Communication Compensatory Restoration	Distributive Communication Violent Communication Manipulation Attempts Surveillance / Restriction Rival Derogation Relationship Threats Signs of Possession Rival Contacts Negative Affect Expression Violent Behavior

Table 4—continued

Study	Avoidance / Denial	Constructive Responses	Destructive Responses
Bryson (1991/1976)	Impression Management Social Support Seeking (-)	Confrontation ^a Arousal ^a	Reactive Retribution Confrontation ^a Arousal ^a
Bryson (1991/1984)	Impression Management Social Support Seeking (-) Reaction to Betrayal ^a	Relational Improvement	Reactive Retribution Aggression Monitoring Reaction to Betrayal ^a
Rich (1991) Buss (1988)	Partner-Attacking ^a	Partner-Enhancing Positive Inducements	Partner-Attacking ^a Direct Guarding Negative Inducements Public Signs of Possession
Buunk (1982)	Avoidance ^a Reappraisal	Communication ^a	Communication ^a Avoidance ^a

Table 4—continued

^aSome scales have individual item content that is applicable to more than one category, e.g. Bryson’s “Confrontation” includes “asking the partner to explain the situation” and “confronting the other person directly.”

Figure 1 Guerrero and Andersen's Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression

Antecedent Factors:

1. Biology
2. Culture
3. Personality
4. Relational Factors
5. Situational Factors
6. Strategic Moves





Figure 2 Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression

Antecedent Factors:

1. Biology
2. Culture
3. Relational Factors
4. Situational Factors
5. Strategic Moves



METHOD

Undergraduate Sample Participants and Procedure

Volunteers from undergraduate psychology courses at the University of Iowa signed up for a study in which they would “answer a series of questions about themselves, their relationship, and feelings such as jealousy that they experience within their relationship.” Interested individuals received an email with screening questions assessing whether or not they would be able and willing to complete a series of online questionnaires and if they were “currently dating or have ‘romantically seen’ someone at least twice and expect to see him/her again soon.” This limitation ensured that the participants were currently engaged in an active relationship with someone. More stringent limitations would likely have had the disadvantage of severely limiting the number of eligible participants from the available sample. Toward the end of recruitment only male participants were sought in order to reach a desired minimum of 150 participants of each gender. Missing data were filled in by computing the participant’s mean score based on multiple imputations predicting the value from other items within that particular measure. Due to missing data that extended beyond a criteria set for each measure, 10 individuals were removed from analyses resulting in a final sample size of 400 (60% female).

The mean age of participants was 19.61 ($SD = 2.52$) with over 95% of the sample between the ages of 18 and 22. Slightly more than 90% of the participants reported their ethnic identity as Caucasian with no other ethnic identity comprising more than 4% of the sample. The large majority of the sample reported preferring a partner of the opposite sex: 2% reported preferring a partner of the same sex, and one participant did not specify her/his preference. The majority of participants reported being in a committed long-term relationship (64.5%) or a casual dating relationship (28.3%). A few participants were living with their partner (3.5%), engaged (2.3%), or married (1.5%). These few

participants were collapsed into the committed long-term relationship category for further analyses. As is common with freshman university students, 39.8% reported being in a long-distance relationship. Participants reported knowing their partner an average of 34.2 months ($SD = 31.3$) and being in a relationship with them for an average of 19.08 months ($SD = 19.37$). However, outliers bias this estimate, as the medians for each are 24 and 14 months, respectively. In fact, over one fourth of participants reported knowing their partner for 1 year or less (28.5%) and being in a relationship with them for 6 months or less (29.25%). On average, participants had been in 2 “serious romantic relationships” ($M = 1.94$, $SD = 1.14$).

Eligible participants received an email that provided them with an ID and password to access the study that was presented through a secure website using the Websurveyor program. Participants first completed questionnaires assessing demographic information and general personality traits followed by personality measures that included more of a relational component (e.g. dependency, adult attachment) and a measure of relationship satisfaction. At this point, but before completing the jealousy questionnaires, participants were provided with a brief clarification of what was meant by jealousy in order to ensure they would consider a wide array of experiences in providing their responses. It read as follows:

The remaining questionnaires focus on your experiences of jealousy in your romantic relationships. Sometimes people use the term "jealousy" to refer to envy over another's possessions (e.g. your neighbor's new car). This is not what we are referring to in the present study. Jealousy has been defined as the experience of feeling that your relationship is threatened by a third person or rival. For the purposes of this study however, this third person or "rival" does not need to be an actual person in the present situation. It can be, but individuals have also reported feelings of jealousy over their partner's past or the potential of future rivals for their partner's affections. All these types of jealousy should be considered when answering the remaining questionnaires. Additionally, jealousy may sometimes be better explained in terms of other emotions or feelings. Sometimes when individuals feel jealousy they report feeling sad, angry, anxious, or afraid of losing their partner instead of actually reporting "I feel jealous." These

different feelings associated with jealousy should also be considered when answering the remaining questionnaires.

This progression of questionnaires—with the personality measures preceding the jealousy measures—was utilized to prevent participants' relationships or experiences with jealousy from being additionally primed, potentially influencing the responses on the general personality measures. The elements of consent and debriefing material were also presented online. Participants received course credit for their participation.

Community Resident Sample Participants and Procedure

Volunteers were recruited by advertising the study through posters, newspapers, word of mouth, and internet postings at community websites in the Midwestern United States. Interested individuals received an email with screening questions assessing whether or not they would be able and willing to complete a series of online questionnaires and if they were married. Towards the end of recruitment only male participants were sought in order to balance out the ratio between men and women. Data were collected from 208 individuals. Missing data were dealt with in the same manner as in the undergraduate sample. Excessive missing data resulted in the deletion of 5 individuals.

An additional 18 participants, although responding that they were married in the screening questionnaire, also indicated within the survey itself that they preferred a romantic partner that was the same sex as themselves. These 18 individuals exhibited differences with regard to jealousy variables and were dropped from further analyses. The status of these individuals' romantic relationships is unclear. It is possible that they could be involved in a same-sex relationship which they view as a marriage; alternatively, however, they could be involved in a heterosexual marriage but prefer same-sex romantic partners. It would be difficult to interpret or discuss any results pertaining to this group since the specific relationship status is unknown; therefore, they were dropped from subsequent analyses. One additional participant was excluded

because although s/he reported being married in the screening questionnaire, s/he reported being in a casual dating relationship within the questionnaire materials. One participant reported being in a committed, long-term relationship of over 40 years and was retained in the sample. This resulted in a final sample size of 184 participants (53.3% female).

The mean age of participants was 37.45 ($SD = 11.30$). The majority of the sample reported their ethnic identity as Caucasian (89.1%) with no other ethnic identity comprising more than 5% of the sample. A few participants reported being in a long-distance relationship (4.3%; 1.1% did not respond to this question). Participants reported being in a romantic relationship with their partner for an average of 13.15 years ($SD = 10.69$; $Median = 9.79$) and having been in an average of 3 “serious romantic relationships” ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 2.06$).

The procedure and presentation of questionnaires was the same as that described in the undergraduate sample with the exception of one additional page collecting information necessary to process the compensatory payment of \$25. This additional page was presented after the elements of consent but before the demographic questions.

Measures

Please refer to Figure 3 to see the relation between specific measures and Guerrero and Andersen’s (1998) Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression.

Demographic, Personality and Relationship Measures

Demographic questionnaire

A brief demographic questionnaire was included to gather the following information: biological sex, age, ethnic identity, male or female partner preference, current relationship status, current relationship duration, duration of acquaintanceship

with partner, the number of previous “serious romantic relationships,” and whether or not the current relationship is long-distance. Please see Appendix B for the demographic questionnaire.

Big Five Inventory (BFI)

The 44-item self-report BFI (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998) consists of short phrases following the stem, *I see myself as someone who...* and was utilized to provide a measure of the Big Five personality factors (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness). This version of the BFI contains 8-item measures of Neuroticism and Extraversion, 9-item scales assessing Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, and a 10-item Openness scale. The items are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The scales have been used in a wide range of studies and have demonstrated good psychometric properties.

Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition (SNAP-2)

The SNAP-2 (Clark, 1993; Clark et al., in press) is a True/False, 390-item measure assessing 12 trait dimensions that define three higher order temperament factors (Negative Emotionality, Positive Emotionality, and Disinhibition). Additionally, the SNAP-2 measures criteria for 12 DSM-IV Axis II personality disorders through diagnostic scales. The trait and temperament scales are all reported to be internally consistent and demonstrate acceptable retest reliabilities. The SNAP-2 is of primary interest in the present study because the trait dimensions (Mistrust, Manipulativeness, Aggression, Self-Harm, Eccentric Perceptions, Dependency, Exhibitionism, Entitlement, Detachment, Impulsivity, Propriety, and Workaholism) measure lower-order maladaptive personality traits and can be thought of as dimensional representations of the underlying structure of the categorical personality disorders. Because of research supporting links

between jealousy and personality disorders or related tendencies, these scales were expected to relate to maladaptive responses to jealousy in theoretically meaningful ways.

Self-esteem Scale (SES)

The 10-item SES (Rosenberg, 1965) was included as a measure of trait self-esteem due to its inclusion in previous research. Although correlations between self-esteem and jealousy have been inconsistent at best, meaningful, replicable relations perhaps can be more easily achieved when jealousy is broken down into its various discrete elements.

3 Vector Dependency Inventory (3VDI)

The 3VDI (Pincus & Wilson, 2001) is a 27-item measure composed of three factor-analytically derived scales measuring submissive dependence, exploitable dependence, and love dependence. Participants rate to what extent items apply to them on a 6-point Likert-type scale. The independent scales show meaningful convergent and discriminant patterns with other constructs, such as neuroticism and attachment styles. Please see Appendix C.

Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR)

The ECR (Brennan et al., 1998), which assesses the two adult romantic attachment dimensions of Avoidance and Anxiety through 36 items rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale, also was included in the analyses. The dimension of Avoidance examines positive or negative views of others, whereas the Anxiety dimension examines positive or negative views of the self.

Quality Marriage Index (QMI)

The 6-item QMI (Norton, 1983) was utilized as a measure of relationship satisfaction. The first five items ask individuals the extent to which they agree or disagree with various statements about their relationship utilizing a 7-point scale. The

final item asks individuals to report their global relationship satisfaction on a 10-point scale. The QMI is advantageous as it is a brief measure that exhibits good psychometric properties (Heyman, Sayers, & Bellack, 1994). The term “relationship” was substituted for the term “marriage” in relevant items.

Jealousy Measures

Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MJS)-Cognitive

Pfeiffer and Wong’s (1989) MJS is a three-dimensional measure assessing the cognitive, emotional and behavioral dimensions of jealousy. Their 8-item MJS-Cognitive scale assesses the cognitive elements of jealousy experience. Guerrero (Guerrero et al., 1995; Guerrero, 1998) has divided this dimension into two subscales: cognitive suspicion of the partner’s interest in another (5 items) and cognitive worry over rivals’ interest in the partner (3 items). Each subscale, as well as the total scale has demonstrated internal consistency and was, psychometrically, one of the best performing scales in Gehl and Watson’s (2003) structural analyses of multiple jealousy measures. Factor analysis was used to determine which scoring methods would be employed.

Affective Elements of Jealousy

Although Pfeiffer and Wong’s (1989) MJS does include a scale for the emotional dimension of jealousy, it was not used in the present study. Guerrero and colleagues (Guerrero et al., 1993) raised important concerns with this measure including a tendency to exhibit restricted range. Guerrero (1998) utilized a series of 7-point items to construct reliable measures of the six categories of jealousy-related emotions as outlined by White and Mullen (1989). Alphas ranged from .71 to .90, however, one scale, envy, was a single item. In order to utilize a more established measure of affect, the present study employed the PANAS-X (Watson & Clark, 1994) with a modified set of instructions such that participants were asked to *indicate to what extent you feel this way when you are*

jealous. Although this provided a more established framework for examining affect, the standard PANAS-X items do not completely encompass the emotional jealousy categories outlined by White and Mullen; in particular, the categories of envy and sexual arousal are not incorporated in the PANAS-X. Therefore, the PANAS-X was supplemented with the non-overlapping content from White and Mullen's six categories. This approach to measuring the affective elements of jealousy experience encompasses the findings of several studies examining this aspect of jealousy (Guerrero et al., 2005; Sharpsteen & Kirkpatrick, 1997; White & Mullen, 1989). Because the PANAS-X was utilized in a novel context with additional items, factor analyses were conducted to examine the structure of affectivity within the specific context of jealousy and to create reliable measures for further analyses.

Communicative Responses to Jealousy (CRJ)

The current version of Guerrero et al.'s (1995; Guerrero, 2004) CRJ, as described previously, was included as a measure of jealousy expression. The prescribed scoring of the 70-item CRJ includes fourteen scales assessing jealousy expression, both in the form of behavioral responses and emotional expression. Please see Appendix A. Given the rational-based methods used in the development of the measure and the fact that additional content has since been added, factor analysis was used to explore alternate scoring procedures for further analyses.

Jealousy-related Goals

Guerrero and Afifi (1999) developed 3-item, 7-point Likert-type scales to assess each of six jealousy related goals (Bryson, 1977 as cited in Bryson, 1991; Guerrero & Andersen, 1998). They reported coefficient alphas ranging from .72 to .85 for the six scales assessing relationship maintenance, self-esteem preservation, reducing uncertainty about the primary relationship, reducing uncertainty about the rival relationship, relationship re-assessment, and equity restoration through retaliation. The items were

framed as concerns the individual has when jealous. Structural analyses of these items revealed a five factor solution within their data. They reported that the items measuring the goal of reducing uncertainty in the primary relationship split across three of the other factors. They argued this was not surprising as reducing this type of uncertainty could be viewed as a primary goal that is often incorporated with the other goals. Factor analyses were once again employed to determine how the scales would be scored in the present study.

Data Analyses

Data analyses can be organized into six categories: (a) preliminary analyses designed to assess the psychometric properties of specific measures, (b) preliminary structural analyses of jealousy measures aimed at data reduction and scale development, (c) preliminary analyses examining demographic differences within each sample and between the two samples, (d) analyses examining personality antecedents as predictors of jealousy experience and expression, (e) analyses to replicate previously reported findings involving the relation between jealousy experience and expression, and (f) analyses examining the relation between jealousy and relationship satisfaction.

Preliminary Analyses of Personality Measures

Bivariate correlations were calculated to examine strongly correlated variables. These variables were then used to create composites for subsequent hierarchical regression analyses. Additional descriptive statistics were calculated to evaluate the psychometric properties of the scales and newly created composites.

Preliminary Analyses of Jealousy Measures

A series of preliminary analyses was necessary to examine the structure of jealousy experience and expression and the reliability of their measurement. Structural analyses in the form of exploratory factor analyses (EFAs) with varimax rotation were

conducted for four of these jealousy measures: (a) the 8-item MJS-Cognitive, (b) the 83 items assessing the affective elements of jealousy experience, (c) the 18 items assessing jealousy-related goals, and (d) the 70-item CRJ. Resulting factor structures were evaluated based upon the scree plots, number of factor markers and strength of factor loadings, relative number and strength of cross-loadings, item intercorrelation matrices, and factor interpretability. Replicability across the two samples was also of primary importance.

Mean-Level Differences within and between Samples

MANOVAs were conducted to examine potential mean-level differences between demographic variables on the personality and jealousy variables. In the undergraduate sample this involved examining for (a) sex differences, (b) differences between casual or committed long-term relationships, and (c) differences between individuals who are or are not in a long-distance relationship. In the community resident sample potential sex differences were examined. MANOVAs were also conducted to examine potential mean-level differences between the undergraduate and married community resident samples on the personality and jealousy variables.

The Relation between Personality and Jealousy

Within each sample, bivariate correlations were calculated between the measures of personality and the six measures of jealousy experience, the five measures of jealousy-related goals, and the six measures of jealousy expression. Hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses were then conducted in each sample for each of the 17 jealousy measures. In the undergraduate sample, the demographic variables of biological sex (female vs. male), relationship status (casual vs. committed long-term), and distance from the partner (long-distance vs. short-distance) were entered in step one. In the community resident sample this step involved entering only biological sex. Step two involved

entering the personality variables as assessed by the BFI, the SNAP-2, the SES, the 3VDI, and the ECR.


The Relation between Jealousy Expression, Experience, and Related Goals

Bivariate correlations were calculated between the measures of jealousy expression, jealousy experience and jealousy-related goals. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were then conducted in each sample for each of the six measures of jealousy expression. The same demographic variables reported above were entered into step one of these analyses for each respective sample. The first set of analyses utilized the six jealousy experience measures in step two. The second set of analyses utilized the five jealousy-related goals as predictors in step two.

The Relation between Relationship Satisfaction and Jealousy

Bivariate correlations were calculated between relationship satisfaction and the 17 jealousy variables. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses utilized the same demographic predictors in step one as previous analyses. Step two involved entering the six jealousy experience variables and step three involved entering the six jealousy expression variables.

Figure 3 Guerrero and Anderson's Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression and Study Measures



RESULTS

Due to the large number of analyses planned, an a priori alpha of $p < .01$ was used. Although discussion of significant findings will primarily be limited to this criterion, results that are significant at an alpha of $p < .05$ are noted in tables and may be mentioned in relation to specific hypotheses as “approaching significance.”

Preliminary Analyses of Personality Measures

Bivariate correlations between the personality measures initially were examined to identify strongly correlated variables in subsequent analyses involving regression. These correlations are presented in Tables 5 through 13. Pairs of variables that exhibited strong correlations in both samples were combined to create composites. More specifically, if a correlation exceeded .70 in at least one of the samples, the variables were considered for a composite. This level was chosen as the criterion because exceeding this benchmark signifies that over half of the variance in one variable is shared with the other variable ($r^2 = .49$). As a result, three composites were created. BFI Neuroticism and SNAP-2 Negative Temperament ($r = .72$, undergraduate sample; $r = .75$, community resident sample) were combined to create Negative Emotionality (NE), the first composite. SNAP-2 Disinhibition-Pure and SNAP-2 Impulsivity ($r = .72$ and $r = .62$) were collapsed to create the second composite, Disinhibition vs. Constraint (DvC). The final composite, Low Self-Worth, included Submissive Dependence and Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem scale ($r = -.62$ and $r = -.75$). Rosenberg’s scale was reverse-keyed, so that a high score on this composite represents greater submissive dependence/lower self-esteem. These three composites, with the remaining 20 personality scales, were then utilized as predictors for relevant hierarchical regression analyses.

Bivariate correlations between the personality composites and scales are reported in Tables 14 and 15. Although no correlations exceed the composite criterion of .70,

several strong and moderate correlations still remain. More specifically, among the 253 correlations between the 23 personality predictors 10 in the undergraduate sample and 17 in the community resident sample exceed .50. A large number of these strong correlations are between measures within the domain of neuroticism (e.g. negative emotionality, low self-worth, and the various dependency measures). There are, however, strong relations between other personality variables. For example, strong negative correlations exist between (a) extraversion and detachment, and (b) agreeableness and aggression, among others. To test subsequent hypotheses, bivariate correlations will need to be considered—in addition to regression analyses—in light of these relations and the relatively large number of personality variables to be used as predictors.

Psychometric properties of the personality measures and composites are reported in Tables 16 and 17. The coefficient alphas ranged from .73 to .93 in the student sample and from .74 to .95 in the community resident sample; these data do not indicate any major psychometric problems in these variables.

Preliminary Analyses of Jealousy Measures

A series of preliminary analyses was necessary to examine the structure of jealousy experience and expression and the reliability of their measurement. Structural analyses in the form of exploratory factor analyses (EFAs) with varimax rotation were conducted for four of these jealousy measures. Confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted on the CRJ items to test the fit of a three-factor model of jealousy expression suggested by previous research.

Multidimensional Jealousy Scale-Cognitive

The psychometric properties of this scale were evaluated in each sample. The 3-item subscale assessing cognitive worry over rivals' interest in the partner replicated in both samples; however, the 5-item subscale assessing cognitive suspicion of the partner's

interest in another did not consistently replicate. Three items that focused on the suspected infidelity of the partner tended to replicate consistently; in contrast, however, two items that reflected a suspicion that the partner may simply be attracted to another person failed to load consistently on this factor. In the undergraduate sample, one of these items (“I suspect that my partner may be attracted to someone else”) cross-loaded across the two factors (see Table 18). This item formed a third factor when three factors were specified (see Table 19). In the undergraduate three-factor solution, the other item (“I suspect that my partner is highly attracted to others”) then cross-loaded with this item and the original factor. In the community resident sample, both of these items cross-loaded in the two-factor solution and formed a separate third factor in the three-factor solution (see Tables 20 and 21, respectively). Dropping these two items from analyses resulted in two 3-item factors in both samples (see Tables 22 and 23). It was decided to retain these two 3-item subscales (i.e., cognitive worry over the rival’s interest in the partner and cognitive suspicion of the partner’s infidelity), dropping the two items that focus on suspicion of the partner’s attraction to others due to their inconsistent behavior across the samples. These two retained subscales are significantly correlated in both the undergraduate ($r = .44$) and community resident ($r = .61$) samples.

Affective Elements of Jealousy

A series of principal axis factor analyses with varimax rotation was conducted and the resulting factor structures were examined in both samples. Consistent with the broader mood literature (Watson & Clark, 1994), the two-factor solutions resulted in nonspecific positive affect and negative affect factors (see Tables 24 and 25). The three factor solutions exhibited items reflective of anger breaking away from other negative affect items and forming a separate third factor (see Tables 26 and 27). As the goal of the present study was to examine more specific aspects of jealousy experience, further, more differentiated solutions were investigated. Subsequent analyses revealed that some item

content from the PANAS-X that was not theoretically related to jealousy (e.g. alert, daring) would form separate factors, but that content theoretically related to jealousy would remain in two large factors.

In order to increase the likelihood of obtaining a clearer, better distinction between factors theoretically related to jealousy, item content that was not theoretically related to jealousy was removed from further analyses. This reduced the analyzed variables from 83 items to 58 items. These 58 items resulted in a four-factor structure (Fear, Anger, Guilt, and Joy/Sexual Arousal) that was similar across both samples (see Tables 28 and 29). Hypothesis #1—namely, that four factors reflecting anger, fear, sadness and guilt would emerge from an EFA of jealousy-related affect items—was partially supported, in that three of the four predicted factors did emerge. In order to reduce inter-factor correlations, stricter criteria were set for item retention. To be retained, items had to exhibit a primary factor loading of at least .5 (increased from .4) and the primary loading had to be greater than the secondary loading by a differential of at least .2 (increased from .1) in both samples. Nine items were retained for the Anger scale (e.g. angry, hostile, vengeful). Six items composed the Fear scale (e.g. scared, worried, lonely). Seven items were retained for the Guilt scale (e.g. disgusted with self, guilty, regretful). Ten items composed the Joy/Sexual Arousal scale (e.g. joyful, happy, sexually aroused).

Item content reflective of sadness tended to split between multiple factors—primarily across Fear and Guilt in the undergraduate sample and across Fear, Guilt and Anger in the community resident sample. The term “envious” consistently exhibited low communalities in almost every structure considered. Some of the additional content aimed at assessing envy—taken from White and Mullen (1989)—tended to load with both the Anger and Guilt factors while also exhibiting low communalities. As expected, item content reflective of joy and sexual arousal defined a single factor supporting hypothesis #2. Despite utilizing stricter item retention criteria to reduce inter-factor

correlations, the Anger, Fear, and Guilt scales exhibit moderate to strong correlations with one another; these associations are consistent with the broader mood literature (Watson & Clark, 1994). Joy/Sexual Arousal tended to exhibit a weak inverse relation with the three other scales. Correlations between these factors—as well as with the MJS-C and Jealousy-related Goals—are presented in Table 30.

Jealousy-related Goals

In the current undergraduate sample a five-factor solution also emerged, with the six items assessing relationship maintenance and reducing uncertainty about the primary relationship all defining the first factor (see Table 31). A forced sixth factor in the undergraduate sample did not contain any items that defined it (i.e. all of the items had stronger loadings on one of the other five factors; see Table 32). Although a five-factor solution best explained the community resident data as well, the items reflective of reducing uncertainty in the primary relationship split across multiple other factors (see Table 33). Once again, a forced sixth factor did not contain any items that defined it (see Table 34). Additionally, one of the items measuring self-esteem preservation loaded with the relationship re-assessment items. In order to maintain consistency across the samples this item—as well as the items assessing reducing uncertainty in the primary relationship—were excluded. This resulted in 4 three-item scales and 1 two-item scale. The scales tend to be moderately correlated with one another; the one exception was relationship maintenance and equity restoration through retaliation, which are unrelated to one another. Correlations between these scales—as well as with the MJS-C and four jealous affect scales—also are presented in Table 30.

Communicative Responses to Jealousy

Confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted in each sample to test the three-factor model previously discussed (see the first row in Table 4). The fourteen CRJ scales were used as variables to model an a priori three-factor structure defined by the ten

destructive scales, the two constructive scales, and the two avoidance scales. CFAs were conducted using EQS; all analyses were based on covariance matrices and the maximum likelihood method. Additionally, factors were allowed to intercorrelate and no cross-loadings were permitted.

Fit indices for the model in each sample appear in Table 35. Previous literature provides guidelines for interpreting goodness-of-fit indices (Brown, 2006). Standardized root mean-square residual (SRMR) values less than or equal to .08 suggest a good model fit. The community resident sample meets this criterion but the undergraduate sample does not. Root mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) values at or below .06 tend to indicate good fit. RMSEA values at or below .08 tend to indicate adequate fit and values below .10 indicate mediocre fit. It is suggested that RMSEA values exceeding .10 indicate the model should be seriously considered for rejection. In both samples the RMSEA values exceed this benchmark, suggesting the model be rejected. Comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker-Lewis (TLI) or non-normed fit index (NNFI) values close to or greater than .95 indicate good fit. Values between .90 and .95 indicate acceptable model fit and values below .90 should be considered for rejection. In the current samples none of these values exceed the .90 benchmark. Fit tended to be poor across the majority of fit indices with several suggesting the model be rejected. This necessitated the search for an alternative measurement model for the CRJ scales.

In order to explicate the structure of the CRJ, exploratory factor analyses with varimax rotation were conducted at the scale level. These results further confirmed that the three-factor structure in each sample is not consistent with the theory presented in Table 4. Additionally, a consistent three-factor structure did not replicate across the two samples (see Tables 36 and 37). The undergraduate sample did yield a factor for the two scales measuring constructive responses, but this factor also included three scales from destructive responses (Negative Affect Expression, Signs of Possession and Rival Derogation). The avoidance responses again defined a common factor in the

undergraduate structure but also pulled content from the destructive responses (Distributive Communication and Manipulation Attempts). The community resident sample produced a factor for constructive responses but it also included Negative Affect Expression. Avoidance responses did not form their own factor in the community resident sample, instead loading with the destructive responses. The third factor was instead marked by Signs of Possession and Rival Contact. Communication with the rival seems to be a more distinct factor in the community resident sample.

Because these analyses failed to yield clear, consistent and interpretable results, I turned next to item-level structural analyses. Accordingly, a series of item-level principal axis factor analyses with varimax rotation was conducted with the undergraduate data; these analyses began with a two-factor solution and continued until the final factor was not well-defined. Factor structures were examined from two to seven factors focusing primarily on the 5- and 6-factor solutions (presented in Tables 38 and 39, respectively).

In the 5-factor model, markers of the first factor primarily included items assessing surveillance, restriction, rival derogation and communication with the rival. The second factor was primarily marked by withdrawal from the partner through active distancing and more passive avoidance. The third factor included violence and threats to end the relationship. The fourth factor included integrative communication and negative affect expression. The fifth factor was primarily marked by compensatory restoration behaviors. In the 6-factor model the first factor was essentially marked by the same content; however, the second factor was altered significantly. Although the active distancing from the partner remained, the more passive avoidance items dropped out as markers. Instead, distributive communication and negative affect expression joined the active distancing content to create a factor reflective of a conflict and withdrawal pattern. The third factor remained essentially unchanged, once again containing violence and threats to end the relationship. The fourth factor extracted contained the compensatory restoration content. The fifth factor was marked by integrative communication, which no

longer clustered with negative affect expression, as it had moved to the second factor. Finally, the sixth factor extracted was marked by three denial items (e.g. pretended nothing was wrong) which had split across factors in the 5-factor solution.

In order to facilitate the decision making process between these two structures, and because it was desired to have similar structures across the two samples, it was decided to examine parallel item-level factor structures in the community resident sample through principal axis factor analyses. Once again, factor structures were examined from two to seven factors. Through an examination of different pairings of factor structures between the undergraduate and community resident sample it was discovered that the six-factor community resident solution and the five-factor undergraduate solution replicated a notable amount of content (see Table 40 for the six-factor community resident solution). The first factor in the community resident 6-factor model was marked by a large mix of destructive responses—primarily surveillance, restriction, rival derogation, distributive communication, and manipulation attempts. The second factor included items reflecting violence and a threat to end the relationship. The third factor was marked by avoidance and active distancing from the partner. The fourth factor was defined by communication with the rival, including signs of possession. The fifth factor is marked by compensatory restoration behaviors and the sixth factor is marked by integrative communication and negative affect expression.

In creating the scales, items were considered for removal if they did not tend to have a primary loading of at least .4 or had secondary loadings that tended to be too close in strength to the primary loadings (i.e., a difference of less than .1). Items that met these criteria and belonged to a replicable cluster of items across the samples were retained. The culmination of these analyses resulted in six scales. The first scale, Surveillance and Competition, is composed of 12 items that replicate as markers of the first factor in each sample. Item content on this factor comes from original CRJ scales of Surveillance/Restriction (7 items), Rival Derogation (3), Relationship Threats (1) and

Manipulation Attempts (1). The second scale, Rival Communication, was only extracted as a unique factor of five items in the community resident sample. In the undergraduate sample this cluster of five items loaded on the first factor. As a result, it is expected that in subsequent analyses these first two scales will perform similarly and be strongly correlated within the undergraduate sample. Item content for this factor is composed of content from original CRJ scales of Rival Contacts (3) and Signs of Possession (2). The remaining four scales all include content that replicated as unique factors across the two samples. Items included in the final scales replicated as markers across both samples. The third scale, Violence and Threats, is composed of six items that replicate across the samples. These items come from CRJ scales of Violent Communication (4), Violent Behavior (1), and Relationship Threats (1). Withdrawal, the fourth scale, combines content from Active Distancing (4) and Avoidance/Denial (3) that replicates across samples. The fifth scale, Affective Integrative Communication, combines content from Integrative Communication (4) and Negative Affect Expression (2). Finally, the sixth scale includes seven of the original eight CRJ Compensatory Restoration items.

Relationship Threats was the only original CRJ scale that contributed content to more than one factor. This allows for easier comparisons with previous research utilizing the prescribed scoring technique. The original scales that suffer the most in the above structure are Distributive Communication and Manipulation Attempts, as no items from the former scale are included and only one from the latter was retained. In the community resident sample, this content tended to load on the first factor but it exhibited low communalities and/or loaded across multiple factors in the undergraduate sample.

Seventeen (of 91) scale intercorrelations among the original fourteen prescribed scales exceeded .60 in the undergraduate sample and 21 (of 91) exceeded this value in the community resident sample (see Table 41); thus, discriminant validity definitely is a concern with these scales. In contrast, the reduced, derived structure of six factors successfully deals with this issue such that only one of the scale intercorrelations in each

sample exceeds .60 (see Table 42). This is the expected correlation between (a) Surveillance and Competition and (b) Rival Communication, which had formed one factor in the undergraduate sample and two separate factors in the community resident sample.

Additional analyses involved conducting two separate item-level principal components analyses reflecting the distinction between interactive and general behavioral responses to assess whether or not the prescribed scoring techniques can be replicated with the methodology used in the original scale construction. Guerrero et al. (1995) used principal components analyses with orthogonal rotation and retained components with eigenvalues equal to or greater than 1.00. Items were retained if they (a) exhibited a primary loading of .50 or higher and (b) secondary loadings were at least .15 less than the primary loadings. Three scales were added to the CRJ after initial scale construction. It was decided to include these added scales in the analyses as they were hypothesized to fit within the two categories of interactive (rival derogation and relationship threats) and general behavioral (signs of possession) responses. Interactive responses would then include (a) Active Distancing, (b) Negative Affect Expression, (c) Integrative Communication, (d) Distributive Communication, (e) Avoidance/Denial, (f) Violent Communication, (g) Rival Derogation, and (h) Relationship Threats. General behavioral responses include (a) Surveillance/Restriction, (b) Compensatory Restoration, (c) Manipulation Attempts, (d) Rival Contacts, (e) Violent Behaviors, and (f) Signs of Possession.

In the undergraduate sample, eight components measuring interactive responses were defined utilizing the same eigenvalue criteria as Guerrero et al. (1995). The eight scales were fairly evident in the derived components; however, several components included items from multiple scales and nine items either exhibited notable cross-loadings or did not display a primary loading equal to or greater than .50. (see Table 43). More specifically, the first component included the integrative communication items with

one negative affect expression item that also met criteria for retention. The second and third components were the rival derogation and violent communication items, respectively. The fourth component retained four of the five relationship threat items, together with one additional item from avoidance/denial. The fifth component included three of the five active distancing items and one distributive communication item. The sixth component included two avoidance/denial items, one negative affect expression item, and one active distancing item. The seventh component included the three denial items from avoidance/denial. The eighth component included three distributive communication items but only one met the criteria for retention. Avoidance/denial tended to split between component six and seven, with avoidance items on the former component and denial items on the latter. As this scale tended to split into two components, the negative affect expression scale was split across multiple components and was the only scale that did not have items defining a separate component.

While only five components were defined from the six scales assessing general behavioral responses in the undergraduate sample, the components tended to be more clearly defined (see Table 44). The first component included the surveillance/restriction items. The second component retained six of the eight compensatory restoration items. The third component explains the lack of a sixth component—more specifically, rival contacts and two of the three signs of possession items were retained together defining one component, rather than forming two separate components. The fourth component includes four of the six manipulation attempt items. The fifth component includes the two violent behavior items—however, only one meets criteria for retention.

In the community resident sample the scales were not as evident in the derived component structures. Examining the interactive responses, eight components were once again extracted based upon eigenvalues greater than 1.00 (see Table 45). The first component was defined by a mix of items—four each from active distancing and distributive communication and one each from avoidance/denial and relationship threats.

The second and third components retained the rival derogation and violent communication items, respectively. The fourth component included four of the five integrative communication items. The fifth component retained three negative affect expression items and the sixth component retained four avoidance/denial items. Only one relationship threat item met retention criteria on the seventh component. Finally, although the eighth component had an eigenvalue exceeding 1.00, no items marked it, so it was poorly defined and uninterpretable. Ten items did not meet criteria for retention. The primary problems in replicating the scales are the latter two ill-defined components and the initial component composed of items from multiple scales.

Examining the PCA of the general behavioral responses reveals that the scales once again were not as evident in the derived component structure in the community resident sample as in the undergraduate sample (see Table 46). The first component included seven surveillance/restriction items and two manipulation attempt items. The second component was defined by the rival contact items and two of the three signs of possession items. The third component included seven compensatory restoration items. The fourth component included three manipulation attempt items and one violent behavior item. The fifth component included one signs of possession item; however, this item did not meet retention criteria due to a cross-loading. Similar to the undergraduate analysis, rival contacts and signs of possession tended to load on the same component—however, several additional issues complicated the community resident structure. The violent behavior items failed to separate as their own component and the manipulation attempt items split between the first and fourth components.

Although several CRJ scales did tend to emerge, these analyses could not consistently replicate the prescribed scoring techniques for other scales. These problems tended to be more apparent in the community resident sample. Thus, hypothesis #3 was partially supported in that the prescribed scales did not emerge in the overall factor analyses. However it was not supported in that they did not consistently emerge as

expected in the secondary analyses involving separate PCAs for the two categories of interactive responses and general behavioral responses. This—taken with the fact that only one prescribed scale (Relationship Threats) contributed content to more than one derived scale in the item-level analyses of the combined item content—suggests that secondary analyses utilizing the prescribed scoring methods are unnecessary.

Comparisons with previous research easily can be made by examining where content from the prescribed scales falls within the derived scales. For example, Rival Communication can be examined for comparison with previous findings regarding Rival Contact.

Psychometric properties of the jealousy scales created through these structural analyses are reported in Tables 47 and 48 in the undergraduate and community resident samples, respectively. Some of the measures tend to be skewed from low endorsement rates. These primarily include (a) Suspicion of the Partner, (b) jealousy-related Joy/Sexual Arousal, and (c) Violence and Threats.

Mean-Level Differences between and within Samples

A MANOVA was conducted to examine differences between the two samples on the personality variables. Cross-sample comparisons of the composites became meaningless as the variables used to create the composites were first standardized within each sample. Due to this, the original variables were utilized for these analyses instead. Undergraduates reported higher levels of extraversion, positive temperament, and exhibitionism. They also reported higher levels of manipulateness, disinhibition, and love dependence. Married community residents reported higher levels of self-harm, detachment, propriety, and submissive dependence. See Table 49 for means, standard deviations, and effect sizes.

A MANOVA was conducted to examine differences between the two samples on the 17 jealousy variables. Married community residents were more likely to be

suspicious of their partner and report experiencing guilt while jealous. They also reported higher levels of concern with relationship maintenance goals. See Table 50 for means, standard deviations, and effect sizes.

In the undergraduate sample a 2 (female vs. male) x 2 (casual vs. committed long-term relationship) x 2 (long- vs. short-distance relationship) MANOVA revealed no significant interactions for any of the personality variables ($ps > .01$). To address possible main effects of each variable directly, three separate MANOVAs were conducted. Significant mean differences, standard deviations, and effect sizes can be found in Tables 51 through 53. Females reported higher levels of negative emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Females also reported higher levels of dependency both as measured by the SNAP-2 and two of the 3VDI scales: exploitable and love dependence. Males reported higher levels of manipulateness, aggression, and disinhibition vs. constraint. Males also reported higher levels of avoidant attachment whereas females reported higher levels of anxious attachment. Individuals in a committed, long-term relationship reported higher levels of conscientiousness and lower levels of manipulateness, disinhibition vs. constraint, and avoidant attachment than individuals in a casual dating relationship. Individuals in a committed, long-term relationship also reported higher levels of relationship satisfaction. Finally, individuals in a long-distance relationship reported higher levels of love dependence than individuals not in a long-distance relationship.

In the married community resident sample a MANOVA was conducted to examine sex differences on the personality variables. Males reported higher levels of openness and detachment, while females reported higher levels of love dependence. See Table 54 for means, standard deviations, and effect sizes.

In the undergraduate sample a 2 (female vs. male) x 2 (casual vs. committed long-term relationship) x 2 (long vs. short-distance relationship) MANOVA revealed no significant interactions for any of the 17 jealousy variables ($ps > .01$). To address

possible main effects of each variable directly, three separate MANOVAs were conducted. Significant mean differences, standard deviations, and effect sizes can be found in Tables 55 through 57. A few significant differences were observed. Males reported higher levels of Joy/Sexual Arousal as part of their jealousy experience, whereas females reported higher levels of Anger and Fear. Females also reported more concern with Relationship Maintenance goals and engaging in more Affective Integrative Communication and Withdrawal. Individuals in a committed long-term relationship reported engaging in more Affective Integrative Communication than individuals in a casual relationship, who in turn were more likely to report Suspicion of their Partner and Relationship Re-assessment as a concern when jealous. Finally, individuals in a long-distance relationship reported engaging in more Affective Integrative Communication than those not in such a relationship.

In the married community resident sample a MANOVA was conducted to examine sex differences on the 17 jealousy variables. Females were found to engage in more Affective Integrative Communication than males. See Table 58 for means, standard deviations, and effect sizes.

The Relation between Personality and Jealousy

The Relation between Personality and Jealousy Experience

Bivariate correlations were calculated between the six measures of jealousy experience and the 23 personality variables (see Tables 59 and 60). ECR Anxiety tended to exhibit the strongest correlations with measures of cognitive jealousy and Anger, Fear and Guilt (r s ranged from .24 to .52). This provides support for hypothesis #4—that individuals high in ECR Anxiety would report higher levels of cognitive jealousy and jealousy related Fear. However, ECR Anxiety exhibited moderate correlations with Anger and Guilt as well. Additionally, in the community resident sample Suspicion of

the Partner correlated more strongly with ECR Avoidance ($r = .37$) than with ECR Anxiety ($r = .24$).

The Low Self-worth composite was used to evaluate hypothesis #5—that self-esteem would be negatively correlated with Worry over the Rival's interest in the partner and Fear. This hypothesis received mixed support in that Worry over the Rival's interest in the partner was uncorrelated with Low Self-worth in the community resident sample but the other correlations were weak to moderate. However, in both samples, Low Self-worth was most strongly correlated with jealousy-related Guilt ($r_s = .35$ and $.34$). Hypothesis #6—that Negative Emotionality would be associated with cognitive measures of jealousy as well as jealous-related Fear and Anger—received more support in the undergraduate sample than in the community resident sample. In the undergraduate sample Negative Emotionality exhibited correlations ranging from $.21$ to $.39$. However, in the community resident sample it was essentially unrelated to cognitive measures of jealousy, instead exhibiting its strongest correlation with jealousy-related Guilt ($r = .25$). Agreeableness exhibited weak negative correlations with jealousy-related Anger in both samples, thus providing minimal support for hypothesis #7.

Hypothesis #8—that Negative Temperament SNAP-2 trait measures (e.g. Mistrust, Self-harm) would be related to cognitive measures of jealousy—received some support. Suspicion of the Partner exhibited weak to moderate correlations with Self-harm, Mistrust, Aggression, and Manipulativeness (r_s range from $.20$ to $.33$). Worry over the Rival tended to exhibit weaker correlations with the same variables (r_s range from $.11$ to $.26$). Hypothesis #9—that Aggression, Impulsivity, and Self-harm would be related to emotional measures of jealousy—received mixed support. Positive, but weak correlations were observed between (a) Aggression and jealousy-related Anger and (b) Self-harm and jealousy-related Guilt. Impulsivity (assessed with the Disinhibition versus Constraint composite) tended to be uncorrelated to emotional measures of jealousy.

Hypothesis #10 received little support. Entitlement and Exhibitionism only exhibited weak correlations with jealousy-related Joy/Sexual Arousal. Manipulativeness tended to exhibit weak correlations as well; its strongest correlation was with Suspicion of the Partner in the undergraduate sample ($r = .25$).

These bivariate analyses were followed by hierarchical multiple regression analyses with each measure of jealousy experience as the criterion variable within each sample. The demographic variables of biological sex (female vs. male), relationship status (casual vs. committed), and distance from partner (long-distance vs. short-distance) were entered into Step 1 in the undergraduate sample. In the community resident sample, sex (female vs. male) was entered into Step 1. The 23 personality variables were then entered in Step 2.

In the undergraduate sample, all of the final models were significant, with adjusted R^2 values ranging from .127 to .326 (see Tables 61 through 66). In the community resident sample, the final models for Anger and Joy/Sexual Arousal were not significant. The remaining four final models were significant with adjusted R^2 values ranging from .136 to .206 (see Tables 67 through 72). In the undergraduate sample, sex was a significant predictor of Suspicion of the Partner with males more likely to report this suspicion. Distance from the partner was a significant predictor of Worry over the Rival, with those in a long distance relationship more likely to report this worry.

Hypothesis #4 was supported in that ECR Anxiety emerged as a significant predictor of Worry over the Rival and jealousy-related Fear in both samples, as well as Suspicion of the Partner in the undergraduate sample. However, it also emerged as a significant predictor of jealousy-related Guilt in both samples and jealousy-related Anger in the undergraduate sample, suggesting it is a general predictor of jealousy experience. ECR Avoidance emerged as a significant predictor of Suspicion of the Partner in both samples.

Low Self-worth did not emerge as a statistically significant predictor, thereby providing little support for hypothesis #5—that is, that self-esteem would be related to cognitive measures of jealousy and jealousy-related Fear. However, in the community resident sample it approached significance as a predictor of Worry over the Rival ($p < .05$). Negative Emotionality was a significant predictor of jealousy-related Fear in the undergraduate sample providing minimal support for hypotheses #6—that it would be related to cognitive measures of jealousy and jealousy-related fear and anger. Agreeableness did not emerge as a significant predictor of jealousy-related Anger, providing no additional support for hypothesis #7.

Hypotheses #8 through #10—that SNAP-2 trait measures would exhibit meaningful relations with jealousy experience measures—received little to no additional support in the regression analyses. The only SNAP-2 trait scale to emerge as a significant predictor was Aggression, which was related to jealousy-related Anger in the undergraduate sample.

The Relation of Personality to Jealousy-related Goals

Bivariate correlations were computed between the five scales representing the jealousy-related goals and the various measures of personality for each sample (see Tables 73 and 74). Correlations were fairly weak at best, with only six in the undergraduate sample and four in the community resident sample exceeding .30. This suggests that personality is less related to measures of jealousy-related goals than to measures of jealousy experience. Correlational patterns tended to differ noticeably between samples as well. In the undergraduate sample, the goal of Relationship Maintenance exhibited weak to moderate correlations with Exploitable Dependence, Love Dependence, ECR Anxiety, and, inversely, ECR Avoidance (r s range from $|.20|$ to $|.40|$); it was most strongly correlated with ECR Anxiety ($r = .40$). In marked contrast, this correlation was not significant in the community resident sample ($r = .08$). The

correlations with Exploitable Dependence, Love Dependence and, inversely, with ECR Avoidance were also found in the community resident sample (r s range from $|.23|$ to $|.30|$). However, Relationship Maintenance goals also tended to be correlated with Agreeableness and, inversely, with Aggression, Manipulativeness, and Negative Emotionality (r s range from $|.21|$ to $|.25|$) in the community resident sample.

Self-esteem Preservation only exhibited very weak correlations (r s $\leq .16$) in the undergraduate sample. In the community resident sample, it exhibited stronger—but still weak to moderate—relations with Positive Temperament, Propriety, Love Dependence, Exploitable Dependence, Exhibitionism, and Entitlement (r s range from $.20$ to $.30$). Reducing Uncertainty about the Rival relationship and Relationship Re-Assessment only exhibited weak correlations (r s $< .20$) in the community resident sample. In the undergraduate sample, the former was weakly to moderately correlated with ECR Anxiety, Exploitable Dependence, and Love Dependence (r s range from $.21$ to $.34$), whereas the latter was weakly correlated to ECR Avoidance and Anxiety (r s = $.21$).

The goal of Equity Restoration through Retaliation exhibited weak to moderate correlations with ECR Anxiety in both samples and ECR Avoidance in the undergraduate sample (r s range from $.24$ to $.32$). It also tended to correlate with SNAP-2 scales of Aggression, Manipulativeness, Mistrust, and Negative Emotionality (r s range from $.20$ to $.41$). An inverse relation with Agreeableness was also apparent—more so in the community resident sample ($r = -.25$) than in the undergraduate sample ($r = -.17$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted next, with each goal serving as a criterion variable: the same demographic and personality predictor variables were used as in the previous analyses of jealousy experience. In the undergraduate sample, all of the final models were significant, with adjusted R^2 values ranging from $.052$ to $.281$ (see Tables 75 through 79). In the community resident sample, the final models for Reducing Uncertainty about the Rival relationship and Relationship Re-assessment were not significant. The remaining three final models were significant, with

adjusted R^2 values ranging from .127 to .270 (see Tables 80 through 84). Although some demographic variables were significant predictors in the initial step, none remained so in the final models.

ECR Anxiety and ECR Avoidance were the most prominent predictors of jealousy-related goals in the undergraduate sample. Both were significant predictors of Relationship Maintenance, Relationship Re-Assessment, and Equity Restoration through Retaliation. ECR Anxiety was also a significant predictor of Reducing Uncertainty about the Rival relationship. In the community resident sample, ECR Anxiety only emerged as a significant predictor of Relationship Maintenance goals. Aggression was a significant predictor of Equity Restoration through Retaliation in both samples.

The Relation between Personality and Jealousy Expression

Bivariate correlations were computed to examine the relations between communicative responses to jealousy and the various measures of personality for each sample (see Tables 85 and 86). When significant, correlations tended to be weak to moderate; overall, only eight in the undergraduate sample and three in the community resident sample exceeded .30. ECR Avoidance was weakly correlated with Affective Integrative Communication ($r_s = -.28$ and $-.17$ in the undergraduate and community resident samples, respectively) and Withdrawal ($r_s = .25$ and $.28$, respectively), providing some support for hypotheses #11 and #13. However, ECR Avoidance was not significantly correlated with Compensatory Restoration, providing no support for hypothesis #12.

SNAP-2 Mistrust was weakly correlated with Surveillance and Competition ($r_s = .24$ and $.19$), providing minimal support for hypothesis #14. Hypothesis #15—that is, that (a) Withdrawal and (b) Violence and Threats would be related to Manipulativeness, Entitlement, and Exhibitionism—received mixed support. Withdrawal tended to be unrelated to these SNAP-2 measures; however, Violence and Threats exhibited weak to

moderate correlations with Manipulativeness ($r_s = .29$ and $.32$). Violence and Threats also exhibited a weak correlation with Entitlement in the community resident sample ($r = .19$). Hypothesis #16—that Aggression and Impulsivity (assessed with the Disinhibition versus Constraint composite) would exhibit significant positive correlations with (a) Violence & Threats, and (b) Rival Communication, and negative correlations with (c) Affective Integrative Communication, and (d) Compensatory Restoration—received mixed support. Violence and Threats was moderately related to Aggression in the undergraduate and community resident samples ($r_s = .39$ and $.47$, respectively). Violence and Threats also exhibited weak correlations with Disinhibition versus Constraint ($r_s = .21$ and $.23$). Additionally, Aggression was correlated with Rival Communication ($r = .30$) and Disinhibition versus Constraint was correlated with Affective Integrative Communication ($r = -.23$) in the undergraduate sample. The other hypothesized correlations were not significant or weak at best.

Following the bivariate analyses, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted with each CRJ factor, entering the same demographic and personality predictor variables as the previously discussed analyses. In the undergraduate sample, all of the final models were significant, with adjusted R^2 values ranging from $.163$ to $.262$ (see Tables 87 through 92). In the community resident sample, the final models for Rival Communication and Affective Integrative Communication were not significant. The remaining four final models were significant, with adjusted R^2 values ranging from $.160$ to $.209$ (see Tables 93 through 98). In the community resident sample, sex was a significant predictor of Compensatory Restoration with males more likely to report engaging in these behaviors.

Hypotheses #11 and #12 received some support in that ECR Avoidance was a significant predictor of Affective Integrative Communication and Compensatory Restoration in the undergraduate sample and approached significance in the community resident sample ($p < .05$). ECR Anxiety, however, was a significant predictor of

Compensatory Restoration in both samples. ECR Avoidance was a significant predictor of Withdrawal in both samples, thus providing support for hypothesis #13.

Hypothesis #14 was not supported, given that Mistrust was not a significant predictor of Surveillance and Competition in either sample. Hypothesis #15—that Manipulativeness, Entitlement, and Exhibitionism would be predictive of (a) Withdrawal and (b) Violence and Threats—was not supported by the regression analyses.

Entitlement did approach significance as a predictor of Violence and Threats in the community resident sample ($p < .05$), but the other hypothesized predictors were not significant. Hypothesis #16—that Aggression and Disinhibition versus Constraint would predict the various destructive responses to jealousy—received mixed support.

Aggression was a significant predictor of Violence and Threats in both samples, as well as (a) Surveillance and Competition and (b) Rival Communication in the undergraduate sample. Disinhibition versus Constraint was not a significant predictor of any of the measures of jealousy expression.

The Relation between Jealousy Expression, Experience, and Related Goals

The Relation between Jealousy Experience and Expression

Bivariate correlations were calculated between the six measures of jealousy expression and the six measures of jealousy experience (see Tables 99 and 100). Hypothesis #17—that jealousy-related Anger would be positively correlated with the majority of destructive responses and negatively correlated with Avoidance/Denial and Compensatory Restoration—was partially supported. The largest correlation in both samples was between jealousy-related Anger and Surveillance and Competition ($r_s = .55$ in the undergraduate sample and $.61$ in the community resident sample). Indeed, in the undergraduate sample, jealousy-related Anger did tend to exhibit significant positive correlations with all of the jealousy expression measures (r_s range from $.22$ to $.55$);

however, this included Compensatory Restoration. This pattern was replicated in the community resident sample (statistically significant r s range from .28 to .61), although the correlation with Compensatory Restoration did not reach significance ($r = .13$). The Withdrawal scale includes items from the CRJ scales of Active Distancing and Avoidance/Denial. Anger was hypothesized to exhibit a positive correlation with the former and a negative correlation with the latter. In short, the hypothesized positive correlations were present; however, the hypothesized inverse relations were not.

Hypothesis #18—that Surveillance behaviors would be related to measures of cognitive jealousy and jealousy-related Fear—was largely supported. Surveillance and Competition (which included CRJ Surveillance items) exhibited moderate to strong positive correlations with all of the measures of jealousy expression except jealousy-related Joy/Sexual Arousal. Hypothesis #19—that Worry over a Rival's interest in the partner would be related to Compensatory Restoration and Derogation of the Rival—was partially supported. CRJ Derogation of the Rival items were included in the Surveillance and Competition scale, which exhibited a moderate correlation with Worry over the Rival in both the undergraduate and community resident sample (r s = .38 and .46, respectively). However, Worry over the Rival was only weakly correlated with Compensatory Restoration (r s = .24 and .18).

Hypothesis #20 cannot be evaluated because a separate jealousy experience factor for envy did not emerge. The content included to assess envy tended to exhibit low factor loadings and was not included in any of the derived factors. Mixed results were found for hypothesis #21—that jealousy-related Guilt would be positively correlated with Withdrawal and negatively correlated with (a) Violence and Threats and (b) Surveillance. Jealousy-related Guilt was positively correlated with Withdrawal (r s = .39) but—opposite to prediction—also with Surveillance and Competition (r s = .39 and .34 in the undergraduate and community resident sample, respectively). Jealousy-related Guilt was

weakly correlated with Violence and Threats in the undergraduate sample ($r = .27$) but this relation was not significant in the community resident sample.

In each sample, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted with each jealousy expression measure as a criterion variable. Demographic variables were entered in step one of the analyses. Once again this included biological sex, relationship status and distance from the partner in the undergraduate sample and biological sex in the community resident sample. Step two involved entering the six jealousy experience variables as predictors. In the undergraduate sample, all of the final models were significant, with adjusted R^2 values ranging from .201 to .436 (see Tables 101 through 106). In the community resident sample, all of the final models were significant, with adjusted R^2 values ranging from .113 to .465 (see Tables 107 through 112). In the undergraduate sample, sex was a significant predictor of Withdrawal and Affective Integrative Communication: females were more likely to engage in these responses to jealousy. The latter effect approached significance in the community resident sample. Being in a committed, long-term relationship (vs. a casual dating relationship) also predicted engaging in Affective Integrative Communication in the undergraduate sample. In both samples, sex approached significance as a predictor of Compensatory Restoration, with males more likely to report engaging in the behaviors.

Hypothesis #17 was largely supported in that jealousy-related Anger was a significant predictor of (a) Surveillance and Competition, (b) Rival Communication, (c) Violence and Threats, and (d) Withdrawal in both samples. It was also a significant predictor of Affective Integrative Communication in the undergraduate sample. In the community resident sample, the hypothesized negative relation with Compensatory Restoration approached significance ($p < .05$) in the regression, despite the fact that these variables exhibited a non-significant positive bivariate correlation.

Hypothesis #18 was partially supported by the regression analyses. Surveillance and Competition was significantly predicted by Suspicion of the Partner in both samples;

however, Worry over the Rival was only significant in the undergraduate sample. Jealousy-related Fear did not emerge as a significant predictor in either sample, though it approached significance in the undergraduate sample ($p < .05$). Hypothesis #19 did not receive much support from the regression analyses. Worry over the Rival was not a significant predictor of Compensatory Restoration in either sample and was only a significant predictor of Surveillance and Competition in the undergraduate sample.

Once again, Hypothesis #20 cannot be evaluated due to a lack of envy content in the jealousy experience measures. Hypothesis #21 was not supported in that jealousy-related Guilt was not a significant predictor of (a) Withdrawal, (b) Surveillance and Competition, or (c) Violence and Threats. It was, however, a significant predictor of Compensatory Restoration in both samples.

Although not explicitly hypothesized, it is interesting to note that jealousy-related Joy/Sexual Arousal exhibited a positive correlation with Violence and Threats in both the undergraduate ($r = .22$) and community resident sample ($r = .33$). It was also a significant predictor of Violence and Threats in both samples.

The Relation between Jealousy Expression and Jealousy-related Goals

Bivariate correlations were calculated between the six jealousy expression measures and the five jealousy-related goals for each sample. See Tables 113 and 114. The jealousy-related goal of Equity Restoration through Retaliation exhibited moderate to strong correlations with the destructive jealousy expression measures of (a) Surveillance and Competition, (b) Rival Communication, (c) Violence and Threats, and (d) Withdrawal (r s range from .36 to .61). The goal of Reducing Uncertainty about the Rival relationship was also moderately correlated with (a) Surveillance and Competition and (b) Rival Communication in both samples (r s range from .38 to .47) and with Compensatory Restoration in the undergraduate sample ($r = .37$). Relationship Re-

assessment was moderately correlated with (a) Surveillance and Competition, (b) Rival Communication, and (c) Withdrawal in the undergraduate sample ($r_s = .39, .34, \text{ and } .33$, respectively). The goal of Self-esteem Preservation only exhibited weak correlations; the highest was with Surveillance and Competition in the community resident sample ($r = .30$). The goal of Relationship Maintenance exhibited its strongest correlations with Compensatory Restoration in both samples ($r_s = .48 \text{ and } .31$ in the undergraduate and community resident sample, respectively) and Affective Integrative Communication in the undergraduate sample ($r = .35$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were calculated for each sample, using each jealousy expression measure as the criterion variable. Demographic predictors in step one remain the same as they have been for previous regressions. Step two involved entering the five jealousy-related goals as predictors. In the undergraduate sample, all of the final models were significant with adjusted R^2 values ranging from .191 to .368 (see Tables 115 through 120). In the community resident sample, all of the final models were significant with adjusted R^2 values ranging from .110 to .431 (see Tables 121 through 126).

The regression analyses revealed similar patterns to the bivariate analyses. More specifically, Equity Restoration through Retaliation was a significant predictor of (a) Surveillance and Competition, (b) Rival Communication, (c) Violence and Threats, and (d) Withdrawal in both samples. Reducing Uncertainty about the Rival relationship was also a significant predictor of (a) Surveillance and Competition and (b) Rival Communication in both samples. This goal was also a significant predictor of Compensatory Restoration in the undergraduate sample and, inversely, of Violence and Threats in the community resident sample.

Relationship Re-assessment was only a significant predictor of Withdrawal in the undergraduate sample. Also in the undergraduate sample it approached significance as a predictor of (a) Surveillance and Competition and (b) Rival Communication ($p < .05$).

The goal of Self-esteem preservation was not a significant predictor of any of the jealousy expression measures. Relationship Maintenance was a significant predictor of Compensatory Restoration in both samples and Affective Integrative Communication in the undergraduate sample.

Several demographic variables remained significant predictors in the final models. In the undergraduate sample sex significantly predicted Withdrawal, Affective Integrative Communication and Compensatory Restoration: females were more likely to engage in the former two responses, whereas males were more likely to engage in the last response. Affective Integrative Communication was also predicted by relationship status, with those in a committed, long-term relationship more likely to engage in the behavior. Finally, in the undergraduate sample, Violence and Threats was significantly predicted by distance from the partner. Those in a long-distance relationship were less likely to engage in these responses. In the community resident sample, sex approached significance as a predictor of Affective Integrative Communication and Compensatory Restoration, exhibiting the same pattern as in the undergraduate sample.

The Relation between Relationship Satisfaction and Jealousy

Bivariate correlations were calculated between relationship satisfaction and measures of jealousy experience and expression. Suspicion of the Partner showed the strongest correlations with the QMI ($r_s = -.38$ and $-.43$ in the undergraduate and community resident samples, respectively). Cognitive jealousy and destructive responses to jealousy seemed to be inversely related to relationship satisfaction whereas emotional jealousy and constructive responses tended to be unrelated to relationship satisfaction. See Table 127.

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted predicting relationship satisfaction for each sample. Step one involved entering the same demographic

characteristics as previous analyses. The six jealousy experience variables were then entered in step two, followed by the six jealousy expression variables in step three.

In the undergraduate sample the final model was significant, adjusted $R^2 = .214$, $F(15, 384) = 8.246$, $p < .001$. Significant predictors included relationship status and, inversely, Suspicion of the Partner. None of the jealousy expression measures entered in step three reached significance as an individual predictor; however, (a) Surveillance and Competition and (b) Affective Integrative Communication approached significance ($p < .05$). Indeed, the model after step two, before these measures were entered, was significant, adjusted $R^2 = .188$, $F(9, 390)$, $p < .001$, with the same two predictors from the final model reaching significance. However, the measures of jealousy expression collectively explained a significant amount of variance above and beyond demographics and jealousy experience, $\Delta R^2 = .037$, $F(6, 384) = 3.120$, $p = .005$. See Table 128.

In the married community resident sample the final model was significant, adjusted $R^2 = .199$, $F(13, 170) = 4.491$, $p < .001$. Once again, however, none of the additional variables entered in step three reached significance as individual predictors. Affective Integrative Communication once again approached significance ($p < .05$). Only Suspicion of the Partner was a significant inverse predictor in this model. Once again, the model after step two was significant, adjusted $R^2 = .181$, $F(7, 176) = 6.770$, $p < .001$, with Suspicion of the Partner as the only significant predictor. The measures of jealousy expression did not significantly predict relationship satisfaction above and beyond sex and jealousy experience, $\Delta R^2 = .043$, $F(6, 170) = 1.656$, $p = .135$. See Table 129.

Table 5 Bivariate Correlations between BFI and SNAP-2 Temperament Scales

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. BFI Neuroticism		-.19*	-.06	-.42**	-.20**	.75	-.26**	.20**
2. BFI Extraversion	-.15**		.20**	.14	.24**	-.16*	.56**	-.06
3. BFI Openness	-.10*	.17**		.06	-.01	-.02	.21**	-.03
4. BFI Agreeableness	-.35**	.12*	.16**		.20**	-.41**	.13	-.22**
5. BFI Conscientiousness	-.07	.09	-.00	.27**		-.16*	.39**	-.47**
6. SNAP-2 Negative Temperament	.72**	-.11*	-.08	-.29**	-.05		-.31**	.26**
7. SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.13**	.48**	.23**	.21**	.28**	-.12*		-.21**
8. SNAP-2 Disinhibition-Pure	-.05	.12*	.01	-.18**	-.59**	.07	-.06	

Note. Undergraduate data ($N = 400$) reported below the diagonal and community resident data ($N = 184$) reported above the diagonal. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 6 Bivariate Correlations between SNAP-2 Trait Scales

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. MST		.43**	.51**	.51**	.43**	.32**	.08	.10	.39**	.28**	.13	.30**
2. MAN	.30**		.51**	.44**	.35**	.37**	.19*	.18*	.16*	.46**	-.20**	.05
3. AGG	.35**	.45**		.44**	.35**	.07	.20**	.12	.21**	.32**	-.08	.19*
4. SFH	.42**	.36**	.36**		.35**	.29**	.02	-.07	.34**	.23**	-.08	.14
5. EP	.48**	.41**	.24**	.34**		.14	.28**	.21**	.24**	.34**	.03	.39**
6. DEP	.22**	.16**	.08	.27**	.15**		.03	-.07	.02	.27**	.02	-.23**
7. EXH	-.00	.24**	.15**	-.04	.11*	.04		.41**	-.38**	.20**	-.09	-.01
8. ENT	.14**	.16**	.09	-.07	.24**	-.01	.38**		-.14	.04	.14	.17*
9. DET	.41**	.16**	.18**	.36**	.21**	.03	-.38**	-.10*		.09	-.08	.16*
10. IMP	.12*	.49**	.33**	.24**	.19**	.05	.21**	.00	-.03		-.38**	-.12
11. PRO	.07	-.16**	-.15**	-.11*	.06	.13**	.07	.21**	-.01	-.43**		.26**
12. WRK	.24**	-.07	.09	.13**	.20**	-.02	.08	.33**	.18**	-.26**	.38**	

Table 6—continued

Note. Undergraduate data ($N = 400$) reported below the diagonal and community resident data ($N = 184$) reported above the diagonal. MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG = Aggression; SFH = Self-harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; IMP = Impulsivity; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 7 Bivariate Correlations between 3VDI, ECR and SES Scales

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. 3VDI Submissive Dependence		.42**	.05	.29**	.45**	-.75**
2. 3VDI Exploitable Dependence	.51**		.45**	-.11	.34**	-.36**
3. 3VDI Love Dependence	.10	.51**		-.40**	.20**	-.06
4. ECR Avoidance	.26**	-.05	-.30**		.25**	-.39**
5. ECR Anxiety	.46**	.49**	.33**	.22**		-.55**
6. Rosenberg SES	-.62**	-.22**	.06	-.29**	-.39**	

Note. Undergraduate data ($N = 400$) reported below the diagonal and community resident data ($N = 184$) reported above the diagonal. 3VDI = 3 Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; SES = Self-esteem Scale.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 8 Bivariate Correlations between (a) BFI and SNAP-2 Temperament Scales and (b) SNAP-2 Trait Scales-Undergraduate Sample

	N	E	O	A	C	NT	PT	DIS-P
MST	.39**	-.15**	-.03	-.32**	-.14**	.54**	-.15**	.17**
MAN	.08	.06	.02	-.37**	-.49**	.22**	-.11*	.59**
AGG	.28**	.10*	-.09	-.53**	-.21**	.37**	-.13*	.36**
SFH	.37**	-.14**	-.02	-.28**	-.24**	.42**	-.28**	.26**
EP	.19**	-.01	.21**	-.16**	-.18**	.37**	.04	.28**
DEP	.31**	-.13**	-.28**	.01	-.14**	.47**	-.15**	.11*
EXH	-.04	.49**	.11*	-.08	-.07	-.01	.34**	.25**
ENT	-.01	.19**	.16**	-.02	.11*	.06	.38**	.08
DET	.22**	-.58**	-.02	-.38**	-.09	.32**	-.48**	-.07
IMP	-.05	.19**	.05	-.20	-.60**	-.01	-.10*	.72**
PRO	.12*	-.00	-.04	.16**	.33**	.19**	.23**	-.32**
WRK	.19**	.04	.14**	-.08	.39**	.28**	.35**	-.27**

Table 8—continued

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; NT = Negative Temperament; PT = Positive Temperament; DIS-P = Disinhibition-Pure; MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG = Aggression; SFH = Self-harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; IMP = Impulsivity; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 9 Bivariate Correlations between (a) BFI and SNAP-2 Temperament Scales and (b) SNAP-2 Trait Scales-Community Resident Sample

	N	E	O	A	C	NT	PT	DIS-P
MST	.40**	-.08	-.02	-.36**	-.09	.51**	-.15	.30**
MAN	.36**	-.02	.02	-.46**	-.46**	.39**	-.13	.63**
AGG	.40**	.02	.05	-.54**	-.06	.46**	-.06	.35**
SFH	.41**	-.23**	.09	-.31**	-.23**	.52**	-.33**	.43**
EP	.18*	.03	.30**	-.20**	-.13	.30**	.08	.32**
DEP	.25**	-.15*	-.16*	-.05	-.41**	.31**	-.30**	.40**
EXH	-.06	.54**	.31**	-.03	.06	-.01	.43**	.15*
ENT	.02	.20**	.12	-.10	.09	.06	.26**	.01
DET	.20**	-.64**	-.01	-.40**	-.21**	.32**	-.49**	.19*
IMP	.15*	.09	.04	-.16*	-.36**	.23**	-.06	.62**
PRO	.02	.03	-.11	.07	.23**	.08	.20**	-.38**
WRK	.21**	-.04	.21**	-.24**	.26**	.25**	.29**	-.15*

Table 9—continued

Note. $N = 184$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; NT = Negative Temperament; PT = Positive Temperament; DIS-P = Disinhibition-Pure; MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG = Aggression; SFH = Self-harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; IMP = Impulsivity; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 10 Bivariate Correlations between (a) BFI and SNAP-2 Temperament Scales and (b) the 3VDI, ECR and SES-Undergraduate Sample

	N	E	O	A	C	NT	PT	DIS-P
3VDI Submissive Dependence	.41**	-.39**	-.27**	-.11*	-.25**	.46**	-.45**	.07
3VDI Exploitable Dependence	.22**	-.11*	-.08	.25**	-.05	.34**	-.03	-.04
3VDI Love Dependence	.16**	.17**	-.01	.30**	.18**	.24**	.21**	-.06
ECR Avoidance	.03	-.17**	-.09	-.28**	-.26**	.10*	-.18**	.26**
ECR Anxiety	.32**	-.04	-.07	-.10*	-.11*	.52**	-.11*	.08
Rosenberg SES	-.36**	.24**	.11*	.25**	.27**	-.44**	.37**	-.18**

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = 3 Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; SES = Self-esteem Scale; N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; NT = Negative Temperament; PT = Positive Temperament; DIS-P = Disinhibition-Pure.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 11 Bivariate Correlations between (a) BFI and SNAP-2 Temperament Scales and (b) the 3VDI, ECR and SES-Community Resident Sample

	N	E	O	A	C	NT	PT	DIS-P
3VDI Submissive Dependence	.46**	-.50**	-.25**	-.20**	-.33**	.52**	-.53**	.27**
3VDI Exploitable Dependence	.26**	-.12	.08	.15*	-.11	.33**	-.08	.03
3VDI Love Dependence	.03	.25**	-.01	.30**	.05	.03	.22**	-.07
ECR Avoidance	.26**	-.30**	-.07	-.41**	-.16*	.37**	-.29**	.24**
ECR Anxiety	.51**	-.07	-.03	-.34**	-.19*	.62**	-.18*	.16*
Rosenberg SES	-.50**	.30**	.12	.29**	.32**	-.62**	.45**	-.34**

Note. $N = 184$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = 3 Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; SES = Self-esteem Scale; N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; NT = Negative Temperament; PT = Positive Temperament; DIS-P = Disinhibition-Pure.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 12 Bivariate Correlations between SNAP-2 Trait Scales and the 3VDI, ECR and SES-Undergraduate Sample

	3VDI	3VDI	3VDI	ECR	ECR	SES
	Sub. Dep.	Exploit. Dep.	Love Dep.	Avoid.	Anxiety	
MST	.29**	.17**	-.02	.29**	.40**	-.38**
MAN	.15**	.03	-.12*	.24**	.19**	-.25**
AGG	.07	-.19**	-.11*	.16**	.15**	-.16**
SFH	.43**	.12*	-.09	.32**	.32**	-.50**
EP	.15**	.20**	.06	.21**	.29**	-.22**
DEP	.60**	.57**	.36**	.02	.43**	-.34**
EXH	-.25**	.03	.15**	-.01	.14**	.12*
ENT	-.25**	.00	.10	.02	.08	.22**
DET	.37**	.02	-.31**	.34**	.19**	-.36**
IMP	.03	-.08	-.11*	.22**	.06	-.17**
PRO	.01	.21**	.18**	-.08	.14**	-.00
WRK	-.11*	.01	-.03	.06	.09	-.00

Note. $N = 400$. SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = 3 Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; SES = Self-esteem Scale; Sub. Dep. = Submissive Dependence; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence; Avoid. = Avoidance; MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG = Aggression; SFH = Self-harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; IMP = Impulsivity; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 13 Bivariate Correlations between SNAP-2 Trait Scales and the 3VDI, ECR and SES-Community Resident Sample

	3VDI	3VDI	3VDI	ECR	ECR	SES
	Sub. Dep.	Exploit. Dep.	Love Dep.	Avoid.	Anxiety	
MST	.38**	.20**	-.13	.36**	.43**	-.46**
MAN	.29**	.14	-.05	.28**	.29**	-.38**
AGG	.11	-.15*	-.18*	.34**	.32**	-.25**
SFH	.50**	.24**	-.07	.32**	.40**	-.60**
EP	.06	.15*	-.02	.13	.22**	-.18*
DEP	.58**	.39**	.23**	.01	.27**	-.39**
EXH	-.28**	-.10	.12	-.15*	-.01	.17*
ENT	-.20**	-.02	.04	-.08	.05	.13
DET	.37**	.01	-.53**	.50**	.22**	-.37**
IMP	.14	-.01	-.06	.13	.16*	-.28**
PRO	-.00	.25**	.19*	-.14	-.03	.08
WRK	-.07	.10	-.07	.17*	.17*	-.05

Note. $N = 184$. SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = 3 Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; SES = Self-esteem Scale; Sub. Dep. = Submissive Dependence; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence; Avoid. = Avoidance; MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG = Aggression; SFH = Self-harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; IMP = Impulsivity; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 14 Bivariate Correlations between Personality Composites and Scales- Undergraduate Sample

	NE	DvC	Low Self-worth
DvC	-.01		
Low Self-worth	.50**	.13**	
BFI Extraversion	-.14**	.17**	-.35**
BFI Openness	-.10*	.03	-.21**
BFI Agreeableness	-.34**	-.20**	-.20**
BFI Conscientiousness	-.06	-.64**	-.29**
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.14**	-.09	-.46**
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.50**	.15**	.37**
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.16**	.58**	.23**
SNAP-2 Aggression	.35**	.37**	.13**
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.42**	.27**	.52**
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.30**	.25**	.20**
SNAP-2 Dependency	.42**	.09	.53**
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.02	.25**	-.21**
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.03	.04	-.26**
SNAP-2 Detachment	.29**	-.05	.40**
SNAP-2 Propriety	.17**	-.41**	.01
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.25**	-.29**	-.06
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.30**	-.06	.40**
3VDI Love Dep.	.21**	-.09	.02
ECR Avoidance	.07	.26**	.30**
ECR Anxiety	.45**	.08	.47**

Table 14—continued

Note. $N = 400$. NE = Negative Emotionality composite; DvC = Disinhibition vs. Constraint composite; BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = 3 Vector Dependency Inventory; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 15 Bivariate Correlations between Personality Composites and Scales-Community Resident Sample

	NE	DvC	Low Self-worth
DvC	.25**		
Low Self-worth	.60**	.30**	
BFI Extraversion	-.19*	.02	-.42**
BFI Openness	-.04	.01	-.20**
BFI Agreeableness	-.44**	-.21**	-.26**
BFI Conscientiousness	-.19**	-.46**	-.35**
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.30**	-.15*	-.52**
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.49**	.31**	.45**
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.40**	.60**	.36**
SNAP-2 Aggression	.46**	.37**	.19**
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.50**	.37**	.59**
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.25**	.36**	.13
SNAP-2 Dependency	.30**	.37**	.52**
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.04	.19**	-.24**
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.04	.03	-.18**
SNAP-2 Detachment	.28**	.16*	.40**
SNAP-2 Propriety	.05	-.42**	-.05
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.24**	-.15*	-.01
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.32**	.01	.42**
3VDI Love Dep.	.03	-.07	.06
ECR Avoidance	.33**	.21**	.36**
ECR Anxiety	.60**	.18*	.53**

Table 15—continued

Note. $N = 184$. NE = Negative Emotionality composite; DvC = Disinhibition vs. Constraint composite; BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = 3 Vector Dependency Inventory; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 16 Descriptive Statistics for Non-Jealousy Measures-Undergraduate Sample

	Average				Number of Items
	α	r_{ij}	M	SD	
Negative Emotionality ^a	.92	.27	0.00	1.86	36
BFI Extraversion	.85	.42	29.01	5.59	8
BFI Openness	.78	.28	35.66	5.86	10
BFI Agreeableness	.79	.31	35.01	5.36	9
BFI Conscientiousness	.78	.32	33.41	5.41	9
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.82	.19	5.96	4.14	19
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.77	.15	5.24	3.59	20
SNAP-2 Aggression	.84	.22	4.08	3.83	20
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.81	.22	1.38	2.22	16
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.77	.19	3.64	2.96	15
SNAP-2 Dependency	.81	.20	5.48	3.75	18
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.87	.20	18.80	5.63	27
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.80	.19	8.68	3.61	16
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.75	.16	7.87	3.25	16
SNAP-2 Detachment	.81	.20	4.33	3.54	18
DvC ^a	.87	.16	0.00	1.85	35
SNAP-2 Propriety	.79	.16	11.86	4.00	20
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.81	.19	7.04	3.80	18
Low Self-worth ^a	.89	.34	0.00	1.80	19

Table 16—continued

	α	Average			Number of Items
		r_{ij}	M	SD	
3VDI Exploitable Dependence	.83	.35	32.47	8.01	9
3VDI Love Dependency	.73	.23	39.46	6.21	9
ECR Avoidance	.92	.41	46.22	17.38	18
ECR Anxiety	.91	.37	64.85	19.41	18
Quality Marriage Index	.93	.70	35.46	7.83	6

Note. $N = 400$. r_{ij} = inter-item correlation; BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; Sub. Dep. = Submissive Dependence; SES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships.

^aComposite of two standardized correlated variables.

Table 17 Descriptive Statistics for Non-Jealousy Measures-Community Resident Sample

	Average				Number of Items
	α	r_{ij}	M	SD	
Negative Emotionality ^a	.93	.32	0.00	1.87	36
BFI Extraversion	.86	.44	26.93	6.67	8
BFI Openness	.76	.26	36.18	5.92	10
BFI Agreeableness	.75	.26	34.17	5.45	9
BFI Conscientiousness	.82	.35	34.18	6.09	9
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.86	.25	6.13	4.61	19
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.74	.13	4.38	3.25	20
SNAP-2 Aggression	.85	.23	4.20	3.97	20
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.84	.26	2.58	3.10	16
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.82	.25	3.81	3.36	15
SNAP-2 Dependency	.80	.18	5.12	3.56	18
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.87	.20	17.39	5.89	27
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.82	.22	5.66	3.67	16
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.78	.18	7.31	3.57	16
SNAP-2 Detachment	.88	.28	6.26	4.66	18
DvC ^a	.83	.12	0.00	1.80	35
SNAP-2 Propriety	.76	.14	13.01	3.85	20
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.82	.19	7.60	3.95	18
Low Self-worth ^a	.90	.37	0.00	1.87	19

Table 17—continued

	α	Average			Number of Items
		r_{ij}	M	SD	
3VDI Exploitable Dependence	.78	.29	32.95	7.56	9
3VDI Love Dependency	.76	.26	36.84	7.08	9
ECR Avoidance	.95	.50	48.27	20.08	18
ECR Anxiety	.87	.28	68.04	18.12	18
Quality Marriage Index	.95	.79	34.95	8.77	6

Note. $N = 184$. r_{ij} = inter-item correlation; BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; Sub. Dep. = Submissive Dependence; SES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships.

^aComposite of two standardized correlated variables.

Table 18 Factor Loadings for Eight-Item Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Factor	
	1	2
I suspect that my partner may be physically intimate with someone else behind my back	.864	.135
I think my partner is developing an intimate relationship with someone else	.853	.179
I suspect that my partner is secretly seeing someone else	.800	.301
I suspect that my partner is highly attracted to others	.630	.401
I suspect that my partner may be attracted to someone else	.556	.521
I think that someone else may be romantically interested in my partner	.156	.856
I am worried that someone is “chasing after” my partner	.206	.819
I am worried that someone is trying to seduce my partner	.320	.761

Note. $N = 400$. MJS = Multidimensional Jealousy Scale. Loadings of $|.50|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 19 Factor Loadings for Eight-Item Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Factor		
	1	2	3
I think my partner is developing an intimate relationship with someone else	.862	.184	.162
I suspect that my partner may be physically intimate with someone else behind my back	.845	.132	.204
I suspect that my partner is secretly seeing someone else	.756	.284	.268
I suspect that my partner is highly attracted to others	.515	.311	.507
I think that someone else may be romantically interested in my partner	.123	.837	.198
I am worried that someone is “chasing after” my partner	.165	.789	.230
I am worried that someone is trying to seduce my partner	.309	.782	.139
I suspect that my partner may be attracted to someone else	.398	.410	.668

Note. $N = 400$. MJS = Multidimensional Jealousy Scale. Loadings of $|.50|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 20 Factor Loadings for Eight-Item Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Community Resident Sample

Item	Factor	
	1	2
I suspect that my partner may be physically intimate with someone else behind my back	.832	.293
I think my partner is developing an intimate relationship with someone else	.823	.333
I suspect that my partner is secretly seeing someone else	.814	.318
I suspect that my partner may be attracted to someone else	.572	.547
I am worried that someone is trying to seduce my partner	.316	.857
I think that someone else may be romantically interested in my partner	.256	.833
I am worried that someone is “chasing after” my partner	.370	.691
I suspect that my partner is highly attracted to others	.476	.492

Note. $N = 184$. MJS = Multidimensional Jealousy Scale. Loadings of $|.50|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 21 Factor Loadings for Eight-Item Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Community Resident Sample

Item	Factor		
	1	2	3
I suspect that my partner is secretly seeing someone else	.807	.292	.242
I suspect that my partner may be physically intimate with someone else behind my back	.802	.261	.271
I think my partner is developing an intimate relationship with someone else	.771	.284	.323
I am worried that someone is trying to seduce my partner	.287	.865	.252
I think that someone else may be romantically interested in my partner	.204	.747	.360
I am worried that someone is “chasing after” my partner	.359	.691	.207
I suspect that my partner may be attracted to someone else	.421	.375	.669
I suspect that my partner is highly attracted to others	.319	.322	.647

Note. $N = 184$. MJS = Multidimensional Jealousy Scale. Loadings of $|.50|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 22 Factor Loadings for Six-Item Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Factor	
	1	2
I suspect that my partner may be physically intimate with someone else behind my back	.878	.149
I think my partner is developing an intimate relationship with someone else	.857	.200
I suspect that my partner is secretly seeing someone else	.790	.315
I think that someone else may be romantically interested in my partner	.142	.860
I am worried that someone is “chasing after” my partner	.193	.815
I am worried that someone is trying to seduce my partner	.316	.784

Note. $N = 400$. MJS = Multidimensional Jealousy Scale. Loadings of $|.50|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 23 Factor Loadings for Six-Item Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the MJS-Cognitive-Community Resident Sample

Item	Factor	
	1	2
I suspect that my partner may be physically intimate with someone else behind my back	.834	.296
I suspect that my partner is secretly seeing someone else	.832	.319
I think my partner is developing an intimate relationship with someone else	.816	.334
I am worried that someone is trying to seduce my partner	.309	.900
I think that someone else may be romantically interested in my partner	.265	.795
I am worried that someone is “chasing after” my partner	.375	.706

Note. $N = 184$. MJS = Multidimensional Jealousy Scale. Loadings of $|\geq .50|$ and greater are highlighted

Table 24 Factor Loadings for Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Affective Items-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Factor	
	I	II
suffering	.790	-.014
lonely	.782	-.130
frightened	.753	.065
rejected	.748	-.205
depressed	.733	-.241
blue	.732	-.115
tense	.729	-.153
grouchy	.720	-.140
hopeless	.715	-.043
distressed	.706	-.090
alone	.706	-.181
scared	.701	-.034
angry	.699	-.193
upset	.697	-.337
downhearted	.694	-.064
worried	.690	-.069
sad	.687	-.337
angry at self	.686	-.044
afraid	.676	-.075

Table 24—continued

Item	Factor	
	I	II
shaky	.674	.110
dissatisfied with self	.672	-.024
nervous	.672	.004
begrudging	.672	.192
blameworthy	.665	.097
frustrated	.661	-.254
ashamed	.659	.107
jittery	.653	.235
scornful	.651	-.024
remorseful	.639	.174
irritable	.633	-.243
resentful	.625	-.075
enraged	.620	-.120
hostile	.614	.041
loathing	.607	.148
anxious	.590	.077
embarrassed	.585	.148
hateful	.584	-.233
vengeful	.577	.104

Table 24—continued

Item	Factor	
	I	II
melancholic	.574	.220
regretful	.554	.002
disgusted with self	.548	-.020
annoyed	.548	-.057
covetous	.536	.302
inadequate	.511	-.281
envious	.505	-.173
disgusted	.496	-.218
sluggish	.493	.075
guilty	.490	.194
tired	.464	.295
contemptuous	.433	.327
friendly	-.164	.820
joyful	-.170	.819
happy	-.197	.817
enthusiastic	-.114	.808
energetic	-.059	.806
excited	-.054	.795
confident	-.207	.779

Table 24—continued

Item	Factor	
	I	II
lively	.010	.766
proud	-.044	.744
secure	-.247	.730
powerful	.065	.720
self-assured	-.050	.712
inspired	-.187	.711
delighted	-.224	.709
cheerful	-.287	.706
active	-.045	.697
sexually aroused	-.209	.689
rested	-.110	.683
determined	.141	.672
passionate	.042	.665
interested	.107	.663
fine	-.202	.638
healthy	-.207	.610
concentrating	.141	.601
bold	.154	.561
desiring	.175	.543

Table 24—continued

Item	Factor	
	I	II
fearless	.089	.540
strong	-.030	.522
lustful	.105	.518
competent	-.022	.497
daring	.217	.423
alert	.265	.331
attentive	.116	.285

Note. $N = 400$. Loadings of $|.40|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 25 Factor Loadings for Two-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Affective Items-Community Resident Sample

Item	Factor	
	I	II
distressed	.789	-.058
frightened	.775	-.013
alone	.758	-.126
worried	.757	-.061
sad	.756	-.246
suffering	.751	-.057
rejected	.751	-.210
hateful	.743	-.063
scared	.743	-.086
tense	.732	-.042
lonely	.730	-.232
grouchy	.728	-.102
hopeless	.726	.037
angry	.723	-.041
scornful	.717	-.010
begrudging	.701	.171
resentful	.698	-.036
blue	.693	.009
loathing	.685	.167

Table 25—continued

Item	Factor	
	I	II
irritable	.685	-.076
upset	.685	-.070
downhearted	.684	-.014
afraid	.681	-.086
anxious	.679	.018
depressed	.679	-.203
enraged	.676	-.079
jittery	.674	.220
angry at self	.671	-.012
frustrated	.668	-.116
annoyed	.666	.061
nervous	.665	.089
shaky	.647	.120
disgusted	.630	-.028
dissatisfied with self	.626	-.043
blameworthy	.625	.036
remorseful	.617	.076
hostile	.599	.062
ashamed	.594	.007

Table 25—continued

Item	Factor	
	I	II
inadequate	.589	-.188
vengeful	.571	.094
contemptuous	.565	.162
disgusted with self	.544	-.005
envious	.524	.012
covetous	.508	.239
melancholic	.506	.023
guilty	.500	.058
regretful	.481	-.018
embarrassed	.477	.132
tired	.351	.228
sluggish	.349	.044
enthusiastic	-.105	.823
lively	.043	.803
joyful	-.187	.789
inspired	-.124	.773
energetic	.056	.772
self-assured	-.088	.757
delighted	-.138	.742

Table 25—continued

Item	Factor	
	I	II
confident	-.099	.739
happy	-.244	.727
proud	-.128	.702
friendly	-.118	.689
excited	.023	.681
active	.047	.675
cheerful	-.221	.663
secure	-.347	.639
interested	.105	.638
powerful	.034	.630
passionate	.107	.630
sexually aroused	-.018	.627
concentrating	.186	.602
determined	.178	.596
competent	-.116	.571
desiring	.126	.547
strong	.080	.538
rested	-.096	.533
fearless	.111	.532

Table 25—continued

Item	Factor	
	I	II
fine	-.308	.521
alert	.326	.502
healthy	-.258	.498
bold	.223	.494
lustful	.077	.439
attentive	.092	.395
daring	.146	.365

Note. $N = 184$. Loadings of $|.40|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 26 Factor Loadings for Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Affective Items-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Factor		
	I	II	III
lonely	.808	-.163	.095
frightened	.752	.033	.165
dissatisfied with self	.744	-.052	-.018
suffering	.743	-.047	.269
hopeless	.739	-.074	.092
blameworthy	.731	.069	.006
alone	.730	-.211	.076
rejected	.730	-.237	.175
blue	.727	-.146	.151
angry at self	.725	-.074	.053
depressed	.705	-.272	.190
scared	.705	-.063	.135
downhearted	.690	-.093	.147
afraid	.689	-.104	.105
nervous	.678	-.024	.128
worried	.674	-.098	.171
ashamed	.672	.079	.118
distressed	.665	-.120	.228
sad	.659	-.366	.173

Table 26—continued

Item	Factor		
	I	II	III
remorseful	.643	.147	.143
disgusted with self	.630	-.044	-.068
shaky	.629	.082	.251
jittery	.625	.207	.221
tense	.610	-.183	.405
melancholic	.589	.195	.108
embarrassed	.584	.123	.137
regretful	.577	-.021	.066
begrudging	.572	.164	.386
grouchy	.552	-.169	.518
sluggish	.547	.054	-.011
anxious	.543	.052	.235
upset	.541	-.365	.465
guilty	.540	.173	.011
inadequate	.531	-.303	.034
tired	.518	.275	.007
loathing	.506	.123	.370
covetous	.495	.279	.235
frustrated	.494	-.281	.493

Table 26—continued

Item	Factor		
	I	II	III
resentful	.491	-.101	.428
envious	.466	-.194	.175
contemptuous	.393	.308	.213
friendly	-.049	.826	-.210
joyful	-.047	.826	-.229
happy	-.066	.825	-.252
enthusiastic	-.019	.811	-.156
energetic	-.047	.807	.045
excited	.035	.796	-.131
confident	-.180	.787	-.023
lively	-.006	.766	.116
proud	.053	.745	-.154
secure	-.203	.739	-.076
powerful	.006	.718	.223
delighted	-.101	.718	-.250
inspired	-.108	.718	-.144
cheerful	-.152	.718	-.292
self-assured	-.028	.713	.013
active	-.114	.701	.220

Table 26—continued

Item	Factor		
	I	II	III
sexually aroused	-.102	.697	-.213
rested	-.040	.686	-.112
determined	.086	.667	.224
passionate	.086	.662	-.023
interested	.118	.657	.065
fine	-.114	.645	-.175
healthy	-.188	.617	-.024
concentrating	.097	.595	.191
bold	.016	.560	.404
fearless	-.018	.539	.319
desiring	.234	.534	-.042
strong	-.187	.530	.404
lustful	.115	.513	.053
competent	-.128	.501	.289
angry	.472	-.222	.651
enraged	.412	-.145	.598
hostile	.419	.018	.584
hateful	.390	-.257	.543
scornful	.476	-.050	.535

Table 26—continued

Item	Factor		
	I	II	III
irritable	.450	-.269	.527
vengeful	.405	.081	.526
disgusted	.311	-.239	.505
annoyed	.404	-.080	.438
alert	.120	.323	.423
daring	.073	.418	.418
attentive	.007	.281	.301

Note. $N = 400$. Loadings of $|.40|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 27 Factor Loadings for Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Affective Items-Community Resident Sample

Item	Factor		
	I	II	III
scared	.734	-.105	.203
dissatisfied with self	.732	-.048	-.022
hopeless	.731	.021	.183
angry at self	.726	-.023	.079
frightened	.723	-.036	.292
suffering	.711	-.079	.263
lonely	.701	-.252	.224
alone	.700	-.149	.289
depressed	.688	-.218	.147
rejected	.687	-.233	.292
ashamed	.686	.002	-.004
disgusted with self	.677	-.006	-.089
remorseful	.674	.067	.067
afraid	.673	-.102	.184
blameworthy	.671	.026	.086
distressed	.669	-.088	.413
sad	.665	-.272	.340
worried	.658	-.088	.366
guilty	.653	.061	-.130

Table 27—continued

Item	Factor		
	I	II	III
downhearted	.652	-.033	.233
blue	.621	-.014	.309
inadequate	.610	-.200	.102
jittery	.608	.197	.307
begrudging	.603	.144	.368
shaky	.602	.100	.257
loathing	.597	.142	.347
nervous	.595	.066	.303
melancholic	.589	.018	-.012
anxious	.583	-.007	.349
regretful	.580	-.020	-.050
grouchy	.564	-.135	.473
tense	.546	-.077	.520
scornful	.540	-.044	.501
frustrated	.529	-.144	.412
embarrassed	.521	.125	.057
envious	.475	-.005	.223
tired	.475	.232	-.109
disgusted	.472	-.058	.444

Table 27—continued

Item	Factor		
	I	II	III
covetous	.453	.221	.246
contemptuous	.435	.135	.390
sluggish	.434	.043	-.056
enthusiastic	.025	.838	-.199
joyful	-.050	.806	-.235
lively	-.004	.795	.153
inspired	-.059	.780	-.092
energetic	.006	.764	.161
delighted	.010	.760	-.245
self-assured	-.097	.756	.048
happy	-.063	.752	-.333
confident	-.138	.736	.097
proud	-.071	.708	-.084
friendly	.017	.704	-.221
cheerful	-.078	.681	-.264
excited	.007	.676	.084
active	-.056	.664	.246
secure	-.245	.655	-.224
interested	.134	.636	.023

Table 27—continued

Item	Factor		
	I	II	III
sexually aroused	.070	.634	-.115
passionate	.121	.626	.047
powerful	-.030	.622	.167
concentrating	.096	.588	.253
determined	.032	.579	.351
competent	-.185	.567	.135
fine	-.128	.546	-.362
desiring	.167	.546	.000
rested	-.025	.541	-.112
strong	-.091	.523	.366
fearless	-.072	.516	.395
healthy	-.196	.508	-.139
alert	.158	.479	.422
lustful	.100	.437	.011
attentive	.013	.384	.194
angry	.426	-.087	.726
hostile	.330	.023	.647
upset	.450	-.109	.597
hateful	.516	-.102	.597

Table 27—continued

Item	Factor		
	I	II	III
vengeful	.326	.058	.597
enraged	.457	-.116	.563
resentful	.486	-.073	.559
irritable	.472	-.112	.556
bold	-.015	.471	.522
annoyed	.480	.028	.510
daring	-.049	.346	.415

Note. $N = 184$. Loadings of $|.40|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 28 Factor Loadings for Four-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the reduced set of 58 Affective Items-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Factor			
	I	II	III	IV
nervous	.763	.160	.009	.176
scared	.748	.161	-.032	.247
worried	.744	.210	-.071	.175
frightened	.706	.244	.043	.315
lonely	.687	.226	-.146	.406
afraid	.643	.193	-.070	.290
tense	.616	.432	-.191	.148
rejected	.605	.285	-.216	.370
distressed	.591	.328	-.109	.263
blue	.584	.274	-.144	.376
downhearted	.564	.268	-.076	.346
sad	.550	.256	-.369	.328
alone	.543	.195	-.220	.457
shaky	.539	.334	.076	.259
anxious	.533	.289	.060	.154
jittery	.521	.296	.195	.298
suffering	.503	.433	-.042	.426
depressed	.495	.347	-.262	.398
inadequate	.411	.116	-.311	.326

Table 28—continued

Item	Factor			
	I	II	III	IV
angry	.367	.728	-.238	.086
hostile	.156	.728	.009	.218
enraged	.245	.685	-1.73	.133
scornful	.223	.669	-.064	.258
vengeful	.152	.640	.059	.238
hateful	.213	.628	-.277	.159
irritable	.287	.596	-.295	.188
resentful	.185	.592	-.119	.338
grouchy	.430	.592	-.181	.188
frustrated	.420	.572	-.280	.105
disgusted	.200	.550	-.248	.086
loathing	.246	.531	.123	.312
begrudging	.318	.521	.149	.350
upset	.473	.520	-.379	.160
annoyed	.388	.467	-.094	.050
covetous	.158	.428	.282	.414
happy	-.086	-.181	.845	.014
joyful	-.078	-.154	.835	.026
friendly	-.058	-.153	.830	.003

Table 28—continued

Item	Factor			
	I	II	III	IV
cheerful	.369	-.263	.759	-.056
sexually aroused	-.113	.129	.759	-.036
delighted	-.072	-.218	.741	-.033
secure	-.115	-.102	.728	-.161
passionate	.068	.028	.642	.023
desiring	.071	.104	.567	.199
lustful	-.064	.185	.545	.144
dissatisfied with self	.369	.147	-.075	.695
disgusted with self	.211	.121	-.053	.692
blameworthy	.386	.151	.037	.658
angry at self	.400	.175	-.095	.639
guilty	.164	.164	.159	.597
ashamed	.312	.281	.069	.596
regretful	.263	.202	-.043	.535
remorseful	.331	.304	.127	.514
hopeless	.492	.237	-.084	.505
melancholic	.353	.259	.191	.407
embarrassed	.341	.299	.138	.399
contemptuous	.125	.329	.294	.361
envious	.218	.297	-.175	.302

Note. $N = 400$. Loadings of $|.40|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 29 Factor Loadings for Four-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the reduced set of 58 Affective Items-Community Resident Sample

Item	Factor			
	I	II	III	IV
angry	.763	.343	.085	-.141
hostile	.753	.155	.083	-.031
vengeful	.731	.095	.135	.031
hateful	.701	.308	.237	-.144
resentful	.663	.287	.221	-.119
irritable	.641	.326	.170	-.145
enraged	.637	.308	.174	-.149
upset	.636	.383	.110	-.167
scornful	.635	.286	.304	-.064
grouchy	.599	.368	.257	-.148
loathing	.572	.214	.421	.134
contemptuous	.562	.123	.301	.129
begrudging	.554	.285	.385	.130
annoyed	.537	.452	.124	-.023
disgusted	.536	.238	.293	-.117
frustrated	.476	.422	.219	-.170
covetous	.394	.176	.326	.214
worried	.319	.747	.228	-.063
scared	.207	.730	.356	-.071

Table 29—continued

Item	Factor			
	I	II	III	IV
frightened	.283	.728	.331	-.014
lonely	.251	.622	.379	-.246
nervous	.299	.619	.228	.065
distressed	.444	.607	.302	-.070
tense	.504	.600	.118	-.097
sad	.369	.589	.317	-.275
afraid	.224	.586	.376	-.084
downhearted	.259	.564	.366	-.015
anxious	.365	.564	.221	-.003
rejected	.345	.519	.427	-.234
jittery	.389	.498	.280	.198
blue	.378	.493	.317	-.008
shaky	.369	.480	.270	.129
alone	.393	.459	.451	-.158
envious	.256	.376	.286	.004
disgusted with self	.098	.186	.741	.012
guilty	.117	.120	.730	.097
dissatisfied with self	.107	.350	.699	-.031
remorseful	.266	.208	.653	.067

Table 29—continued

Item	Factor			
	I	II	III	IV
regretful	.185	.080	.631	-.027
blameworthy	.234	.276	.630	.037
angry at self	.221	.368	.621	-.016
ashamed	.162	.327	.600	.024
melancholic	.204	.234	.499	.080
inadequate	.202	.357	.480	-.190
hopeless	.378	.448	.455	.065
suffering	.445	.408	.453	-.058
depressed	.323	.412	.442	-.180
embarrassed	.185	.255	.421	.112
joyful	-.092	-.139	-.011	.845
delighted	-.078	-.064	-.012	.829
happy	-.143	-.171	-.014	.811
friendly	-.138	.051	-.052	.742
cheerful	-.150	-.103	-.055	.725
sexually aroused	-.025	.063	-.019	.671
secure	-.184	-.273	-.086	.608
passionate	.062	.051	.104	.562
desiring	.108	-.012	.176	.556
lustful	.078	.048	.040	.455

Note. $N = 184$. Loadings of $|\geq .40|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 30 Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Experience and Jealousy-Related Goals

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Jealousy Experience											
1. Suspicion of Partner	-	.61**	.32**	.11	.02	.09	-.04	.14	.29**	.31**	.30**
2. Worry over Rival	.44**	-	.45**	.24**	.23**	.02	.09	.13	.38**	.19**	.22**
3. Anger	.21**	.28**	-	.64**	.50**	-.18*	.13	.20**	.37**	.21**	.39**
4. Fear	.20**	.35**	.54**	-	.64**	-.15	.27**	.24**	.24**	.03	.13
5. Guilt	.27**	.22**	.51**	.65**	-	.01	.17*	.17*	.25**	.05	.14
6. Joy/Sexual Arousal	.11*	-.02	-.27**	-.13**	-.03	-	-.05	.12	-.02	.08	.23**
Jealousy-Related Goals											
7. Relat. Maint.	.06	.25**	.25**	.41**	.31**	-.14**	-	.27**	.29**	.15*	-.06
8. SE Preserv.	.01	.09	.17**	.14**	.15**	.06	.35**	-	.23**	.31**	.30**
9. Red. Uncertain. Rival	.20**	.31**	.32**	.34**	.16**	-.06	.45**	.38**	-	.46**	.44**
10. Relat. Re-assess.	.23**	.17**	.20**	.15**	.13**	.05	.25**	.46**	.49**	-	.42**
11. Equity Restor. Retal.	.37**	.17**	.29**	.19**	.23**	.15**	.05	.29**	.33**	.40**	-

Table 30—continued

Note. Undergraduate data ($N = 400$) reported below the diagonal and community resident data ($N = 184$) reported above the diagonal. Relat. Maint. = Relationship Maintenance; SE Preserv. = Self-Esteem Preservation; Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Relat. Re-assess. = Relationship Re-assessment; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 31 Factor Loadings for Five-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Jealousy-related Goals-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Factor				
	I	II	III	IV	V
holding onto my relationship	.882	.099	.068	.063	.062
keeping the relationship going	.839	.138	.079	-.018	-.037
knowing where I stand with my partner	.683	.297	.242	.006	.167
preserving the relationship	.675	.143	.183	.000	.067
determining what my partner has in mind for our relationship	.584	.289	.336	-.060	.224
reducing uncertainty about the relationship's future	.531	.221	.195	-.072	.192
finding out how serious the rival relationship is	.268	.746	.137	.161	.215
finding out how enduring the rival relationship is	.237	.726	.143	.216	.241
determining how much of a threat the rival is	.379	.609	.117	.149	.100
feeling good about myself despite the situation	.141	.091	.714	.083	.188
maintaining self-esteem	.243	.070	.651	.128	.097
keeping my pride	.180	.183	.612	.166	.226
hurting my partner back	-.138	.080	.021	.722	.093
making my partner feel bad	.022	.103	.126	.706	.152

Table 31—continued

Item	Factor				
	I	II	III	IV	V
showing my partner what it's like to feel negative emotion	.079	.157	.165	.631	.170
deciding if I should stay in the relationship	.023	.218	.129	.291	.726
weighing the costs and benefits of staying in the relationship	.112	.232	.266	.221	.695
determining how much I really care about the relationship	.298	.101	.304	.105	.533

Note. $N = 400$. Loadings of $|.40|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 32 Factor Loadings for Six-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Jealousy-related Goals-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
holding onto my relationship	.884	.110	.070	.067	.058	-.054
keeping the relationship going	.841	.148	.082	-.012	-.045	-.066
preserving the relationship	.678	.149	.163	-.010	.084	.262
knowing where I stand with my partner	.677	.312	.224	-.007	.183	.236
determining what my partner has in mind for our relationship	.587	.301	.348	-.053	.210	-.130
reducing uncertainty about the relationship's future	.532	.229	.205	-.067	.181	-.103
finding out how serious the rival relationship is	.259	.749	.142	.165	.206	-.055
finding out how enduring the rival relationship is	.229	.726	.148	.221	.231	-.042
determining how much of a threat the rival is	.362	.632	.097	.140	.108	.171
maintaining self-esteem	.222	.067	.707	.121	.086	.344
feeling good about myself despite the situation	.147	.097	.701	.095	.184	-.082
keeping my pride	.183	.187	.603	.175	.224	-.069
hurting my partner back	-.140	.079	.011	.718	.098	.073

Table 32—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
making my partner feel bad	.023	.105	.119	.704	.152	.007
showing my partner what it's like to feel negative emotion	.083	.158	.166	.646	.157	-.071
deciding if I should stay in the relationship	.012	.213	.105	.281	.791	.124
weighing the costs and benefits of staying in the relationship	.113	.240	.281	.229	.662	-.076
determining how much I really care about the relationship	.297	.112	.311	.109	.517	-.039

Note. $N = 400$. Loadings of $|.40|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 33 Factor Loadings for Five-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Jealousy-related Goals-Community Resident Sample

Item	Factor				
	I	II	III	IV	V
keeping the relationship going	.820	.095	.077	-.018	.020
holding onto my relationship	.807	.071	.082	-.048	.126
preserving the relationship	.609	.292	.008	-.197	.329
determining what my partner has in mind for our relationship	.522	.342	.469	.033	.099
finding out how enduring the rival relationship is	.091	.709	.201	.276	.020
determining how much of a threat the rival is	.118	.652	.065	.142	.188
finding out how serious the rival relationship is	.261	.650	.249	.234	-.100
knowing where I stand with my partner	.421	.435	.107	-.098	.428
reducing uncertainty about the relationship's future	.256	.426	.315	.097	.295
weighing the costs and benefits of staying in the relationship	-.007	.306	.750	.208	.116
determining how much I really care about the relationship	.208	.081	.744	.080	.080
deciding if I should stay in the relationship	-.112	.384	.605	.273	.100

Table 33—continued

Item	Factor				
	I	II	III	IV	V
feeling good about myself despite					
the situation	.193	-.046	.427	.018	.380
making my partner feel bad	-.074	.208	.045	.803	.059
hurting my partner back	-.092	.083	.141	.742	.006
showing my partner what it's like to					
feel negative emotion	.019	.295	.247	.626	.239
maintaining self-esteem	.173	.107	.014	.060	.872
keeping my pride	.035	.077	.307	.226	.632

Note. $N = 184$. Loadings of $|.40|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 34 Factor Loadings for Six-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the Jealousy-related Goals-Community Resident Sample

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
holding onto my relationship	.822	.048	.049	.097	-.029	.061
keeping the relationship going	.806	.031	.104	.005	-.013	.111
preserving the relationship	.657	.035	.211	.307	-.176	-.147
knowing where I stand with my partner	.508	.188	.305	.421	-.077	-.294
determining what my partner has in mind for our relationship	.507	.362	.408	.137	.007	.313
weighing the costs and benefits of staying in the relationship	.049	.797	.233	.137	.207	.042
deciding if I should stay in the relationship	-.048	.768	.261	.104	.281	-.173
determining how much I really care about the relationship	.214	.644	.113	.117	.068	.301
finding out how enduring the rival relationship is	.060	.169	.797	.077	.238	.055
finding out how serious the rival relationship is	.236	.209	.729	-.056	.201	.123
determining how much of a threat the rival is	.167	.155	.558	.201	.150	-.253
reducing uncertainty about the relationship's future	.289	.315	.382	.313	.099	-.018

Table 34—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
maintaining self-esteem	.198	-.014	.069	.857	.065	-.035
keeping my pride	.046	.248	.074	.655	.219	.117
feeling good about myself despite						
the situation	.152	.290	.031	.448	-.021	.440
making my partner feel bad	-.072	.079	.201	.066	.800	-.044
hurting my partner back	-.087	.163	.077	.010	.749	.006
showing my partner what it's like						
to feel negative emotion	.018	.232	.305	.266	.613	.065

Note. $N = 184$. Loadings of $|.40|$ and greater are highlighted.

Table 35 Fit Indices for Three-Factor CRJ Model

Sample	<i>N</i>	<i>df</i>	χ^2	SRMR	RMSEA	CFI	TLI / NNFI
Undergraduate	400	74	1009.02	.093	.178	.74	.68
Community Resident	184	74	353.35	.076	.144	.83	.80

Note. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy; SRMR = standardized root mean-square residual; RMSEA = root mean-square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index; NNFI = non-normed fit index.

Table 36 Factor Loadings for Scale-Level Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ-Undergraduate Sample

Scale	Factor		
	I	II	III
RT	.786	.394	.114
RC	.728	.045	.273
VB	.660	.277	.178
VC	.609	.266	-.021
S/R	.605	.305	.558
AD	.186	.907	.199
DC	.484	.632	.323
MA	.517	.532	.294
A/D	.195	.470	.042
NAE	.089	.528	.676
IC	-.051	.130	.626
SoP	.459	.025	.618
CR	.230	.055	.579
RD	.508	.299	.526

Note. $N = 400$. Loadings of $|\geq .40|$ and greater are highlighted. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy; RT = Relationship Threats; RC = Rival Contact; VB = Violent Behavior; VC = Violent Communication; S/R = Surveillance/Restriction; AD = Active Distancing; DC = Distributive Communication; MA = Manipulation Attempts; A/D = Avoidance/Denial; NAE = Negative Affect Expression; IC = Integrative Communication; SoP = Signs of Possession; CR = Compensatory Restoration; RD = Rival Derogation.

Table 37 Factor Loadings for Scale-Level Three-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ-Community Resident Sample

Scale	Factor		
	I	II	III
DC	.824	.218	.342
RT	.779	.386	.112
MA	.744	.214	.305
VB	.697	.298	.052
AD	.670	.188	.346
S/R	.648	.431	.336
RD	.610	.497	.277
VC	.590	.113	-.079
A/D	.388	-.019	.274
SoP	.138	.729	.385
RC	.341	.714	.091
CR	.033	.107	.626
NAE	.570	.186	.608
IC	.136	.216	.483

Note. $N = 184$. Loadings of $|\geq .40|$ and greater are highlighted. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy; DC = Distributive Communication; RT = Relationship Threats; MA = Manipulation Attempts; VB = Violent Behavior; AD = Active Distancing; S/R = Surveillance/Restriction; RD = Rival Derogation; VC = Violent Communication; A/D = Avoidance/Denial; SoP = Signs of Possession; RC = Rival Contact; CR = Compensatory Restoration; NAE = Negative Affect Expression; IC = Integrative Communication.

Table 38 Factor Loadings for Item-Level Five-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Factor				
	I	II	III	IV	V
tried to prevent my partner from seeing the rival	.720	.127	.227	.183	.247
“checked up” on my partner more than usual	.700	.205	.141	.174	.298
said mean things about the rival	.695	.246	.115	.248	-.026
made negative comments about the rival	.691	.194	.092	.261	.006
tried to convince my partner that the rival is not a nice person	.677	.162	.191	.159	.151
restricted my partner’s access to the rival	.674	.127	.348	.141	.112
made sure rivals know my partner is “taken”	.668	.070	.057	.170	.227
kept closer tabs on my partner	.643	.267	.127	.163	.141
let rivals know that my partner and I are in a close relationship	.641	-.045	.135	.096	.204
told the rival not to see my partner anymore	.620	-.039	.410	.025	.083
confronted the rival	.609	-.008	.388	-.014	.069
showed my partner extra affection when rivals were around	.587	.106	-.101	.181	.381
called the rival bad names	.576	.232	.202	.320	-.038
threatened to terminate the relationship if s/he saw the rival anymore	.576	.211	.486	.102	-.028
forced my partner to choose between me and the rival	.567	.172	.397	.076	.106
talked to the rival	.567	-.026	.375	.032	.090
tricked my partner to test her/his loyalty	.538	.320	.362	-.006	.130
tried to determine my partner’s whereabouts	.525	.257	.022	.241	.250
repeatedly called my partner	.514	.151	.197	.345	.314
spied on or followed my partner	.506	.207	.454	.039	.120

Table 38—continued

Item	Factor				
	I	II	III	IV	V
looked through my partner's belongings for evidence of a rival relationship	.502	.348	.250	.149	.070
tried to get revenge on my partner	.485	.357	.437	-.085	.003
yelled or cursed at my partner	.468	.337	.424	.287	-.197
slammed doors	.429	.228	.390	.195	.021
tried to be more attractive or appealing than the rival	.419	.315	-.096	.118	.388
confronted my partner in an accusatory manner	.411	.288	.367	.301	.051
brought up the rival's name to see how my partner reacted	.409	.365	-.045	.211	.085
gave my partner the "silent treatment"	.130	.732	.118	.153	.037
ignored my partner	.176	.690	.193	.147	-.013
decreased affection toward my partner	.222	.680	.064	.139	-.146
got quiet and didn't say much	-.054	.643	-.049	.117	.312
became silent	-.035	.622	.016	.084	.281
gave my partner cold or dirty looks	.384	.601	.255	.230	-.080
stopped calling or initiating communication with my partner	.190	.587	.318	-.075	-.011
physically pulled away from my partner	.214	.581	.094	.215	-.004
tried to make my partner feel jealous too	.396	.510	.190	-.076	.086
quarreled or argued with my partner	.360	.504	.134	.446	-.146
made hurtful or mean comments to my partner	.370	.470	.369	.229	-.162
acted rude toward my partner	.390	.459	.361	.169	-.172
tried to make my partner feel guilty	.354	.446	.025	.330	-.022
flirted with others in front of my partner	.375	.430	.225	-.062	-.089

Table 38—continued

Item	Factor				
	I	II	III	IV	V
acted like I didn't care	-.033	.376	.191	-.295	.199
threatened to harm my partner	.035	.080	.835	-.021	.144
became physically violent	.147	.037	.805	-.032	.108
used physical force with my partner	.132	.117	.786	.070	.097
pushed, shoved or hit my partner	.164	.157	.754	.093	.009
hit or threw objects	.280	.026	.663	.026	.089
threatened to be unfaithful	.342	.193	.592	-.076	-.029
told my partner that I will start dating other people too	.334	.238	.589	-.090	.030
told my partner that I wanted to break up	.339	.340	.519	.058	-.134
shared my jealous feelings with my partner	.081	.022	.043	.752	.075
explained my feelings to my partner	.079	.000	-.020	.739	.107
discussed bothersome issues with my partner	.236	.067	.010	.684	.113
vented my frustration when with my partner	.284	.171	.156	.650	-.015
appeared hurt in front of my partner	.187	.337	.080	.646	.098
let my partner see how upset I was	.149	.413	.014	.636	.067
tried to talk to my partner and reach an understanding	.083	-.061	-.092	.599	.224
wore displeasure on my face for my partner to see	.355	.406	.077	.474	.034
cried or sulked in front of my partner	.258	.321	.254	.455	.111
appeared sad and depressed	.046	.281	-.022	.404	.258
calmly questioned my partner	.059	.020	-.070	.394	.317
tried to be the "best" partner possible	.221	-.028	-.138	.214	.685
told my partner how much I care for her/him	.245	-.031	-.042	.378	.655

Table 38—continued

Item	Factor				
	I	II	III	IV	V
spent more time with my partner than usual	.446	.018	-.019	.192	.642
tried to prove to my partner I love her/him	.192	.076	.004	.277	.573
increased affection toward my partner	.123	-.141	.233	-.002	.556
told my partner how much I need her/him	.128	.050	.169	.369	.520
bought gifts or did special things for my partner	.145	.032	.350	-.001	.516
pretended nothing was wrong	-.083	.310	.211	-.234	.429
denied feeling jealous	-.004	.337	.179	-.273	.393

Note. $N = 400$. Loadings of $|\geq .30|$ and greater are highlighted. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy.

Table 39 Factor Loadings for Item-Level Six-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
tried to prevent my partner from seeing the rival	.673	.257	.233	.340	.046	-.057
let rivals know that my partner and I are in a close relationship	.663	.002	.140	.160	.152	.022
“checked up” on my partner more than usual	.663	.292	.143	.353	.067	.037
made sure rivals know my partner is “taken”	.662	.149	.061	.230	.150	.011
confronted the rival	.651	-.012	.394	-.033	.103	.094
tried to convince my partner that the rival is not a nice person	.648	.257	.195	.189	.088	.000
restricted my partner’s access to the rival	.639	.239	.354	.169	.054	-.039
told the rival not to see my partner anymore	.639	.003	.418	.037	.085	.017
said mean things about the rival	.635	.416	.123	.081	.095	-.110
made negative comments about the rival	.634	.370	.101	.114	.113	-.130
talked to the rival	.610	-.024	.381	-.012	.154	.086
kept closer tabs on my partner	.608	.349	.128	.181	.072	.041

Table 39—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
showed my partner extra affection						
when rivals were around	.575	.160	-.100	.395	.134	.057
forced my partner to choose between						
me and the rival	.552	.218	.399	.104	.049	.068
threatened to terminate the relationship						
if s/he saw the rival anymore	.541	.300	.490	.010	.031	.002
tricked my partner to test her/his						
loyalty	.528	.298	.357	.088	-.017	.203
tried to determine my partner's						
whereabouts	.507	.311	.020	.252	.193	.101
called the rival bad names	.496	.442	.211	.123	.108	-.180
spied on or followed my partner	.478	.245	.454	.141	-.025	.077
tried to get revenge on my partner	.474	.318	.431	-.045	-.092	.211
repeatedly called my partner	.463	.294	.200	.417	.198	-.048
looked through partner's belongings						
for evidence of a rival relationship	.443	.437	.249	.156	-.008	.027
tried to be more attractive or appealing						
than the rival	.405	.291	-.104	.371	.068	.215
quarreled or argued with my partner	.265	.701	.135	.012	.200	-.092
gave my partner the "silent treatment"	.077	.697	.099	.053	.011	.295
gave my partner cold or dirty looks	.315	.676	.248	-.008	.059	.111

Table 39—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
decreased affection toward my partner	.182	.666	.049	-.158	.050	.241
ignored my partner	.133	.657	.176	-.020	.044	.288
made hurtful or mean comments to my partner	.267	.633	.371	.011	-.038	-.082
let my partner see how upset I was	.063	.621	.013	.228	.396	-.098
wore displeasure on my face for my partner to see	.276	.586	.078	.170	.261	-.068
physically pulled away from my partner	.186	.573	.081	-.029	.154	.240
appeared hurt in front of my partner	.097	.570	.081	.280	.395	-.148
acted rude toward my partner	.317	.566	.360	-.073	-.009	.004
yelled or cursed at my partner	.360	.564	.434	.008	.011	-.206
tried to make my partner feel guilty	.291	.564	.023	.068	.164	.011
cried or sulked in front of my partner	.155	.529	.258	.314	.176	-.138
stopped calling or initiating communication with my partner	.172	.483	.301	-.072	-.105	.345
became silent	-.036	.472	-.010	.185	.074	.460
brought up the rival's name to see how my partner reacted	.374	.422	-.048	.115	.118	.084
tried to make my partner feel jealous too	.388	.416	.177	.010	-.080	.333

Table 39—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
flirted with others in front of my partner	.356	.392	.218	-.125	-.088	.202
confronted my partner in an accusatory manner	.375	.388	.367	.087	.221	.036
appeared sad and depressed	-.006	.373	-.028	.352	.246	.022
threatened to harm my partner	.039	.033	.828	.102	.004	.164
became physically violent	.147	.016	.801	.079	-.011	.111
used physical force with my partner	.111	.137	.783	.113	.028	.076
pushed, shoved or hit my partner	.129	.209	.752	.054	.016	.029
hit or threw objects	.265	.062	.664	.105	-.002	.022
threatened to be unfaithful	.339	.170	.589	-.071	-.058	.139
told my partner that I will start dating other people too	.320	.207	.584	.006	-.105	.161
told my partner that I wanted to break up	.294	.393	.518	-.091	-.038	.054
slammed doors	.383	.333	.392	.090	.083	-.020
spent more time with my partner than usual	.431	.052	-.022	.683	.115	.082
told my partner how much I care for her/him	.244	.020	-.044	.670	.344	.069

Table 39—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
tried to prove to my partner I love her/him	.159	.126	.000	.653	.156	.056
told my partner how much I need her/him	.082	.144	.169	.629	.226	-.008
tried to be the “best” partner possible	.247	-.065	-.144	.628	.255	.186
increased affection toward my partner	.117	-.166	.233	.593	-.046	.069
bought gifts or did special things for my partner	.130	-.009	.346	.542	-.062	.150
tried to talk to my partner and reach an understanding	.126	.017	-.088	.127	.778	.025
explained my feelings to my partner	.064	.206	-.011	.150	.724	-.162
discussed bothersome issues with my partner	.234	.244	.017	.113	.711	-.086
shared my jealous feelings with my partner	.050	.257	.052	.159	.680	-.204
calmly questioned my partner	.124	-.016	-.075	.156	.613	.216
vented my frustration when with my partner	.224	.420	.165	.115	.497	-.203
pretended nothing was wrong	-.015	.016	.186	.195	-.044	.598
acted like I didn’t care	.036	.086	.167	-.051	-.091	.587
denied feeling jealous	.053	.057	.154	.184	-.117	.565

Table 39—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
got quiet and didn't say much	-.048	.482	-.076	.198	.124	.493

Note. $N = 400$. Loadings of $|\geq .30|$ and greater are highlighted. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy.

Table 40 Factor Loadings for Item-Level Six-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ-Community Resident Sample

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
“checked up” on my partner more than usual	.858	.077	.132	.293	.054	.078
looked through my partner’s belongings for evidence of a rival relationship	.823	.120	.031	.066	.009	.088
tried to determine my partner’s whereabouts	.762	.125	.081	.229	.135	.110
kept closer tabs on my partner	.742	-.026	.152	.220	.104	.112
spied on or followed my partner	.711	.196	.158	.170	.029	-.004
tried to prevent my partner from seeing the rival	.684	.238	.088	.382	.188	.119
repeatedly called my partner	.675	.238	.102	.185	.215	.080
forced my partner to choose between me and the rival	.659	.263	.044	.300	.029	.163
tried to make my partner feel guilty	.655	.083	.252	.061	.064	.221
called the rival bad names	.625	.231	.129	.281	-.021	.345
brought up the rival’s name to see how my partner reacted	.598	.144	.120	.028	.071	.220
confronted my partner in an accusatory manner	.598	.261	.204	.180	.009	.376
made hurtful or mean comments to my partner	.586	.209	.447	.099	-.087	.291

Table 40—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
made negative comments about the rival	.573	.197	.156	.419	-.058	.306
said mean things about the rival	.572	.193	.157	.390	-.035	.372
threatened to terminate the relationship if s/he saw the rival anymore	.571	.346	.105	.356	-.064	.191
quarreled or argued with my partner	.568	.051	.451	.142	.003	.336
slammed doors	.552	.274	.267	.190	.017	.164
restricted my partner's access to the rival	.547	.201	.082	.415	.073	.105
yelled or cursed at my partner	.532	.389	.344	.177	-.056	.303
cried or sulked in front of my partner	.520	.219	.180	.111	.156	.377
appeared hurt in front of my partner	.509	.054	.352	.112	.155	.483
tried to be more attractive or appealing than the rival	.495	.090	.134	.030	.385	.097
tricked my partner to test her/his loyalty	.490	.354	.071	.044	.185	.019
acted rude toward my partner	.468	.403	.418	.153	-.049	.260
gave my partner cold or dirty looks	.459	.177	.445	.260	.101	.268
tried to make my partner feel jealous too	.456	.363	.239	.058	.235	.020
told my partner that I wanted to break up	.419	.338	.252	.186	-.160	.225
appeared sad and depressed	.378	-.015	.248	-.033	.255	.158
used physical force with my partner	.130	.850	.082	-.059	-.005	.112
pushed, shoved or hit my partner	.156	.832	.123	-.029	-.008	.061
became physically violent	.134	.801	-.024	.069	.014	.103

Table 40—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
hit or threw objects	.161	.665	.101	.231	-.033	.114
threatened to harm my partner	.163	.622	.006	.195	.003	-.036
threatened to be unfaithful	.351	.605	.165	.190	.068	-.042
tried to get revenge on my partner	.507	.515	.148	.148	-.018	.052
told my partner that I will start dating other people too	.446	.481	.128	.087	.050	-.040
flirted with others in front of my partner	.353	.390	.142	.016	.143	.009
became silent	.113	.067	.737	-.036	.231	-.088
got quiet and didn't say much	.110	.008	.731	-.051	.176	-.048
gave my partner the "silent treatment"	.350	-.021	.726	.134	.029	.049
ignored my partner	.397	.123	.595	.213	-.037	.042
decreased affection toward my partner	.454	.159	.561	.192	-.091	.191
physically pulled away from my partner	.402	.102	.543	.155	-.071	.221
stopped calling or initiating communication with my partner	.420	.270	.531	.111	-.046	.057
acted like I didn't care	-.005	.181	.428	.093	.158	-.116
talked to the rival	.175	.097	.145	.810	-.016	.083
let rivals know that my partner and I are in a close relationship	.196	.019	.078	.795	.143	.173
confronted the rival	.335	.228	.081	.743	.027	.056

Table 40—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
told the rival not to see my partner anymore	.329	.149	.110	.700	.026	.091
made sure rivals know my partner is “taken”	.363	.065	.035	.678	.193	.093
tried to convince my partner that the rival is not a nice person	.394	.296	.120	.407	.018	.290
tried to be the best partner possible	.006	-.139	.025	.026	.789	.177
spent more time with my partner than usual	.161	-.063	.079	.072	.771	.049
told my partner how much I care for her/him	.071	-.065	.047	.084	.684	.267
bought gifts of did special things for my partner	.042	.066	.125	-.038	.665	-.037
increased affection toward my partner	-.101	.134	-.123	-.071	.652	.076
tried to prove to my partner I love her/him	.153	-.004	.041	.001	.592	.104
told my partner how much I need her/him	.102	.033	.128	.044	.582	.289
showed my partner extra affection when rivals were around	.164	.008	.092	.372	.518	.104
pretended nothing was wrong	-.064	.083	.270	.020	.395	-.261
calmly questioned my partner	.018	.017	-.083	.105	.306	.277
denied feeling jealous	-.026	.118	.249	.056	.298	-.187
explained my feelings to my partner	.132	.006	-.084	.105	.173	.733

Table 40—continued

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
shared my jealous feelings with my partner	.186	.159	-.012	.097	.075	.651
discussed bothersome issues with my partner	.200	.018	-.076	.108	.242	.612
tried to talk to my partner and reach an understanding	.118	.007	-.120	.071	.388	.598
let my partner see how upset I was	.428	.035	.295	.059	.131	.561
vented my frustration when with my partner	.316	.083	.348	.133	.080	.536
wore displeasure on my face for my partner to see	.389	.117	.313	.100	.091	.428

Note. $N = 184$. Loadings of $|.30|$ and greater are highlighted. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy.

Table 41 Bivariate Correlations between Prescribed CRJ Scales

	DC	VC	MA	S/R	RC	VB	RD	RT	SoP	NAE	AD	A/D	IC	CR
DC	-	.43**	.72**	.74**	.49**	.66**	.73**	.75**	.38**	.76**	.77**	.40**	.35**	.20**
VC	.47**	-	.47**	.36**	.22**	.60**	.39**	.54**	.15*	.28**	.27**	.23**	.11	.05
MA	.67**	.39**	-	.73**	.40**	.60**	.64**	.76**	.36**	.59**	.60**	.37**	.33**	.30**
S/R	.65**	.42**	.68**	-	.54**	.56**	.73**	.74**	.53**	.65**	.62**	.31**	.32**	.28**
RC	.44**	.44**	.48**	.60**	-	.46**	.57**	.57**	.63**	.38**	.44**	.18*	.21**	.13
VB	.60**	.59**	.50**	.53**	.53**	-	.57**	.61**	.37**	.51**	.51**	.24**	.17*	.14
RD	.68**	.31**	.60**	.69**	.53**	.52**	-	.68**	.54**	.65**	.61**	.23**	.40**	.17*
RT	.67**	.61**	.66**	.69**	.65**	.62**	.56**	-	.41**	.57**	.60**	.30**	.28**	.14
SoP	.41**	.20**	.47**	.64**	.56**	.39**	.62**	.39**	-	.40**	.40**	.20**	.33**	.37**
NAE	.66**	.24**	.49**	.59**	.25**	.37**	.52**	.38**	.40**	-	.66**	.31**	.47**	.40**
AD	.72**	.30**	.64**	.51**	.26**	.37**	.49**	.50**	.29**	.60**	-	.56**	.19*	.18*
A/D	.31**	.28**	.43**	.28**	.17**	.24**	.20**	.33**	.16**	.23**	.57**	-	.02	.28**
IC	.27**	.03	.18**	.31**	.17**	.15**	.32**	.11*	.31**	.59**	.21**	.03	-	.38**

Table 41—continued

	DC	VC	MA	S/R	RC	VB	RD	RT	SoP	NAE	AD	A/D	IC	CR
CR	.24**	.19**	.31**	.53**	.28**	.28**	.39**	.25**	.52**	.44**	.17**	.27**	.37**	-

Note. Undergraduate data ($N = 400$) reported below the diagonal and community resident data ($N = 184$) reported above the diagonal. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy; DC = Distributive Communication; VC = Violent Communication; MA = Manipulation Attempts; S/R = Surveillance/Restriction; RC = Rival Contact; VB = Violent Behavior; RD = Rival Derogation; RT = Relationship Threats; SoP = Signs of Possession; NAE = Negative Affect Expression; AD = Active Distancing; A/D = Avoidance/Denial; IC = Integrative Communication; CR = Compensatory Restoration.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 42 Bivariate Correlations between Derived Jealousy Expression Measures (CRJ items)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Surveillance & Competition	-	.64**	.48**	.55**	.52**	.18*
2. Rival Communication	.72**	-	.32**	.36**	.34**	.16*
3. Violence & Threats	.48**	.47**	-	.32**	.20**	.04
4. Withdrawal	.46**	.24**	.28**	-	.30**	.12
5. Affective Integrative Communication	.43**	.28**	.09	.29**	-	.36**
6. Compensatory Restoration	.46**	.37**	.20**	.15**	.36**	-

Note. Undergraduate data ($N = 400$) is below the diagonal and community resident data ($N = 184$) is above the diagonal. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 43 Loadings for Item-Level Eight-Component Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ Interactive Responses-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Component							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
tried to talk to my partner and reach an understanding	.836	.038	-.066	.007	.079	-.020	.024	-.194
explained my feelings to my partner	.828	.057	-.044	.043	-.088	.122	-.070	.206
discussed bothersome issues with my partner	.781	.260	.000	.045	.114	.086	-.016	.049
shared my jealous feelings with my partner	.743	.121	.054	-.048	-.018	.206	-.140	.196
calmly questioned my partner	.680	.013	-.006	.035	.118	.066	.143	-.400
vented my frustration when with my partner	.626	.265	.094	.094	.190	.013	-.049	.413
appeared hurt in front of my partner	.465	.168	.170	-.011	.280	.455	-.223	.271
made negative comments about the rival	.171	.882	.094	.083	.180	.071	.010	.074
said mean things about the rival	.153	.865	.078	.146	.191	.086	.035	.131

Table 43—continued

Item	Component							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
called the rival bad names	.173	.753	.140	.140	.090	.136	.000	.299
tried to convince my partner that the rival is not a nice person	.148	.708	.111	.359	.111	.117	.012	-.056
used physical force with my partner	.036	.118	.864	.160	.099	.052	.109	.092
threatened to harm my partner	-.008	.017	.841	.259	-.014	.070	.165	.037
became physically violent	-.012	.130	.833	.250	.024	-.031	.126	-.003
pushed, shoved or hit my partner	.023	.154	.829	.161	.201	-.006	.067	.155
told my partner that I wanted to break up	.068	.111	.254	.717	.157	-.021	.074	.375
threatened to terminate the relationship if s/he saw the rival anymore	.111	.383	.280	.688	.168	.031	-.035	.088

Table 43—continued

Item	Component							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
told my partner that I will start dating other people too	-.039	.139	.424	.651	.139	-.000	.105	.060
stopped calling or initiating communication with my partner	-.073	.008	.092	.606	.374	.244	.228	.148
forced my partner to choose between me and the rival	.107	.425	.241	.590	.023	.181	.015	-.039
threatened to be unfaithful	-.072	.220	.455	.574	.136	.060	.025	-.051
confronted my partner in an accusatory manner	.331	.297	.265	.400	.280	.056	.066	.176
decreased affection toward my partner	.051	.126	.025	.153	.786	.204	.117	.162
physically pulled away from my partner	.159	.114	.088	.162	.775	.276	.062	-.078
gave my partner cold or dirty looks	.098	.359	.196	.214	.649	.212	.064	.220
acted rude toward my partner	.031	.365	.264	.254	.538	.039	.039	.320

Table 43—continued

Item	Component							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
wore displeasure on my face for my partner to see	.324	.338	.126	.107	.432	.379	-.177	.082
became silent	.005	.074	-.040	.089	.139	.780	.342	.023
got quiet and didn't say much	.072	.064	-.049	.004	.203	.751	.356	-.025
appeared sad and depressed	.254	.072	.066	.000	.109	.645	-.172	-.069
gave my partner the "silent treatment"	.010	.108	-.014	.286	.338	.582	.213	.340
let my partner see how upset I was	.470	.125	.046	-.007	.274	.478	-.122	.372
cried or sulked in front of my partner	.285	.237	.290	.174	.035	.464	-.149	.357
ignored my partner	.046	.148	.015	.327	.346	.433	.277	.386
pretended nothing was wrong	-.007	.024	.214	-.038	-.035	.133	.812	.000

Table 43—continued

Item	Component							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
acted like I didn't care	-.069	-.029	.088	.086	.210	-.061	.773	.041
denied feeling jealous	-.065	.026	.115	.144	-.014	.182	.697	-.062
made hurtful or mean comments to my partner	.044	.364	.222	.298	.344	.110	.040	.559
yelled or cursed at my partner	.108	.475	.289	.298	.280	.014	-.027	.529
quarreled or argued with my partner	.271	.300	.041	.207	.409	.262	-.047	.491

Note. $N = 400$. Loadings of $|\geq .30|$ and greater are highlighted. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy.

Table 44 Loadings for Item-Level Five-Component Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ General Behavioral Responses-Undergraduate Sample

Item	Component				
	I	II	III	IV	V
kept closer tabs on my partner	.731	.150	.258	.250	.018
“checked up” on my partner more than usual	.713	.332	.277	.241	.061
looked through partner’s belongings for evidence of a rival relationship	.682	.061	.117	.294	.196
tried to prevent my partner from seeing the rival	.681	.300	.347	.183	.189
restricted my partner’s access to the rival	.676	.122	.396	.120	.252
tried to determine my partner’s whereabouts	.661	.258	.121	.319	-.071
spied on or followed my partner	.627	.043	.234	.159	.399
repeatedly called my partner	.600	.427	.141	.201	.151
tricked my partner to test his/her loyalty	.469	.063	.273	.388	.393
told my partner how much I care for her/him	.160	.797	.142	.048	-.072
tried to be the “best” partner possible	.139	.757	.118	.016	-.156
spent more time with my partner than usual	.304	.747	.269	.077	-.058
tried to prove to my partner I love her/him	.166	.720	-.051	.184	.084
told my partner how much I need her/him	.064	.708	.057	.048	.261
increased affection toward my partner	.013	.630	.033	-.108	.414

Table 44—continued

Item	Component				
	I	II	III	IV	V
bought gifts or did special things for my partner	.061	.587	.064	-.023	.508
let rivals know that my partner and I are in a close relationship	.201	.239	.793	.135	.022
talked to the rival	.197	.043	.766	.088	.341
confronted the rival	.269	.010	.738	.079	.364
told the rival not to see my partner anymore	.329	.046	.662	.092	.395
made sure rivals know my partner is “taken”	.346	.278	.632	.253	-.112
showed my partner extra affection when rivals were around	.245	.484	.489	.345	-.218
flirted with other in front of my partner	.093	-.078	.119	.778	.271
tried to make my partner feel jealous too	.227	.043	.072	.737	.243
tried to make my partner feel guilty	.269	.103	.070	.655	.002
brought up the rival’s name to see how my partner reacted	.273	.147	.147	.610	-.150
Tried to be more attractive or appealing than the rival	.299	.449	.099	.508	-.184
Tried to get revenge on my partner	.329	-.056	.251	.501	.483

Table 44—continued

Item	Component				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Hit or threw objects	.191	.075	.275	.099	.650
Slammed doors	.306	.088	.268	.311	.442

Note. $N = 400$. Loadings of $|\geq .30|$ and greater are highlighted. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy.

Table 45 Loadings for Item-Level Eight-Component Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ Interactive Responses-Community Resident Sample

Item	Component							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
ignored my partner	.753	.233	.015	-.049	.096	.154	.136	-.176
decreased affection toward my partner	.751	.291	.132	.054	.126	.032	.008	.066
gave my partner the “silent treatment”	.744	.106	-.090	-.026	.194	.260	.136	.167
stopped calling or initiating communication with my partner	.739	.090	.170	.016	.092	.072	.333	-.088
physically pulled away from my partner	.691	.307	.098	.079	.129	.090	-.120	.062
made hurtful or mean comments to my partner	.683	.321	.160	.136	.268	-.077	.143	-.009
quarreled or argued with my partner	.678	.322	.021	.216	.295	-.035	.031	-.032
told my partner that I wanted to break up	.627	.193	.264	.195	-.091	-.214	.292	-.112

Table 45—continued

Item	Component							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
yelled or cursed at my partner	.616	.372	.304	.151	.197	-.116	.226	-.096
acted rude toward my partner	.585	.421	.377	.097	.153	.011	.017	.056
gave my partner cold or dirty looks	.505	.419	.183	.157	.310	.174	-.008	.177
made negative comments about the rival	.308	.822	.106	.146	.148	.036	.130	.007
said mean things about the rival	.323	.786	.110	.220	.167	.030	.139	.002
called the rival bad names	.289	.754	.153	.203	.224	.023	.163	.003
tried to convince my partner that the rival is not a nice person	.257	.660	.262	.205	.032	.048	.058	.012
forced my partner to choose between me and the rival	.294	.474	.202	.177	.259	-.049	.431	-.076

Table 45—continued

Item	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
threatened to terminate the relationship if s/he saw the rival anymore	.363	.474	.253	.085	.274	-.146	.429	-.167
confronted my partner in an accusatory manner	.451	.470	.247	.239	.299	-.116	.148	-.045
used physical force with my partner	.134	.128	.892	.069	-.025	.048	.076	.109
pushed, shoved or hit my partner	.179	.124	.875	.004	.061	.072	.024	-.045
became physically violent	.040	.165	.868	.075	.028	.003	.112	.076
threatened to harm my partner	.054	.108	.678	-.055	.198	.045	.223	-.269
tried to talk to my partner and reach an understanding	-.037	.057	-.019	.838	.204	.076	.052	-.204
explained my feelings to my partner	.043	.156	-.007	.802	.117	-.130	.081	.175
discussed bothersome issues with my partner	.079	.224	-.012	.793	-.007	-.013	.062	.045

Table 45—continued

Item	Component							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
shared my jealous feelings with my partner	.185	.241	.188	.672	.035	-.161	-.091	.037
calmly questioned my partner	.008	-.071	-.007	.637	-.025	.214	.015	-.515
vented my frustration when with my partner	.456	.279	.082	.458	.226	.014	-.058	.181
appeared sad and depressed	.192	.099	-.004	-.010	.785	.072	.057	-.075
cried or sulked in front of my partner	.294	.329	.222	.218	.613	-.077	.149	-.061
appeared hurt in front of my partner	.412	.336	.102	.299	.603	-.022	-.060	.227
let my partner see how upset I was	.374	.279	.033	.407	.507	-.053	.024	.207
wore displeasure on my face for my partner to see	.351	.329	.165	.285	.431	.023	-.070	.245
pretended nothing was wrong	.004	-.008	.064	-.012	-.005	.797	-.086	-.246

Table 45—continued

Item	Component							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
denied feeling jealous	-.008	.140	.044	-.050	-.068	.698	.128	.055
became silent	.540	-.214	.042	.012	.192	.571	.121	.355
got quiet and didn't say much	.535	-.192	.006	.032	.205	.565	.040	.357
acted like I didn't care	.393	.018	.198	-.108	.012	.429	-.263	-.397
told my partner that I will start dating other people too	.256	.293	.351	.024	-.032	.103	.627	.129
threatened to be unfaithful	.235	.231	.474	.006	.089	.131	.576	.022

Note. $N = 184$. Loadings of $|\geq .30|$ and greater are highlighted. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy.

Table 46 Loadings for Item-Level Five-Component Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation of the CRJ General Behavioral Responses-Community Resident Sample

Item	Component				
	I	II	III	IV	V
looked through my partners belongs for evidence of a rival relationship	.859	.086	-.002	.147	-.014
“checked up” on my partner more than usual	.836	.321	.014	.213	.125
tried to determine my partners whereabouts	.817	.268	.115	.130	.014
kept closer tabs on my partner	.806	.223	.077	.010	.154
spied on or followed my partner	.791	.205	.026	.120	-.045
repeatedly called my partner	.702	.238	.212	.256	-.014
brought up the rival’s name to see how my partner reacted	.688	.018	.084	.162	.009
tried to make my partner feel guilty	.667	.099	.071	.273	.057
tried to prevent my partner from seeing the rival	.653	.405	.084	.306	.241
restricted my partner’s access to the rival	.541	.438	-.047	.220	.243
slammed doors	.530	.289	.061	.438	-.125
tried to me more attractive or appealing than the rival	.440	-.018	.329	.358	.419

Table 46—continued

Item	Component				
	I	II	III	IV	V
talked to the rival	.170	.873	.009	.024	-.046
confronted the rival	.299	.828	.065	.182	-.145
let rivals know that my partner and I are in a close relationship	.178	.811	.071	.021	.342
told the rival not to see my partner anymore	.292	.793	.065	.141	-.100
made sure rivals know my partner is “taken”	.322	.694	.061	.142	.369
increased affection toward my partner	-.077	-.031	.774	-.006	-.090
told my partner how much I need her/him	.120	.134	.759	.044	-.061
tried to prove to my partner I love them	.156	.038	.748	.025	-.100
tried to be the “best” partner possible	-.003	-.012	.737	-.006	.451
bought gifts or did special things for my partner	.060	-.028	.714	.113	-.007
told my partner how much I care for her/him	.065	.106	.710	.051	.303
spent more time with my partner than usual	.121	.050	.686	.115	.431
flirted with others in front of my partner	.188	.012	.015	.764	.217
tried to make my partner feel jealous too	.318	.079	.126	.762	.188
tricked my partner to test her/his loyalty	.402	.085	.131	.585	-.018

Table 46—continued

Item	Component				
	I	II	III	IV	V
tried to get revenge on my partner	.462	.261	.028	.564	-.319
hit or threw objects	.120	.380	.026	.549	-.283
showed my partner extra affection when rivals were around	.122	.381	.433	.073	.544

Note. $N = 184$. Loadings of $|\geq .30|$ and greater are highlighted. CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy. Table 47 Descriptive Statistics for Jealousy Measures—Undergraduate Sample

	α	Average r_{ij}	M	SD	Number of Items
Cognitive Jealousy					
Suspicion of Partner	.90	.76	4.72	2.47	3
Worry over Rival	.88	.72	8.51	3.27	3
Affective Jealousy					
Fear	.92	.65	17.39	6.27	6
Anger	.91	.53	26.54	8.01	9
Guilt	.89	.54	16.71	6.44	7
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.92	.55	16.46	7.68	10
CRJ					
Surveillance & Competition	.93	.53	37.18	16.27	12
Rival Communication	.87	.59	13.27	7.07	5
Violence & Threats	.91	.63	9.52	5.90	6
Withdrawal	.87	.48	25.90	8.55	7
Affect. Integ. Comm.	.88	.54	26.59	7.68	6
Compensatory Restoration	.87	.48	25.11	8.49	7
Jealousy Goals					
Relationship Maintenance	.86	.67	14.73	4.41	3
Self-Esteem Preservation	.66	.50	8.93	2.87	2
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.85	.65	12.55	4.77	3
Relationship Re-assessment	.79	.56	12.72	4.65	3
Equity Restor. Retal.	.76	.51	8.32	3.94	3

Table 47—continued

Note. $N = 400$. r_{ij} = inter-item correlation; CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy; Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation.

Table 48 Descriptive Statistics for Jealousy Measures-Community Resident Sample

	α	Average r_{ij}	M	SD	Number of Items
Cognitive Jealousy					
Suspicion of Partner	.92	.79	5.53	2.81	3
Worry over Rival	.89	.74	7.79	3.29	3
Affective Jealousy					
Fear	.91	.63	18.35	6.10	6
Anger	.92	.58	28.16	8.70	9
Guilt	.89	.54	18.82	6.78	7
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.89	.47	14.88	6.38	10
CRJ					
Surveillance & Competition	.95	.59	39.96	18.86	12
Rival Communication	.91	.68	13.82	8.24	5
Violence & Threats	.89	.60	9.71	6.25	6
Withdrawal	.89	.53	27.34	9.22	7
Affect. Integ. Comm.	.85	.49	25.75	7.50	6
Compensatory Restoration	.87	.49	26.30	8.61	7
Jealousy Goals					
Relationship Maintenance	.82	.61	16.04	3.91	3
Self-esteem Preservation	.72	.57	9.02	3.04	2
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.79	.56	12.56	4.73	3
Relationship Re-assessment	.82	.61	12.84	5.13	3
Equality Restor. Retal.	.80	.58	8.35	4.30	3

Table 48—continued

Note. $N = 184$. r_{ij} = inter-item correlation; CRJ = Communicative Responses to Jealousy; Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation.

Table 49 MANOVA Personality Variables by Sample

Variable	Undergraduates		Community Residents		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
BFI Neuroticism*	22.75	5.94	23.87	6.52	-.18
BFI Extraversion**	29.01	5.59	26.93	6.67	.34
BFI Openness	35.66	5.86	36.18	5.99	-.09
BFI Agreeableness	35.01	5.36	34.17	5.45	.16
BFI Conscientiousness	33.41	5.41	34.18	6.09	-.14
SNAP-2 Negative Temperament	12.32	7.09	13.00	7.98	-.09
SNAP-2 Mistrust	5.96	4.14	6.13	4.61	-.04
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness**	5.24	3.59	4.38	3.25	.25
SNAP-2 Aggression	4.08	3.83	4.20	3.97	-.03
SNAP-2 Self-harm**	1.38	2.22	2.58	3.10	-.46
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	3.64	2.96	3.81	3.36	-.06
SNAP-2 Dependency	5.48	3.75	5.12	3.56	.10
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament**	18.80	5.63	17.39	5.89	.25
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism**	8.68	3.61	5.66	3.67	.83
SNAP-2 Entitlement	7.87	3.25	7.31	3.57	.17
SNAP-2 Detachment**	4.33	3.54	6.26	4.66	-.48
SNAP-2 Impulsivity*	5.81	3.95	5.04	3.44	.21
SNAP-2 Disinhibition-Pure**	4.84	3.13	3.79	2.77	.35
SNAP-2 Propriety**	11.86	4.00	13.02	3.85	-.30
SNAP-2 Workaholism	7.04	3.80	7.60	3.95	-.15

Table 49—continued

Variable	Undergraduates		Community Residents		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Self-esteem Scale	32.11	5.00	31.34	5.30	.15
3VDI Sub. Dep.**	23.45	7.16	25.76	8.06	-.31
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	32.47	8.01	32.95	7.56	-.06
3VDI Love Dep.**	39.46	6.21	36.84	7.08	.40
ECR Avoidance	46.22	17.38	48.27	20.08	-.11
ECR Anxiety	64.85	19.41	68.04	18.12	-.17
Quality Marriage Index	35.46	7.83	34.95	8.77	.06

Note. $N = 584$ ($n = 400$ Undergraduates; $n = 184$ Community Residents). BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; Sub. Dep. = Submissive Dependence; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 50 MANOVA Jealousy Variables by Sample

Variable	Undergraduates		Community Residents		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Suspicion of Partner**	4.72	2.47	5.53	2.81	-.31
Worry over Rival*	8.51	3.27	7.79	3.29	.22
Anger*	26.55	8.01	28.16	8.69	-.19
Fear	17.39	6.27	18.35	6.10	-.16
Guilt**	16.71	6.44	18.82	6.78	-.32
Joy/Sexual Arousal*	16.46	7.68	14.88	6.38	.22
Surveillance & Competition	37.19	16.27	39.96	18.86	-.16
Rival Communication	13.27	7.07	13.82	8.24	-.07
Violence & Threats	9.52	5.90	9.71	6.25	-.03
Withdrawal	25.90	8.55	27.34	9.21	-.16
Affect. Integ. Comm.	26.59	7.68	25.75	7.50	.11
Compensatory Restoration	25.11	8.49	26.30	8.61	-.14
Relationship Maintenance**	14.73	4.41	16.04	3.91	-.31
Self-Esteem Preservation	8.93	2.87	9.02	3.04	-.03
Red. Uncertain. Rival	12.55	4.77	12.56	4.73	-.00
Relationship Re-assessment	12.72	4.65	12.84	5.13	-.03
Equity Restor. Retal.	8.32	3.94	8.35	4.30	-.01

Note. $N = 584$ ($n = 400$ Undergraduates; $n = 184$ Community Residents). Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication. Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 51 MANOVA Personality Variables by Sex-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	Females		Males		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Negative Emotionality ^{a**}	0.48	1.78	-0.72	1.73	.68
BFI Extraversion**	29.68	5.38	27.99	5.76	.31
BFI Openness	35.63	5.78	35.72	6.00	-.02
BFI Agreeableness**	35.85	4.99	33.76	5.65	.40
BFI Conscientiousness**	34.48	5.13	31.81	5.45	.51
SNAP-2 Mistrust	6.22	4.12	5.56	4.13	.16
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness**	4.42	3.13	6.46	3.88	-.59
SNAP-2 Aggression**	3.56	3.68	4.87	3.93	-.35
SNAP-2 Self-harm	1.35	2.15	1.43	2.32	-.04
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	3.56	2.97	3.75	2.96	-.06
SNAP-2 Dependency**	5.89	3.97	4.86	3.31	.28
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	18.97	5.57	18.53	5.73	.08
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	8.75	3.60	8.57	3.63	.05
SNAP-2 Entitlement	7.80	3.02	7.98	3.56	-.05
SNAP-2 Detachment*	4.00	3.32	4.84	3.81	-.24
SNAP-2 DvC ^{a**}	-0.37	1.78	0.55	1.83	-.51
SNAP-2 Propriety*	12.24	4.03	11.28	3.89	.24
SNAP-2 Workaholism	7.31	3.80	6.64	3.77	.18
Low Self-worth ^{a*}	0.18	1.87	-0.27	1.66	.26
3VDI Exploit. Dep.**	34.00	8.30	30.16	6.97	.49
3VDI Love Dep.**	41.30	5.72	36.70	5.90	.80

Table 51—continued

Variable	Females		Males		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
ECR Avoidance**	44.35	17.04	49.02	17.54	-.27
ECR Anxiety**	68.15	19.00	59.91	19.03	.43
Quality Marriage Index	35.88	8.14	34.81	7.30	.14

Note. *N* = 400 (*n* = 240 Females; *n* = 160 Males). BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence.

^aComposite of two standardized correlated variables.

p* < .05. *p* < .01.

Table 52 MANOVA Personality Variables by Relationship Status-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	Casual Dating		Committed/ Long-Term		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Negative Emotionality ^{a*}	-0.33	1.81	0.13	1.86	-.25
BFI Extraversion	28.67	5.44	29.14	5.65	-.08
BFI Openness	35.12	6.35	35.88	5.65	-.13
BFI Agreeableness	34.79	5.13	35.10	5.45	-.06
BFI Conscientiousness ^{**}	31.64	5.65	34.11	5.16	-.45
SNAP-2 Mistrust	6.15	4.35	5.88	4.06	.06
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness ^{**}	6.20	3.88	4.85	3.40	.37
SNAP-2 Aggression	4.20	3.72	4.03	3.87	.04
SNAP-2 Self-harm	1.71	2.51	1.25	2.08	.20
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	4.00	3.09	3.49	2.91	.17
SNAP-2 Dependency	5.50	3.36	5.47	3.89	.01
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	18.73	5.18	18.82	5.81	-.02
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	8.75	3.61	8.65	3.62	.03
SNAP-2 Entitlement	7.96	3.32	7.84	3.22	.04
SNAP-2 Detachment	4.24	3.68	4.37	3.49	-.04
SNAP-2 DvC ^{a**}	0.74	1.98	-0.29	1.72	.55
SNAP-2 Propriety	11.53	4.24	11.98	3.90	-.11
SNAP-2 Workaholism	6.75	3.69	7.16	3.85	-.11
Low Self-worth ^a	0.17	1.65	-0.07	1.85	.14
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	31.97	7.77	32.66	8.11	-.09

Table 52—continued

Variable	Casual Dating		Committed/ Long-Term		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
3VDI Love Dep.	38.61	6.46	39.80	6.09	-.19
ECR Avoidance**	56.73	16.15	42.07	16.07	.91
ECR Anxiety	66.11	19.04	64.36	19.57	.09
Quality Marriage Index**	31.51	6.85	37.01	7.65	-.77

Note. $N = 400$ ($n = 240$ Females; $n = 160$ Males). BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence.

^aComposite of two standardized correlated variables.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 53 MANOVA Personality Variables by Distance from Partner-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	Long Distance		Not Long Distance		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Negative Emotionality ^a	-0.03	1.92	0.02	1.81	-.03
BFI Extraversion	29.33	5.62	28.79	5.56	.10
BFI Openness	35.10	5.77	36.03	5.90	-.16
BFI Agreeableness	35.42	5.36	34.75	5.35	.13
BFI Conscientiousness	33.87	5.06	33.10	5.63	.15
SNAP-2 Mistrust	6.00	4.15	5.93	4.13	.02
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	5.31	3.58	5.19	3.60	.03
SNAP-2 Aggression	3.88	3.75	4.22	3.88	-.09
SNAP-2 Self-harm	1.23	2.20	1.48	2.23	-.11
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	3.87	3.04	3.48	2.91	.13
SNAP-2 Dependency	5.45	3.75	5.49	3.75	-.01
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	19.35	5.34	18.43	5.80	.17
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	8.84	3.55	8.57	3.65	.08
SNAP-2 Entitlement	7.62	3.33	8.04	3.18	-.13
SNAP-2 Detachment	4.11	3.51	4.48	3.56	-.10
SNAP-2 DvC ^a	-0.17	1.78	0.11	1.90	-.16
SNAP-2 Propriety	12.16	3.78	11.66	4.14	.13
SNAP-2 Workaholism	7.13	3.44	6.98	4.03	.04
3VDI Sub. Dep./SES	.02	1.82	-0.01	1.79	.02
Low Self-worth ^a	32.94	7.80	32.15	8.15	.10

Table 53—continued

Variable	Long Distance		Not Long Distance		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
3VDI Love Dep.**	40.60	5.70	38.71	6.43	.31
ECR Avoidance*	43.75	16.92	47.84	17.52	-.24
ECR Anxiety	64.83	18.14	64.86	20.25	-.00
Quality Marriage Index	35.62	8.60	35.34	7.28	.03

Note. $N = 400$ ($n = 240$ Females; $n = 160$ Males). BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence.

^aComposite of two standardized correlated variables.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 54 MANOVA Personality Variables by Sex-Community Resident Sample

Variable	Females		Males		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Negative Emotionality ^a	0.20	1.82	-0.23	1.92	.23
BFI Extraversion*	28.07	6.64	25.63	6.50	.37
BFI Openness**	35.05	6.19	37.47	5.36	-.41
BFI Agreeableness	34.89	5.36	33.35	5.46	.29
BFI Conscientiousness*	35.09	5.93	33.15	6.13	.32
SNAP-2 Mistrust	6.04	4.61	6.22	4.63	-.04
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness*	3.90	2.92	4.92	3.53	-.32
SNAP-2 Aggression	4.02	3.67	4.40	4.29	-.10
SNAP-2 Self-harm	2.44	3.00	2.73	3.23	-.10
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	3.58	3.24	4.07	3.49	-.15
SNAP-2 Dependency	5.15	3.54	5.08	3.60	.02
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	17.76	5.30	16.97	6.51	.14
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	5.78	3.65	5.52	3.71	.07
SNAP-2 Entitlement	7.63	3.38	6.94	3.76	.20
SNAP-2 Detachment**	5.06	3.80	7.63	5.16	-.59
SNAP-2 DvC ^a	-0.24	1.66	0.28	1.93	-.29
SNAP-2 Propriety	13.14	3.98	12.87	3.70	.07
SNAP-2 Workaholism	7.33	4.01	7.92	3.88	-.15
Low Self-worth ^a	0.18	1.90	-0.20	1.83	.21
3VDI Exploit. Dep.*	34.19	7.84	31.52	7.01	.36
3VDI Love Dep.**	38.69	6.91	34.72	6.69	.58

Table 54—continued

Variable	Females		Males		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
ECR Avoidance*	45.16	19.11	51.80	20.69	-.34
ECR Anxiety	70.04	18.48	65.76	17.53	.24
Quality Marriage Index	35.60	7.95	34.21	9.62	.16

Note. $N = 184$ ($n = 98$ Females; $n = 86$ Males). BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence.

^aComposite of two standardized correlated variables.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 55 MANOVA Jealousy Variables by Sex-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	Females		Males		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Suspicion of Partner*	4.52	2.25	5.03	2.74	-0.21
Worry over Rival	8.53	3.33	8.48	3.19	0.02
Anger**	27.51	7.80	25.10	8.14	0.30
Fear**	18.38	6.16	15.91	6.15	0.40
Guilt*	17.27	6.69	15.88	5.97	0.22
Joy/Sexual Arousal**	15.11	6.93	18.47	8.31	-0.45
Surveillance & Competition*	38.69	16.58	34.93	15.57	0.23
Rival Communication	12.85	7.13	13.90	6.97	-0.15
Violence & Threats	9.26	5.41	9.90	6.57	-0.11
Withdrawal**	27.04	8.40	24.19	8.52	0.34
Affect. Integ. Comm.**	28.38	7.31	23.91	7.46	0.61
Compensatory Restoration	24.80	8.65	25.58	8.25	-0.09
Relationship Maintenance**	15.25	4.44	13.95	4.26	0.30
Self-Esteem Preservation	9.12	2.93	8.64	2.76	0.17
Reducing Uncertainty about Rival*	12.95	4.98	11.94	4.38	0.21
Relationship Re-assessment	12.96	4.74	12.34	4.50	0.13
Equity Restor. Retal.	8.37	3.89	8.24	4.01	0.03

Note. $N = 400$ ($n = 240$ Females; $n = 160$ Males). Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 56 MANOVA Jealousy Variables by Relationship Status-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	Casual Dating		Committed/ Long-Term		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Suspicion of Partner**	5.44	2.75	4.44	2.29	0.41
Worry over Rival	8.73	3.01	8.43	3.37	0.09
Anger	25.76	7.63	26.85	8.15	-0.14
Fear	17.12	6.16	17.49	6.32	-0.06
Guilt	17.46	6.67	16.41	6.33	0.16
Joy/Sexual Arousal	17.31	7.11	16.12	7.88	0.16
Surveillance & Competition	36.71	15.59	37.37	16.55	-0.04
Rival Communication	14.04	6.61	12.97	7.24	0.15
Violence & Threats	10.37	6.99	9.18	5.40	0.20
Withdrawal	26.39	9.06	25.71	8.35	0.08
Affect. Integ. Comm.**	23.38	7.33	27.86	7.46	-0.60
Compensatory Restoration	25.03	8.08	25.14	8.66	-0.01
Relationship Maintenance	14.26	4.22	14.91	4.47	-0.15
Self-Esteem Preservation	9.12	2.74	8.85	2.92	0.09
Reducing Uncertainty about Rival	12.97	4.18	12.38	4.98	0.12
Relationship Re-assessment**	13.70	4.06	12.33	4.81	0.30
Equity Restor. Retal.	8.64	3.91	8.19	3.95	0.11

Note. $N = 400$ ($n = 113$ Casual Dating, $n = 287$ Committed Long-Term). Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation.

** $p < .01$.

Table 57 MANOVA Jealousy Variables by Distance from Partner-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	Long Distance		Not Long Distance		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Suspicion of Partner	4.75	2.60	4.70	2.37	0.02
Worry over Rival*	8.97	3.20	8.21	3.29	0.23
Anger	26.40	7.56	26.64	8.32	-0.03
Fear	17.64	5.93	17.22	6.49	0.07
Guilt	16.58	6.11	16.79	6.65	-0.03
Joy/Sexual Arousal	16.85	8.05	16.20	7.44	0.08
Surveillance & Competition	37.09	16.24	37.24	16.32	-0.01
Rival Communication	13.67	7.64	13.00	6.68	0.09
Violence & Threats	8.85	4.93	9.96	6.44	-0.19
Withdrawal	25.92	8.33	25.89	8.71	0.00
Affect. Integ. Comm.**	27.87	7.21	25.75	7.88	0.28
Compensatory Restoration	25.86	8.20	24.62	8.66	0.15
Relationship Maintenance*	15.41	4.18	14.28	4.50	0.26
Self-Esteem Preservation	9.18	2.74	8.77	2.95	0.14
Reduce Uncertainty – Rival	12.72	4.82	12.43	4.75	0.06
Relationship Reassessment	13.00	4.61	12.53	4.67	0.10
Equity Restor. Retal.	8.70	3.91	8.06	3.95	0.16

Note. $N = 400$ ($n = 159$ Long Distance, $n = 241$ Not Long Distance). Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 58 MANOVA Jealousy Variables by Sex-Community Resident Sample

Variable	Females		Males		<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Suspicion of Partner	5.71	2.93	5.31	2.68	0.14
Worry over Rival	7.86	3.48	7.71	3.07	0.05
Anger	28.92	9.06	27.29	8.22	0.19
Fear*	19.28	6.04	17.29	6.03	0.33
Guilt	18.56	6.96	19.10	6.60	-0.08
Joy/Sexual Arousal	14.86	6.76	14.91	5.96	-0.01
Surveillance & Competition*	42.79	19.67	36.73	17.45	0.33
Rival Communication	13.70	8.63	13.95	7.82	-0.03
Violence & Threats	10.28	6.97	9.06	5.27	0.20
Withdrawal	28.36	8.89	26.17	9.49	0.24
Affect. Integ. Comm.**	27.18	7.28	24.12	7.45	0.42
Compensatory Restoration	25.21	8.78	27.55	8.29	-0.28
Relationship Maintenance	16.26	4.02	15.80	3.80	0.12
Self-Esteem Preservation	9.30	3.17	8.71	2.88	0.20
Red. Uncertain. Rival	12.54	4.74	12.58	4.74	-0.01
Relationship Re-assessment	13.04	5.29	12.62	4.96	0.08
Equity Restor. Retal.	8.78	4.63	7.86	3.87	0.22

Note. $N = 184$ ($n = 98$ Females, $n = 86$ Males). Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication. Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 59 Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy Experience Measures – Undergraduate Sample

	Suspicion of Partner	Worry over Rival	Anger	Fear	Guilt	Joy/Sexual Arousal
Negative Emotionality ^a	.28**	.21**	.31**	.39**	.35**	-.12*
BFI Extraversion	-.10	-.01	.02	-.01	-.09	.06
BFI Openness	-.12*	.04	-.05	-.04	-.07	.05
BFI Agreeableness	-.21**	-.06	-.19**	.01	-.08	-.08
BFI Conscientiousness	-.10	.02	.01	-.01	-.09	-.05
SNAP-2 MST	.32**	.26**	.23**	.21**	.28**	-.03
SNAP-2 MAN	.25**	.14**	.18**	.10*	.19**	.16**
SNAP-2 AGG	.28**	.18**	.29**	.07	.08	.06
SNAP-2 SFH	.33**	.16**	.22**	.22**	.29**	.01
SNAP-2 EP	.19**	.12*	.14**	.21**	.24**	.14*
SNAP-2 DEP	.14**	.12*	.16**	.29**	.29**	-.08
SNAP-2 PT	-.08	-.05	-.10	-.03	-.10	.17**

Table 59—continued

	Suspicion of Partner	Worry over Rival	Anger	Fear	Guilt	Joy/Sexual Arousal
SNAP-2 EXH	.07	.11*	.05	-.01	-.04	.18**
SNAP-2 ENT	.08	.06	.10*	.07	.02	.20**
SNAP-2 DET	.18**	.13*	.16**	.13**	.19**	-.07
DvC ^a	.14**	.07	.03	-.05	.05	.13*
SNAP-2 PRO	.09	.07	.07	.17**	.12*	-.03
SNAP-2 WRK	.09	.07	.04	.06	.06	.13**
Low Self-worth ^a	.27**	.20**	.17**	.29**	.35**	-.08
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.13**	.24**	.13**	.39**	.32**	-.05
3VDI Love Dep.	-.01	.13*	.14**	.31**	.18**	-.11*
ECR Avoidance	.36**	.07	.05	-.01	.18**	.14**
ECR Anxiety	.42**	.42**	.39**	.52**	.46**	-.11*

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG =

Table 69—continued

Aggression; SFH = Self-Harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; PT = Positive Temperament; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence; Love Dep. Love Dependence.

^aComposite of two standardized correlated variables.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 60 Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy Experience Measures – Community Resident Sample

	Suspicion of Partner	Worry over Rival	Anger	Fear	Guilt	Joy/Sexual Arousal
Negative Emotionality ^a	.13	.14	.21**	.20**	.25**	.03
BFI Extraversion	.03	.07	-.05	-.01	-.10	.11
BFI Openness	-.07	.02	.00	-.02	.02	.02
BFI Agreeableness	-.19*	-.25**	-.18*	.01	-.11	-.04
BFI Conscientiousness	.03	-.04	.01	.04	-.06	.06
SNAP-2 MST	.27**	.24**	.24**	.13	.28**	.22**
SNAP-2 MAN	.20**	.11	.13	-.02	.13	.15*
SNAP-2 AGG	.28**	.18*	.23**	-.03	.04	.18*
SNAP-2 SFH	.26**	.21**	.13	.10	.25**	.17*
SNAP-2 EP	.18*	.21**	.10	.06	.10	.25**
SNAP-2 DEP	-.09	-.06	-.07	.05	.17*	.09
SNAP-2 PT	.03	.00	-.04	-.05	-.12	.11

Table 60—continued

	Suspicion of Partner	Worry over Rival	Anger	Fear	Guilt	Joy/Sexual Arousal
SNAP-2 EXH	.06	.07	-.01	-.06	-.11	.23**
SNAP-2 ENT	.01	-.01	.05	-.05	-.12	.14
SNAP-2 DET	.15*	.15*	.14	.02	.18*	-.03
DvC ^a	.15*	.10	.07	.03	.06	.13
SNAP-2 PRO	-.12	-.06	-.09	.01	.09	.14
SNAP-2 WRK	.17*	.20**	.19*	.11	.22**	.04
Low Self-worth ^a	.09	.05	.09	.20**	.34**	.00
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.01	.01	.03	.23**	.34**	.12
3VDI Love Dep.	-.12	-.02	.06	.25**	.17*	.01
ECR Avoidance	.37**	.22**	.20**	.11	.14	-.00
ECR Anxiety	.24**	.30**	.30**	.41**	.41**	.04

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG =

Table 60—continued

Aggression; SFH = Self-Harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; PT = Positive Temperament; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence; Love Dep. Love Dependence.

^aComposite of two standardized correlated variables.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 61 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Suspicion of Partner-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.040	.033**
Sex	.354	.252	.070		
Relationship Status	-.963	.276	-.176**		
Distance from Partner	-.202	.250	-.040		
Step 2				.357	.312**
Sex	.750	.267	.149**		
Relationship Status	-.403	.261	-.074		
Distance from Partner	-.315	.222	-.063		
Negative Emotionality ^a	.170	.089	.128		
BFI Extraversion	-.045	.027	-.102		
BFI Openness	-.017	.021	-.040		
BFI Agreeableness	.004	.028	.010		
BFI Conscientiousness	.057	.029	.126*		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.040	.035	.066		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.039	.042	.057		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.086	.038	.133*		
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.142	.063	.127*		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.069	.045	-.083		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.086	.040	-.131*		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.011	.027	.024		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.007	.038	.010		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.022	.040	.029		

Table 61—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.082	.049	-.118		
DvC ^a	.042	.093	.032		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.052	.032	.084		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.035	.039	-.054		
Low Self-worth ^a	-.010	.097	-.007		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.021	.020	.067		
3VDI Love Dep.	-.018	.024	-.046		
ECR Avoidance	.031	.008	.216**		
ECR Anxiety	.042	.007	.332**		

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .040$, $F(3, 396) = 5.502$, $p = .001$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .317$, $F(23, 373) = 7.995$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 7.965$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 62 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Worry over Rival-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.017	.009
Sex	-.072	.339	-.011		
Relationship Status	-.432	.372	-.059		
Distance from Partner	-.816	.336	-.122*		
Step 2				.277	.227**
Sex	.688	.375	.103		
Relationship Status	-.542	.367	-.075		
Distance from Partner	-.941	.312	-.141**		
Negative Emotionality ^a	.059	.125	.034		
BFI Extraversion	-.017	.038	-.029		
BFI Openness	.063	.029	.113*		
BFI Agreeableness	.018	.040	.029		
BFI Conscientiousness	.130	.041	.216**		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.097	.049	.123*		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.005	.060	.006		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.132	.054	.154*		
SNAP-2 Self-harm	-.031	.089	-.021		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.148	.064	-.134*		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.121	.056	-.138*		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.026	.038	-.044		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.068	.054	.075		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.014	.056	.014		

Table 62—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
SNAP-2 Detachment	.025	.069	.027		
DvC ^a	.213	.131	.121		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.020	.045	.025		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.042	.054	-.048		
Low Self-worth ^a	.100	.137	.055		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.077	.028	.189**		
3VDI Love Dep.	-.025	.034	-.048		
ECR Avoidance	-.011	.011	-.059		
ECR Anxiety	.062	.010	.367**		

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .017$, $F(3, 396) = 2.221$, $p = .085$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .260$, $F(23, 373) = 5.839$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 5.494$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 63 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Anger-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.024	.016*
Sex	-2.322	.827	-.142**		
Relationship Status	.682	.906	.038		
Distance from Partner	.481	.820	.029		
Step 2				.267	.216**
Sex	-1.757	.925	-.108		
Relationship Status	.471	.904	.026		
Distance from Partner	.204	.769	.012		
Negative Emotionality ^a	.276	.309	.064		
BFI Extraversion	.085	.094	.059		
BFI Openness	-.005	.072	-.003		
BFI Agreeableness	-.081	.098	-.054		
BFI Conscientiousness	.146	.101	.099		
SNAP Mistrust	-.070	.120	-.036		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.233	.147	.104		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.417	.133	.199**		
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.323	.218	.089		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.112	.158	-.042		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.054	.139	-.025		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.053	.095	-.038		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.121	.132	-.055		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.244	.138	.099		

Table 63—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
SNAP-2 Detachment	.242	.169	.107		
DvC ^a	-.184	.322	-.043		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.120	.111	.060		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.297	.134	-.141*		
Low Self-worth ^a	-.396	.338	-.089		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.003	.069	.003		
3VDI Love Dep.	.051	.083	.040		
ECR Avoidance	-.013	.027	-.027		
ECR Anxiety	.133	.026	.322**		

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .024$, $F(3, 396) = 3.209$, $p = .023$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .243$, $F(23, 373) = 5.388$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 5.231$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 64 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Fear-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.038	.031**
Sex	-2.481	.642	-.194**		
Relationship Status	-.173	.704	-.012		
Distance from Partner	-.262	.637	-.020		
Step 2				.370	.326**
Sex	-.065	.671	-.005		
Relationship Status	-.422	.656	-.030		
Distance from Partner	-.078	.558	-.006		
Negative Emotionality ^a	.669	.224	.198**		
BFI Extraversion	.124	.068	.110		
BFI Openness	-.033	.052	-.031		
BFI Agreeableness	.085	.071	.072		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.011	.073	-.009		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	-.135	.087	-.089		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.116	.107	.066		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.027	.097	.016		
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.256	.158	.091		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.090	.114	.042		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.088	.101	-.053		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.065	.069	.058		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.173	.096	-.099		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.128	.100	.066		

Table 64—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
SNAP-2 Detachment	.256	.123	.144*		
DvC ^a	-.293	.234	-.087		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.086	.080	.055		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.192	.097	-.116*		
Low Self-worth ^a	-.042	.245	.012		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.091	.050	.117		
3VDI Love Dep.	.072	.060	.071		
ECR Avoidance	-.032	.019	-.089		
ECR Anxiety	.122	.019	.376**		

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .038$, $F(3, 396) = 5.187$, $p = .002$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .332$, $F(23, 373) = 8.546$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 8.421$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 65 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Guilt-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.020	.013*
Sex	-1.641	.665	-.125*		
Relationship Status	-1.363	.729	-.095		
Distance from Partner	.151	.660	.011		
Step 2				.290	.240**
Sex	.021	.732	.002		
Relationship Status	-.533	.715	-.037		
Distance from Partner	.280	.608	.021		
Negative Emotionality ^a	.421	.244	.121		
BFI Extraversion	.050	.074	.043		
BFI Openness	-.021	.057	-.019		
BFI Agreeableness	-.012	.077	-.010		
BFI Conscientiousness	.027	.080	.022		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	-.008	.095	-.005		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.213	.117	.119		
SNAP-2 Aggression	-.107	.106	-.063		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.265	.173	.091		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.076	.125	.035		
SNAP-2 Dependency	.011	.110	.006		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.038	.075	.033		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.186	.105	-.105		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.031	.109	.015		

Table 65—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
SNAP-2 Detachment	.103	.134	.056		
DvC ^a	-.079	.255	-.023		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.112	.088	.070		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.104	.106	-.062		
Low Self-worth ^a	.110	.267	.031		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.060	.055	.075		
3VDI Love Dep.	.071	.066	.069		
ECR Avoidance	.025	.021	.068		
ECR Anxiety	.087	.020	.264**		

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .020$, $F(3, 396) = 2.753$, $p = .042$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .269$, $F(23, 373) = 6.145$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 5.849$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 66 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Joy/Sexual Arousal-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.050	.043**
Sex	3.309	.782	.211**		
Relationship Status	-.647	.857	-.038		
Distance from Partner	-.963	.776	-.061		
Step 2				.184	.127**
Sex	2.066	.936	.132*		
Relationship Status	.623	.915	.037		
Distance from Partner	-.845	.778	-.054		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.390	.313	-.094		
BFI Extraversion	-.104	.095	-.076		
BFI Openness	-.025	.072	-.019		
BFI Agreeableness	-.117	.099	-.082		
BFI Conscientiousness	.019	.102	.013		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	-.167	.121	-.090		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.117	.149	.055		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.027	.135	.014		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.050	.221	.014		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.270	.159	.104		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.152	.141	-.074		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.090	.096	.066		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.188	.134	.088		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.263	.139	.111		

Table 66—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.333	.171	-.153		
DvC ^a	.111	.326	.027		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.106	.112	-.055		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.316	.135	.156*		
Low Self-worth ^a	.340	.342	.080		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.131	.070	.137		
3VDI Love Dep.	-.057	.084	-.046		
ECR Avoidance	.062	.027	.141*		
ECR Anxiety	-.054	.026	-.137*		

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .050$, $F(3, 396) = 7.019$, $p < .001$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .134$, $F(23, 373) = 2.658$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 3.239$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 67 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Suspicion of Partner-Community Resident

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.005	.000
Sex	-.400	.416	-.071		
Step 2				.310	.206**
Sex	-.656	.451	-.117		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.274	.160	-.183		
BFI Extraversion	.023	.047	.055		
BFI Openness	-.089	.040	-.187*		
BFI Agreeableness	.024	.050	.047		
BFI Conscientiousness	.018	.043	.039		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.048	.064	.078		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.080	.095	.093		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.050	.074	.070		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.172	.088	.190		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.042	.079	.050		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.121	.077	-.154		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.028	.051	.059		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.041	.075	.054		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.045	.063	-.057		
SNAP-2 Detachment	.019	.080	.031		
DvC ^a	.012	.167	.008		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.083	.066	-.114		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.040	.069	.057		

Table 67—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Low Self-worth ^a	-.270	.190	-.180		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.055	.037	.149		
3VDI Love Dependence	-.014	.040	-.036		
ECR Avoidance	.046	.012	.329**		
ECR Anxiety	.029	.015	.190		

Note. $N = 184$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .005$, $F(1, 182) = 0.927$, $p = .337$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .305$, $F(23, 159) = 3.060$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 2.982$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 68 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Worry over Rival-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.001	-.005
Sex	-.148	.487	-.023		
Step 2				.250	.136**
Sex	-.478	.550	-.073		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.243	.195	-.138		
BFI Extraversion	.076	.057	.154		
BFI Openness	-.055	.049	-.100		
BFI Agreeableness	-.094	.061	-.156		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.040	.052	-.073		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.077	.078	.108		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	-.067	.116	-.066		
SNAP-2 Aggression	-.070	.090	-.085		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.197	.107	.186		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.056	.096	.057		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.089	.093	-.096		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.041	.062	-.074		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.053	.092	.060		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.086	.077	-.094		
SNAP-2 Detachment	.092	.097	.130		
DvC ^a	.065	.203	.036		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.046	.080	-.053		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.108	.084	.130		

Table 68—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Low Self-worth ^a	-.515	.231	-.294*		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.014	.045	.032		
3VDI Love Dependence	.058	.048	.126		
ECR Avoidance	.026	.015	.156		
ECR Anxiety	.049	.018	.270**		

Note. $N = 184$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .001$, $F(1, 182) = 0.092$, $p = .762$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .249$, $F(23, 159) = 2.296$, $p = .001$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 2.205$, $p = .002$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 69 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Anger-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.009	.003
Sex	-1.628	1.283	-.094		
Step 2				.215	.096*
Sex	-1.937	1.487	-.111		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.037	.528	-.008		
BFI Extraversion	-.099	.154	-.076		
BFI Openness	-.006	.132	-.004		
BFI Agreeableness	.000	.165	.000		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.002	.141	-.001		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.390	.210	.207		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.101	.315	.038		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.184	.243	.084		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.093	.291	-.033		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.215	.260	-.083		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.370	.252	-.152		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.081	.167	-.055		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.019	.249	-.008		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.026	.208	.010		
SNAP-2 Detachment	.179	.263	.096		
DvC ^a	.138	.550	.029		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.294	.216	-.130		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.269	.226	.122		

Table 69—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Low Self-worth ^a	-.883	.626	-.190		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	-.025	.121	-.022		
3VDI Love Dependence	.304	.131	.248*		
ECR Avoidance	.048	.040	.110		
ECR Anxiety	.095	.049	.199		

Note. $N = 184$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .009$, $F(1, 182) = 1.611$, $p = .206$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .206$, $F(23, 159) = 1.816$, $p = .018$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 1.814$, $p = .016$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 70 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Fear-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.026	.021*
Sex	-1.985	.892	-.163*		
Step 2				.270	.159**
Sex	-1.104	1.007	-.091		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.047	.357	-.014		
BFI Extraversion	-.033	.104	-.036		
BFI Openness	.021	.089	.021		
BFI Agreeableness	.044	.112	.039		
BFI Conscientiousness	.107	.096	.107		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.100	.142	.076		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	-.079	.213	-.042		
SNAP-2 Aggression	-.267	.165	-.174		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.064	.197	-.032		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.017	.176	.010		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.183	.171	-.107		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.096	.113	-.093		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.001	.168	.001		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.121	.141	-.071		
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.038	.178	-.029		
DvC ^a	.493	.372	.146		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.004	.146	.002		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.097	.153	.062		

Table 70—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Low Self-worth ^a	-.196	.424	-.060		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.021	.082	.026		
3VDI Love Dependence	.177	.089	.205*		
ECR Avoidance	.045	.027	.150		
ECR Anxiety	.138	.034	.411**		

Note. $N = 184$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .026$, $F(1, 182) = 4.951$, $p = .027$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .243$, $F(23, 159) = 2.300$, $p = .001$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 2.444$, $p = .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 71 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Guilt-Community Residents Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.002	-.004
Sex	.543	1.004	.040		
Step 2				.310	.206**
Sex	.995	1.088	.073		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.460	.386	-.127		
BFI Extraversion	.070	.113	.069		
BFI Openness	.028	.096	.024		
BFI Agreeableness	-.035	.121	-.028		
BFI Conscientiousness	.061	.103	.055		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.166	.154	.113		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.113	.230	.054		
SNAP-2 Aggression	-.218	.178	-.128		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.068	.213	.031		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.222	.190	-.110		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.042	.185	-.022		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.115	.122	-.099		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.054	.182	.029		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.265	.152	-.139		
SNAP-2 Detachment	.142	.193	.098		
DvC ^a	.253	.402	.067		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.099	.158	.056		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.370	.166	.215*		

Table 71—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Low Self-worth ^a	.262	.458	.072		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.125	.089	.140		
3VDI Love Dependence	.142	.096	.149		
ECR Avoidance	.009	.029	.027		
ECR Anxiety	.109	.036	.292**		

Note. *N* = 184. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .002$, $F(1, 182) = 0.293$, $p = .589$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .308$, $F(23, 159) = 3.086$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 2.973$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 72 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Joy/Sexual Arousal-Community Resident

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.000	-.005
Sex	.050	.945	.004		
Step 2				.187	.064
Sex	.294	1.110	.023		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.444	.394	-.130		
BFI Extraversion	-.019	.115	-.019		
BFI Openness	-.098	.098	-.091		
BFI Agreeableness	-.017	.124	-.014		
BFI Conscientiousness	.110	.105	.105		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.121	.157	.088		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.009	.235	.005		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.149	.182	.093		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.268	.217	.130		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.308	.194	.162		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.024	.188	-.013		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.006	.125	.006		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.269	.186	.155		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.030	.155	.017		
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.124	.197	-.091		
DvC ^a	.284	.410	.080		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.246	.161	.148		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.188	.169	-.117		

Table 72—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Low Self-worth ^a	-.295	.467	-.087		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.178	.091	.211		
3VDI Love Dependence	-.106	.098	-.118		
ECR Avoidance	.003	.030	.008		
ECR Anxiety	.002	.037	.007		

Note. $N = 184$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .000$, $F(1, 182) = 0.003$, $p = .958$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .187$, $F(23, 159) = 1.591$, $p = .052$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 1.525$, $p = .066$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 73 Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy-Related Goals – Undergraduate Sample

	Relationship	Self-Esteem	Red. Uncertain.	Relationship	Equity
	Maintenance	Preservation	Rival	Re-assessment	Restor. Retal.
Negative Emotionality ^a	.18**	.05	.10*	.02	.20**
BFI Extraversion	-.01	.02	.04	.06	-.04
BFI Openness	.04	.08	.08	.06	-.15**
BFI Agreeableness	.11*	.07	.05	-.04	-.17**
BFI Conscientiousness	.07	.03	-.01	-.01	-.06
SNAP-2 MST	.16**	.11*	.15**	.10*	.21**
SNAP-2 MAN	.01	.03	.06	.06	.23**
SNAP-2 AGG	-.03	.06	.05	.07	.31**
SNAP-2 SFH	.04	-.02	.01	.01	.15**
SNAP-2 EP	.11*	.10	.13**	.12*	.17**
SNAP-2 DEP	.19**	.03	.07	-.01	.15**
SNAP-2 PT	.02	.10*	-.01	.07	-.05

Table 73—continued

	Relationship Maintenance	Self-Esteem Preservation	Red. Uncertain. Rival	Relationship Re-assessment	Equity Restor. Retal.
SNAP-2 EXH	.00	.12*	.04	.09	.11*
SNAP-2 ENT	-.02	.15**	.04	.09	.10*
SNAP-2 DET	.11*	-.01	.03	.05	.08
DvC ^a	-.07	.02	.01	.02	.09
SNAP-2 PRO	.17**	.16**	.06	.12*	.12*
SNAP-2 WRK	.04	.06	-.02	.12*	.10
Low Self-worth ^a	.14**	.02	.10*	.00	.18**
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.31**	.11*	.23**	.05	.10*
3VDI Love Dep.	.34**	.16**	.21**	.06	.04
ECR Avoidance	-.20**	.05	.05	.21**	.32**
ECR Anxiety	.40**	.12*	.34**	.21**	.28**

Note. $N = 400$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation; BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three

Table 73—continued

Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG = Aggression; SFH = Self-Harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; PT = Positive Temperament; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism;

Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence; Love Dep. = Love Dependence.

^aComposite of two standardized correlated variables.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 74 Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy-Related Goals – Community Resident Sample

	Relationship Maintenance	Self-Esteem Preservation	Red. Uncertain. Rival	Relationship Re-assessment	Equity Restor. Retal.
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.21**	.00	.10	-.06	.20**
BFI Extraversion	.08	.13	-.06	.01	.04
BFI Openness	-.03	.09	-.02	-.01	-.08
BFI Agreeableness	.25**	.03	-.11	.04	-.25**
BFI Conscientiousness	.11	.16*	.02	.19*	-.03
SNAP-2 MST	-.14	.10	.10	.06	.25**
SNAP-2 MAN	-.23**	.03	.12	-.03	.32**
SNAP-2 AGG	-.25**	.06	.11	.12	.41**
SNAP-2 SFH	-.15*	-.07	.03	-.15*	.08
SNAP-2 EP	-.14	.11	.12	.11	.20**
SNAP-2 DEP	.03	.01	-.03	-.08	.06
SNAP-2 PT	.11	.30**	.05	.14	.08

Table 74—continued

	Relationship Maintenance	Self-Esteem Preservation	Red. Uncertain. Rival	Relationship Re-assessment	Equity Restor. Retal.
SNAP-2 EXH	-.07	.20**	-.09	.02	.04
SNAP-2 ENT	-.10	.20**	-.08	.00	.15*
SNAP-2 DET	-.18*	-.15*	.08	.03	.00
DvC ^a	-.13	-.08	.14	.08	.19*
SNAP-2 PRO	.12	.26**	-.08	-.01	-.12
SNAP-2 WRK	-.09	.17*	.15*	.14	.19*
Low Self-worth ^a	-.12	-.09	.02	-.16*	.08
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.23**	.23**	.08	.00	.11
3VDI Love Dep.	.27**	.25**	.07	.00	.13
ECR Avoidance	-.30**	-.09	.09	.05	.13
ECR Anxiety	.08	.08	.18*	-.10	.24**

Note. $N = 184$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation; BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three

Table 74—continued

Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG = Aggression; SFH = Self-Harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; PT = Positive Temperament; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence; Love Dep. = Love Dependence.

^aComposite of two standardized correlated variables.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 75 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Relationship Maintenance-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.035	.028**
Sex	-1.180	.452	-.131**		
Relationship Status	.262	.495	.027		
Distance from Partner	-1.017	.448	-.113*		
Step 2				.328	.281**
Sex	.060	.487	.007		
Relationship Status	-.531	.476	-.054		
Distance from Partner	-.611	.405	-.068		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.129	.163	-.054		
BFI Extraversion	.035	.049	.045		
BFI Openness	.029	.038	.039		
BFI Agreeableness	.067	.051	.081		
BFI Conscientiousness	.024	.053	.030		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.076	.063	.071		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.014	.078	.012		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.002	.070	.002		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.061	.115	-.031		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.018	.083	-.012		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.016	.073	-.014		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.070	.050	.090		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.003	.070	.002		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.116	.073	-.086		

Table 75—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
SNAP-2 Detachment	.381	.089	.306**		
DvC ^a	.135	.170	.057		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.100	.058	.091		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.062	.070	-.053		
Low Self-worth ^a	.002	.178	.001		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.009	.036	.016		
3VDI Love Dep.	.118	.044	.166**		
ECR Avoidance	-.075	.014	-.297**		
ECR Anxiety	.085	.013	.374**		

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .035$, $F(3, 396) = 4.783$, $p = .003$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .293$, $F(23, 373) = 7.078$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 7.008$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 76 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Self-Esteem Preservation-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.015	.008
Sex	-.525	.297	-.090		
Relationship Status	-.442	.326	-.069		
Distance from Partner	-.427	.295	-.073		
Step 2				.113	.052**
Sex	-.432	.364	-.074		
Relationship Status	-.281	.356	-.044		
Distance from Partner	-.349	.303	-.060		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.094	.122	-.061		
BFI Extraversion	-.051	.037	-.100		
BFI Openness	.043	.028	.088		
BFI Agreeableness	.052	.038	.098		
BFI Conscientiousness	.007	.040	.012		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.058	.047	.083		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	-.012	.058	-.015		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.125	.053	.167*		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.084	.086	-.065		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.023	.062	-.023		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.055	.055	-.071		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.038	.037	.075		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.077	.052	.097		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.066	.054	.075		

Table 76—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
SNAP-2 Detachment	.047	.067	.058		
DvC ^a	.065	.127	.042		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.107	.044	.149*		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.052	.053	-.069		
Low Self-worth ^a	.122	.133	.076		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.011	.027	.030		
3VDI Love Dep.	.057	.033	.124		
ECR Avoidance	.011	.011	.065		
ECR Anxiety	.000	.010	-.003		

Note. *N* = 400. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .015$, $F(3, 396) = 2.058$, $p = .105$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .098$, $F(23, 373) = 1.795$, $p = .014$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 1.836$, $p = .008$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 77 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Reducing Uncertainty about Rival-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.018	.011
Sex	-1.148	.494	-.118*		
Relationship Status	-.879	.541	-.083		
Distance from Partner	-.322	.490	-.033		
Step 2				.174	.117**
Sex	-.186	.585	-.019		
Relationship Status	-.777	.571	-.073		
Distance from Partner	-.189	.486	-.019		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.112	.195	-.044		
BFI Extraversion	.041	.059	.048		
BFI Openness	.082	.045	.101		
BFI Agreeableness	.039	.062	.044		
BFI Conscientiousness	.016	.064	.018		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.082	.076	.071		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.032	.093	.024		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.136	.084	.109		
SNAP-2 Self-harm	-.228	.138	-.106		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.035	.100	.021		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.142	.088	-.112		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.025	.060	-.030		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.047	.084	-.035		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.002	.087	.001		

Table 77—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
SNAP-2 Detachment	.031	.107	.023		
DvC ^a	-.128	.203	-.050		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.014	.070	.012		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.097	.085	-.078		
Low Self-worth ^a	.013	.214	.005		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.068	.044	.114		
3VDI Love Dep.	.078	.053	.101		
ECR Avoidance	.005	.017	.020		
ECR Anxiety	.074	.016	.299**		

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .018$, $F(3, 396) = 2.419$, $p = .066$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .156$, $F(23, 373) = 3.074$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 3.032$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 78 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Relationship Re-assessment-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.030	.023**
Sex	-.864	.478	-.091		
Relationship Status	-1.641	.524	-.159**		
Distance from Partner	-.618	.474	-.065		
Step 2				.142	.083**
Sex	-1.012	.581	-.107		
Relationship Status	-.916	.567	-.089		
Distance from Partner	-.625	.483	-.066		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.306	.194	-.122		
BFI Extraversion	.025	.059	.030		
BFI Openness	.052	.045	.066		
BFI Agreeableness	-.035	.061	-.040		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.037	.063	-.043		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	-.016	.075	-.014		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.001	.093	.001		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.123	.084	.102		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.138	.137	-.066		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.052	.099	.033		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.029	.087	-.023		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.012	.060	.015		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.001	.083	.001		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.035	.086	-.024		

Table 78—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
SNAP-2 Detachment	.065	.106	.049		
DvC ^a	-.069	.202	-.028		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.126	.069	.108		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.062	.084	.051		
Low Self-worth ^a	-.253	.212	-.098		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.008	.043	.014		
3VDI Love Dep.	.040	.052	.054		
ECR Avoidance	.053	.017	.200**		
ECR Anxiety	.048	.016	.199**		

Note. *N* = 400. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .030$, $F(3, 396) = 4.134$, $p = .007$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .112$, $F(23, 373) = 2.119$, $p = .002$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 2.383$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 79 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Equity Restoration through Retaliation-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.011	.003
Sex	-.177	.409	-.022		
Relationship Status	-.586	.448	-.067		
Distance from Partner	-.703	.406	-.087		
Step 2				.283	.233**
Sex	-.406	.450	-.051		
Relationship Status	.590	.440	.067		
Distance from Partner	-.713	.374	-.089		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.013	.150	-.006		
BFI Extraversion	-.093	.046	-.132*		
BFI Openness	-.050	.035	-.074		
BFI Agreeableness	.024	.047	.033		
BFI Conscientiousness	.032	.049	.044		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	-.042	.058	-.044		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.157	.072	.143*		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.328	.065	.319**		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.099	.106	-.056		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.010	.077	.007		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.023	.068	-.022		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.015	.046	-.022		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.034	.064	.031		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.035	.067	.029		

Table 79—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.166	.082	-.149*		
DvC ^a	-.125	.157	-.059		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.102	.054	.104		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.021	.065	.021		
Low Self-worth ^a	-.006	.164	-.003		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.026	.034	.053		
3VDI Love Dep.	.013	.041	.021		
ECR Avoidance	.078	.013	.345**		
ECR Anxiety	.029	.012	.142**		

Note. $N = 400$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .011$, $F(3, 396) = 1.434$, $p = .232$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .272$, $F(23, 373) = 6.156$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 5.660$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 80 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Relationship Maintenance-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.003	-.002
Sex	-.453	.579	-.058		
Step 2				.289	.181**
Sex	.207	.637	.026		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.557	.226	-.267*		
BFI Extraversion	-.019	.066	-.032		
BFI Openness	-.021	.056	-.032		
BFI Agreeableness	.005	.071	.006		
BFI Conscientiousness	.038	.060	.060		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.015	.090	.017		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	-.158	.135	-.131		
SNAP-2 Aggression	-.032	.104	-.032		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.039	.124	.031		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.110	.111	-.094		
SNAP-2 Dependency	.023	.108	.021		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.001	.072	-.002		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.040	.106	-.038		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.101	.089	-.092		
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.008	.113	-.009		
DvC ^a	.313	.235	.144		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.083	.093	.081		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.035	.097	-.036		

Table 80—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Low Self-worth ^a	-.488	.268	-.234		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.132	.052	.256*		
3VDI Love Dependence	.021	.056	.038		
ECR Avoidance	-.030	.017	-.156		
ECR Anxiety	.077	.021	.355**		

Note. $N = 184$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .003$, $F(1, 182) = 0.612$, $p = .435$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .285$, $F(23, 159) = 2.774$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 2.690$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 81 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Self-Esteem Preservation-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.009	.004
Sex	-.587	.449	-.096		
Step 2				.242	.127**
Sex	-.383	.512	-.063		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.186	.182	-.114		
BFI Extraversion	-.068	.053	-.149		
BFI Openness	.025	.045	.049		
BFI Agreeableness	-.005	.057	-.009		
BFI Conscientiousness	.043	.049	.086		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.044	.072	.066		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.080	.108	.086		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.088	.084	.115		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.121	.100	-.124		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.038	.089	-.041		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.002	.087	-.002		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.086	.058	.167		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.122	.085	.147		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.037	.071	.043		
SNAP-2 Detachment	.021	.091	.032		
DvC ^a	.020	.189	.012		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.130	.074	.164		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.011	.078	.015		

Table 81—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Low Self-worth ^a	-.128	.215	-.078		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.083	.042	.207*		
3VDI Love Dependence	.063	.045	.146		
ECR Avoidance	.008	.014	.052		
ECR Anxiety	.011	.017	.064		

Note. *N* = 184. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .009$, $F(1, 182) = 1.709$, $p = .193$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .232$, $F(23, 159) = 2.119$, $p = .004$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 2.112$, $p = .003$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 82 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Reducing Uncertainty about Rival-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.000	-.005
Sex	.041	.700	.004		
Step 2				.167	.041
Sex	-.372	.833	-.039		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.025	.296	-.010		
BFI Extraversion	-.127	.086	-.179		
BFI Openness	-.019	.074	-.024		
BFI Agreeableness	-.063	.093	-.072		
BFI Conscientiousness	.098	.079	.126		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.059	.118	.057		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.186	.176	.128		
SNAP-2 Aggression	-.028	.136	-.023		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.149	.163	-.098		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.084	.145	.060		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.127	.141	-.095		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.056	.094	.070		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.162	.139	-.125		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.192	.116	-.145		
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.042	.148	-.042		
DvC ^a	.573	.308	.218		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.083	.121	-.068		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.079	.127	.066		

Table 82—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Low Self-worth ^a	-.622	.351	-.246		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.056	.068	.090		
3VDI Love Dependence	.073	.073	.110		
ECR Avoidance	.011	.022	.048		
ECR Anxiety	.053	.028	.201		

Note. *N* = 184. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .000$, $F(1, 182) = 0.003$, $p = .954$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .167$, $F(23, 159) = 1.383$, $p = .126$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 1.325$, $p = .155$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 83 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Relationship Re-assessment-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.002	-.004
Sex	-.425	.759	-.041		
Step 2				.213	.095*
Sex	-.998	.878	-.097		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.119	.312	-.043		
BFI Extraversion	-.086	.091	-.112		
BFI Openness	-.043	.078	-.050		
BFI Agreeableness	.047	.098	.050		
BFI Conscientiousness	.150	.083	.178		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.071	.124	.064		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	-.102	.186	-.065		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.296	.144	.229*		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.422	.171	-.256*		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.049	.153	.032		
SNAP-2 Dependency	.047	.149	.033		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.021	.099	.024		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.028	.147	.020		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.109	.122	-.076		
SNAP-2 Detachment	.140	.155	.127		
DvC ^a	.709	.324	.249*		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.075	.128	-.056		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.160	.134	.123		

Table 83—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Low Self-worth ^a	-.644	.369	-.235		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.121	.072	.179		
3VDI Love Dependence	.078	.077	.108		
ECR Avoidance	.032	.024	.127		
ECR Anxiety	-.033	.029	-.115		

Note. *N* = 184. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .002$, $F(1, 182) = 0.313$, $p = .577$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .212$, $F(23, 159) = 1.861$, $p = .014$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 1.798$, $p = .018$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 84 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Equity Restoration through Retaliation-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.011	.006
Sex	-.915	.634	-.106		
Step 2				.366	.270**
Sex	-.438	.662	-.051		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.235	.235	-.102		
BFI Extraversion	-.019	.069	-.029		
BFI Openness	-.110	.059	-.151		
BFI Agreeableness	-.057	.074	-.072		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.024	.063	-.034		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.096	.093	.103		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.130	.140	.098		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.471	.108	.434**		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.253	.129	-.183		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.107	.115	.084		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.034	.112	-.028		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.052	.074	.072		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.184	.111	-.156		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.123	.092	.102		
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.072	.117	-.078		
DvC ^a	-.126	.245	-.053		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.316	.096	-.283**		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.131	.101	.120		

Table 84—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Low Self-worth ^a	-.173	.278	-.075		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.125	.054	.219*		
3VDI Love Dependence	.109	.058	.180		
ECR Avoidance	.015	.018	.069		
ECR Anxiety	.007	.022	.029		

Note. *N* = 184. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .011$, $F(1, 182) = 2.083$, $p = .151$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .355$, $F(23, 159) = 3.866$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 3.832$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 85 Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy Expression – Undergraduate Sample

	Surveillance & Competition	Rival Communication	Violence & Threats	Withdrawal	Affect. Integ. Comm.	Compensatory Restoration
Negative Emotionality ^a	.28**	.11*	.15**	.29**	.25**	.10*
BFI Extraversion	.06	.09	.08	-.01	.08	-.01
BFI Openness	-.03	.00	-.07	-.03	.09	.06
BFI Agreeableness	-.16**	-.14**	-.21**	-.15**	.07	.10
BFI Conscientiousness	-.03	-.07	-.17**	-.07	.25**	-.05
SNAP-2 MST	.24**	.18**	.22**	.24**	.09	.17**
SNAP-2 MAN	.19**	.25**	.29**	.13**	-.11*	.13*
SNAP-2 AGG	.28**	.30**	.39**	.12*	.04	.06
SNAP-2 SFH	.17**	.12*	.27**	.17**	-.01	.10
SNAP-2 EP	.17**	.18**	.20**	.15**	.07	.21**
SNAP-2 DEP	.13**	-.01	.08	.12*	.07	.21**
SNAP-2 PT	-.00	.07	-.05	-.08	.14**	.06

Table 85—continued

	Surveillance & Competition	Rival Communication	Violence & Threats	Withdrawal	Affect. Integ. Communication	Compensatory Restoration
SNAP-2 EXH	.18**	.16**	.14**	.07	.11*	.05
SNAP-2 ENT	.16**	.16**	.07	.06	.14**	.10*
SNAP-2 DET	.09	.07	.12*	.14**	-.04	.08
DvC ^a	.05	.11*	.21**	.08	-.23**	.04
SNAP-2 PRO	.20**	.14**	.01	.15**	.18**	.14**
SNAP-2 WRK	.07	.11*	.06	.09	.15**	.01
Low Self-worth ^a	.14**	.01	.13**	.26**	-.05	.16**
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.20**	.05	.01	.21**	.22**	.36**
3VDI Love Dep.	.14**	.06	-.08	.05	.30**	.21**
ECR Avoidance	.12*	.15**	.36**	.25**	-.28**	-.10
ECR Anxiety	.43**	.21**	.19**	.33**	.20**	.39**

Note. N = 400. Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close

Table 85—continued

Relationships; MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG = Aggression; SFH = Self-Harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; PT = Positive Temperament; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence; Love Dep. = Love Dependence.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 86 Bivariate Correlations between Personality Predictors and Jealousy Expression – Community Resident Sample

	Surveillance & Competition	Rival Communication	Violence & Threats	Withdrawal	Affect. Integ. Communication	Compensatory Restoration
Negative Emotionality ^a	.22**	.05	.20**	.15*	.10	.07
BFI Extraversion	.09	.06	.02	.06	.14	.00
BFI Openness	-.06	.05	-.09	-.08	-.03	-.11
BFI Agreeableness	-.24**	-.15*	-.28**	-.12	-.04	.09
BFI Conscientiousness	-.02	.06	-.03	.13	.04	.05
SNAP-2 MST	.19**	.16*	.28**	.27**	.04	.18*
SNAP-2 MAN	.24**	.08	.32**	.08	.03	-.05
SNAP-2 AGG	.25**	.15*	.47**	.19*	.06	-.06
SNAP-2 SFH	.13	.05	.29**	.02	-.04	.11
SNAP-2 EP	.18*	.18*	.21**	.18*	.11	.09
SNAP-2 DEP	-.04	-.13	.14	-.11	-.02	.14
SNAP-2 PT	.12	.13	-.01	.14	.21**	.01

Table 86—continued

	Surveillance & Competition	Rival Communication	Violence & Threats	Withdrawal	Integrative Communication	Compensatory Restoration
SNAP-2 EXH	.10	-.02	.12	-.00	.09	-.07
SNAP-2 ENT	.15	.12	.19**	.09	.11	-.03
SNAP-2 DET	.02	.09	.07	.11	-.14	.01
DvC ^a	.14	.03	.23**	.06	.06	-.06
SNAP-2 PRO	-.10	-.03	-.04	.06	.03	.25**
SNAP-2 WRK	.21**	.28**	.07	.25**	.14	.10
Low Self-worth ^a	.06	-.07	.14	.06	-.04	.15*
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.09	.01	.00	-.01	.14	.25**
3VDI Love Dep.	.11	-.00	-.01	-.03	.15*	.11
ECR Avoidance	.17*	.04	.16*	.28**	-.17*	-.10
ECR Anxiety	.37**	.23**	.22**	.22**	.16*	.27**

Note. $N = 184$. Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependency Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close

Table 86—continued

Relationships; MST = Mistrust; MAN = Manipulativeness; AGG = Aggression; SFH = Self-Harm; EP = Eccentric Perceptions; DEP = Dependency; PT = Positive Temperament; EXH = Exhibitionism; ENT = Entitlement; DET = Detachment; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; PRO = Propriety; WRK = Workaholism; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence; Love Dep. = Love Dependence.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 87 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.013	.006
Sex	-3.806	1.688	-.115*		
Relationship Status	-.064	1.850	-.002		
Distance from Partner	.405	1.675	.012		
Step 2				.308	.260**
Sex	-2.822	1.825	-.085		
Relationship Status	1.066	1.784	.030		
Distance from Partner	.124	1.518	.004		
Negative Emotionality ^a	.250	.610	.029		
BFI Extraversion	.022	.185	.008		
BFI Openness	.018	.141	.007		
BFI Agreeableness	-.141	.193	-.046		
BFI Conscientiousness	.074	.199	.025		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	-.049	.236	-.012		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.313	.291	.069		
SNAP-2 Aggression	1.138	.263	.268**		
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.279	.430	.038		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.185	.311	-.034		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.510	.274	-.117		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.018	.187	.006		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.192	.261	.043		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.372	.272	.074		

Table 87—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
SNAP-2 Detachment	.053	.334	.012		
DvC ^a	-.376	.635	-.043		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.826	.218	.203**		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.589	.264	-.138*		
Low Self-worth ^a	-.800	.367	-.088		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.309	.136	.152*		
3VDI Love Dep.	-.055	.164	-.021		
ECR Avoidance	.065	.053	.069		
ECR Anxiety	.274	.050	.327**		

Note. *N* = 400. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .013$, $F(3, 396) = 1.746$, $p = .157$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .295$, $F(23, 373) = 6.917$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 6.390$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 88 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Rival Communication-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.012	.004
Sex	.934	.735	.065		
Relationship Status	-.999	.805	-.064		
Distance from Partner	-.857	.729	-.059		
Step 2				.217	.163**
Sex	.462	.844	.032		
Relationship Status	-.264	.825	-.017		
Distance from Partner	-.552	.702	-.038		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.241	.282	-.063		
BFI Extraversion	.045	.085	.035		
BFI Openness	-.030	.065	-.025		
BFI Agreeableness	.039	.089	.030		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.070	.092	-.053		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.024	.109	.014		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.274	.134	.139*		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.543	.122	.294**		
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.077	.199	.024		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.015	.144	-.006		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.291	.127	-.154*		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.056	.087	.044		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.060	.121	.030		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.046	.126	.021		

Table 88—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
SNAP-2 Detachment	.140	.155	.070		
DvC ^a	-.260	.294	-.068		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.287	.101	.163**		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.012	.122	-.007		
Low Self-worth ^a	-.334	.308	-.085		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.065	.063	.074		
3VDI Love Dep.	.117	.076	.102		
ECR Avoidance	.041	.024	.101		
ECR Anxiety	.053	.023	.145*		

Note. *N* = 400. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .012$, $F(3, 396) = 1.576$, $p = .195$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .205$, $F(23, 373) = 4.255$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 3.980$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 89 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Violence & Threats-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.016	.008
Sex	.402	.612	.033		
Relationship Status	-.966	.670	-.074		
Distance from Partner	.962	.607	.080		
Step 2				.292	.243**
Sex	-.518	.670	-.043		
Relationship Status	.743	.655	.057		
Distance from Partner	.903	.557	.075		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.126	.224	-.040		
BFI Extraversion	.090	.068	.085		
BFI Openness	-.069	.052	-.069		
BFI Agreeableness	.087	.071	.079		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.078	.073	-.072		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	-.033	.087	-.023		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.145	.107	.088		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.528	.097	.342**		
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.276	.158	.103		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.086	.114	.043		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.002	.101	-.001		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.039	.069	.037		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.093	.096	.057		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.062	.100	-.034		

Table 89—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
SNAP-2 Detachment	.059	.123	.035		
DvC ^a	-.271	.233	-.085		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.123	.080	.083		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.044	.097	-.029		
Low Self-worth ^a	-.239	.245	-.073		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.041	.050	.055		
3VDI Love Dep.	-.017	.060	-.017		
ECR Avoidance	.110	.019	.323**		
ECR Anxiety	.007	.018	.023		

Note. *N* = 400. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .016$, $F(3, 396) = 2.122$, $p = .097$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .276$, $F(23, 373) = 6.331$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 5.921$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 90 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Withdrawal-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.031	.024**
Sex	-3.075	.879	-.179**		
Relationship Status	-1.317	.963	-.069		
Distance from Partner	.018	.872	.001		
Step 2				.225	.171**
Sex	-2.132	1.015	-.122*		
Relationship Status	.309	.992	.016		
Distance from Partner	-.431	.844	-.025		
Negative Emotionality ^a	.573	.339	.124		
BFI Extraversion	.067	.103	.044		
BFI Openness	.053	.079	.036		
BFI Agreeableness	-.154	.107	-.097		
BFI Conscientiousness	.090	.111	.057		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	-.017	.132	-.008		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.067	.162	.028		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.040	.146	.018		
SNAP-2 Self-harm	-.130	.239	-.034		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	-.121	.173	-.042		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.319	.153	-.140*		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	-.114	.104	-.075		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.016	.145	-.007		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.099	.151	.038		

Table 90—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.071	.186	-.029		
DvC ^a	.567	.353	.123		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.343	.121	.161**		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.017	.147	-.008		
Low Self-worth ^a	.267	.371	.056		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.194	.076	.182*		
3VDI Love Dep.	-.074	.091	-.053		
ECR Avoidance	.098	.029	.200**		
ECR Anxiety	.067	.028	.152*		

Note. *N* = 400. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .031$, $F(3, 396) = 4.262$, $p = .006$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .194$, $F(23, 373) = 4.056$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 4.168$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 91 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.135	.128**
Sex	-3.769	.746	-.241**		
Relationship Status	3.486	.818	.205**		
Distance from Partner	-1.423	.740	-.091		
Step 2				.303	.254
Sex	-1.888	.865	-.121*		
Relationship Status	1.535	.846	.090		
Distance from Partner	-1.328	.719	-.085		
Negative Emotionality ^a	.633	.289	.153*		
BFI Extraversion	-.068	.088	-.049		
BFI Openness	.090	.067	.069		
BFI Agreeableness	.008	.091	.006		
BFI Conscientiousness	.173	.094	.122		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	-.007	.112	-.004		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	-.073	.138	-.034		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.270	.125	.135*		
SNAP-2 Self-harm	.169	.204	.049		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.030	.147	.011		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.166	.130	-.081		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.061	.089	.045		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	.156	.124	.073		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.140	.129	.059		

Table 91—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
SNAP-2 Detachment	.108	.158	.050		
DvC ^a	-.317	.301	-.076		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.045	.104	.023		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.147	.125	-.073		
Low Self-worth ^a	-.531	.316	-.124		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.147	.065	.153*		
3VDI Love Dep.	.049	.078	.040		
ECR Avoidance	-.079	.025	-.178**		
ECR Anxiety	.051	.024	.129*		

Note. *N* = 400. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .135$, $F(3, 396) = 20.576$, $p < .001$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .168$, $F(23, 373) = 3.900$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 6.224$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 92 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.008	.000
Sex	.883	.884	.051		
Relationship Status	.110	.968	.006		
Distance from Partner	-1.284	.877	-.074		
Step 2				.310	.262**
Sex	2.329	.951	.134*		
Relationship Status	-.579	.930	-.031		
Distance from Partner	-.808	.791	-.047		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.618	.318	-.135		
BFI Extraversion	.030	.096	.020		
BFI Openness	.065	.074	.045		
BFI Agreeableness	.164	.100	.103		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.008	.104	-.005		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.098	.123	.048		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.002	.152	.001		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.284	.137	.128*		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.078	.224	.020		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.143	.162	.050		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.073	.143	-.032		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.206	.098	.137*		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.081	.136	-.034		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.120	.142	.046		

Table 92—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
SNAP-2 Detachment	.379	.174	.158*		
DvC ^a	.074	.331	.016		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.173	.114	.082		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.242	.138	-.108		
Low Self-worth ^a	.194	.348	.041		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.237	.071	.224**		
3VDI Love Dep.	-.021	.086	-.015		
ECR Avoidance	-.113	.028	-.231**		
ECR Anxiety	.157	.026	.359**		

Note. *N* = 400. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .008$, $F(3, 396) = 1.012$, $p = .387$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .302$, $F(23, 373) = 7.108$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(26, 373) = 6.446$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 93 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.026	.020*
Sex	-6.053	2.758	-.161*		
Step 2				.307	.202**
Sex	-5.723	3.032	-.152		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.312	1.076	-.031		
BFI Extraversion	.020	.314	.007		
BFI Openness	-.491	.269	-.154		
BFI Agreeableness	-.276	.337	-.080		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.066	.288	-.021		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.042	.428	.010		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.811	.641	.140		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.132	.496	.028		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.187	.592	.031		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.145	.529	.026		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.601	.514	-.114		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.322	.341	.101		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.036	.507	-.007		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.174	.423	.033		
SNAP-2 Detachment	.183	.537	.045		
DvC ^a	.390	1.121	.037		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.684	.441	-.139		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.532	.462	.111		

Table 93—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Low Self-worth ^a	-2.539	1.276	-.252*		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.218	.248	.087		
3VDI Love Dependence	.352	.267	.132		
ECR Avoidance	.118	.081	.126		
ECR Anxiety	.333	.101	.320**		

Note. *N* = 184. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .026$, $F(1, 182) = 4.817$, $p = .029$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .281$, $F(23, 159) = 2.801$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 2.930$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 94 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Rival Communication-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.000	-.005
Sex	.249	1.221	.015		
Step 2				.211	.092*
Sex	.094	1.413	.006		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.568	.502	-.129		
BFI Extraversion	.070	.146	.057		
BFI Openness	-.080	.125	-.058		
BFI Agreeableness	-.073	.157	-.048		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.022	.134	-.017		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.180	.200	.100		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.030	.299	.012		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.095	.231	.046		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.081	.276	.030		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.144	.247	.059		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.191	.240	-.083		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.088	.159	.063		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.418	.236	-.186		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.178	.197	.077		
SNAP-2 Detachment	.109	.250	.062		
DvC ^a	.119	.522	.026		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.273	.205	-.127		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.376	.215	.180		

Table 94—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Low Self-worth ^a	-1.026	.595	-.233		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.052	0.115	.048		
3VDI Love Dependence	.035	.124	.030		
ECR Avoidance	-.025	.038	-.062		
ECR Anxiety	.136	.047	.299**		

Note. $N = 184$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .000$, $F(1, 182) = 0.042$, $p = .838$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .211$, $F(23, 159) = 1.848$, $p = .015$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 1.773$, $p = .020$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 95 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Violence & Threats-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.010	.004
Sex	-1.217	.921	-.097		
Step 2				.305	.200**
Sex	-1.297	1.006	-.104		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.570	.357	-.171		
BFI Extraversion	.005	.104	.005		
BFI Openness	-.131	.089	-.124		
BFI Agreeableness	-.068	.112	-.060		
BFI Conscientiousness	.046	.095	.045		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	-.034	.142	-.025		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.098	.213	.051		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.632	.164	.401**		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.340	.196	.169		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.059	.175	.032		
SNAP-2 Dependency	.169	.171	.097		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.024	.113	.023		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.079	.168	-.046		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.282	.140	.161*		
SNAP-2 Detachment	.013	.178	.009		
DvC ^a	.025	.372	.007		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.058	.146	-.036		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	-.016	.153	-.010		

Table 95—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Low Self-worth ^a	-.226	.423	-.068		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.032	.082	.039		
3VDI Love Dependence	.037	.088	.042		
ECR Avoidance	.012	.027	.037		
ECR Anxiety	.021	.033	.061		

Note. *N* = 184. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .010$, $F(1, 182) = 1.746$, $p = .188$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .296$, $F(23, 159) = 2.943$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 2.911$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 96 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Withdrawal-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.014	.009
Sex	-2.183	1.356	-.119		
Step 2				.270	.160**
Sex	-2.212	1.520	-.120		
Negative Emotionality ^a	.012	.540	.003		
BFI Extraversion	.091	.157	.066		
BFI Openness	-.167	.135	-.107		
BFI Agreeableness	.158	.169	.093		
BFI Conscientiousness	.093	.144	.062		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.332	.215	.166		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	.082	.322	.029		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.061	.249	.026		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.460	.297	-.155		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.241	.265	.088		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.329	.258	-.127		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.266	.171	.170		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.207	.254	-.083		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.034	.212	.013		
SNAP-2 Detachment	.169	.269	.085		
DvC ^a	.431	.562	.084		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.026	.221	.011		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.166	.232	.071		

Table 96—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Low Self-worth ^a	-.045	.640	-.009		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	-.033	.124	-.027		
3VDI Love Dependence	.064	.134	.049		
ECR Avoidance	.125	.041	.273**		
ECR Anxiety	.079	.051	.155		

Note. *N* = 184. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .014$, $F(1, 182) = 2.592$, $p = .109$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .256$, $F(23, 159) = 2.421$, $p = .001$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 2.447$, $p = .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 97 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.042	.037**
Sex	-3.067	1.088	-.205**		
Step 2				.188	.066
Sex	-2.132	1.305	-.142		
Negative Emotionality ^a	.258	.463	.065		
BFI Extraversion	-.050	.135	-.045		
BFI Openness	-.124	.116	-.098		
BFI Agreeableness	-.119	.145	-.086		
BFI Conscientiousness	-.075	.124	-.061		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.016	.184	.010		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	-.173	.276	-.075		
SNAP-2 Aggression	.098	.213	.052		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	-.166	.255	-.069		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.133	.228	.059		
SNAP-2 Dependency	-.157	.221	.075		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.223	.147	.176		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.069	.218	-.034		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	.006	.182	.003		
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.139	.231	-.086		
DvC ^a	.596	.482	.143		
SNAP-2 Propriety	-.104	.190	-.053		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.170	.199	.090		

Table 97—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Low Self-worth ^a	-.371	.549	-.093		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.158	.106	.160		
3VDI Love Dependence	-.073	.115	-.069		
ECR Avoidance	-.076	.035	-.203*		
ECR Anxiety	.068	.043	.163		

Note. *N* = 184. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .042$, $F(1, 182) = 7.955$, $p = .005$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .146$, $F(23, 159) = 1.246$, $p = .214$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 1.536$, $p = .063$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 98 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Personality Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.018	.013
Sex	2.332	1.264	.136		
Step 2				.312	.209**
Sex	5.541	1.379	.322**		
Negative Emotionality ^a	-.443	.489	-.096		
BFI Extraversion	.129	.143	.100		
BFI Openness	-.313	.122	-.215*		
BFI Agreeableness	.217	.153	.137		
BFI Conscientiousness	.054	.131	.038		
SNAP-2 Mistrust	.206	.195	.110		
SNAP-2 Manipulativeness	-.303	.292	-.114		
SNAP-2 Aggression	-.103	.225	-.047		
SNAP-2 Self-Harm	.235	.269	.085		
SNAP-2 Eccentric Perceptions	.290	.241	.113		
SNAP-2 Dependency	.032	.234	.013		
SNAP-2 Positive Temperament	.047	.155	.032		
SNAP-2 Exhibitionism	-.116	.230	-.049		
SNAP-2 Entitlement	-.015	.192	-.006		
SNAP-2 Detachment	-.176	.244	-.095		
DvC ^a	-.258	.510	-.054		
SNAP-2 Propriety	.267	.200	.119		
SNAP-2 Workaholism	.019	.210	.009		

Table 98—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Low Self-worth ^a	.438	.580	.095		
3VDI Exploit. Dep.	.164	.113	.144		
3VDI Love Dependence	-.185	.121	-.152		
ECR Avoidance	-.076	.037	-.178*		
ECR Anxiety	.178	.046	.375**		

Note. $N = 184$. BFI = Big Five Inventory; SNAP-2 = Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality-2nd Edition; 3VDI = Three Vector Dependence Inventory; ECR = Experiences in Close Relationships; DvC = Disinhibition versus Constraint; Exploit. Dep. = Exploitable Dependence. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .018$, $F(1, 182) = 3.404$, $p = .067$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .294$, $F(23, 159) = 2.957$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(24, 159) = 3.010$, $p < .001$.

^aMean of two standardized correlated predictors.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 99 Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Expression and Jealousy Experience – Undergraduate Sample

	Surveillance & Comp.	Rival Comm.	Violence & Threats	Withdrawal	Affect. Integ. Comm.	Comp. Restoration
Suspicion of Partner	.40**	.31**	.39**	.26**	.06	.15**
Worry over Rival	.38**	.24**	.06	.22**	.26**	.24**
Anger	.55**	.36**	.22**	.43**	.36**	.25**
Fear	.45**	.21**	.14**	.39**	.37**	.45**
Guilt	.39**	.27**	.27**	.39**	.27**	.43**
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.04	.07	.22**	-.02	-.03	.09

Note. $N = 400$. Surveillance & Comp. = Surveillance & Competition; Rival Comm. = Rival Communication; Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; Comp. Restoration = Compensatory Restoration.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 100 Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Expression and Jealousy Experience – Community Resident Sample

	Surveillance & Comp.	Rival Comm.	Violence & Threats	Withdrawal	Affect. Integ. Comm.	Comp. Restoration
Suspicion of Partner	.44**	.21**	.16*	.32**	.16*	.07
Worry over Rival	.46**	.31**	.06	.31**	.24**	.18*
Anger	.61**	.39**	.28**	.50**	.30**	.13
Fear	.38**	.21**	.11	.40**	.21**	.28**
Guilt	.34**	.28**	.12	.39**	.15*	.40**
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.08	-.02	.33**	.14	.05	.15*

Note. $N = 184$. Surveillance & Comp. = Surveillance & Competition; Rival Comm. = Rival Communication; Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; Comp. Restoration = Compensatory Restoration.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 101 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.013	.006
Sex	-3.806	1.688	-.115*		
Relationship Status	-.064	1.850	-.002		
Distance from Partner	.405	1.675	.012		
Step 2				.449	.436**
Sex	-2.610	1.325	-.079		
Relationship Status	1.254	1.427	.035		
Distance from Partner	1.221	1.275	.037		
Suspicion of Partner	1.492	.291	.226**		
Worry over Rival	.598	.221	.120**		
Anger	.889	.099	.438**		
Fear	.366	.141	.141*		
Guilt	-.052	.133	-.020		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.365	.086	.172**		

Note. $N = 400$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .013$, $F(3, 396) = 1.746$, $p = .157$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .436$, $F(6, 390) = 51.380$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(9, 390) = 35.279$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 102 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Rival Communication-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.012	.004
Sex	.934	.735	.065		
Relationship Status	-.999	.805	-.064		
Distance from Partner	-.857	.729	-.059		
Step 2				.219	.201**
Sex	1.085	.686	.075		
Relationship Status	-.520	.739	-.033		
Distance from Partner	-.711	.660	-.049		
Suspicion of Partner	.475	.151	.165**		
Worry over Rival	.139	.115	.064		
Anger	.308	.051	.349**		
Fear	-.060	.073	-.053		
Guilt	.078	.069	.071		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.117	.045	.127**		

Note. $N = 400$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .012$, $F(3, 396) = 1.576$, $p = .195$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .207$, $F(6, 390) = 17.253$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(9, 390) = 12.156$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 103 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Violence & Threats-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.016	.008
Sex	.402	.612	.033		
Relationship Status	-.966	.670	-.074		
Distance from Partner	.962	.607	.080		
Step 2				.261	.244**
Sex	-.076	.557	-.006		
Relationship Status	-.082	.600	-.006		
Distance from Partner	.987	.536	.082		
Suspicion of Partner	.861	.122	.359**		
Worry over Rival	-.278	.093	-.154**		
Anger	.145	.042	.197**		
Fear	-.034	.059	-.036		
Guilt	.119	.056	.129*		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.182	.036	.237**		

Note. $N = 400$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .016$, $F(3, 396) = 2.122$, $p = .097$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .245$, $F(6, 390) = 21.547$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(9, 390) = 15.292$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 104 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Withdrawal-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.031	.024**
Sex	-3.075	.879	-.176**		
Relationship Status	-1.317	.963	-.069		
Distance from Partner	.018	.872	.001		
Step 2				.266	.249**
Sex	-2.200	.804	-.126**		
Relationship Status	-.754	.865	-.040		
Distance from Partner	.110	.773	.006		
Suspicion of Partner	.459	.177	.132*		
Worry over Rival	.045	.134	.017		
Anger	.293	.060	.274**		
Fear	.159	.086	.116		
Guilt	.158	.081	.119		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.090	.052	.081		

Note. $N = 400$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .031$, $F(3, 396) = 4.262$, $p = .006$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .235$, $F(6, 390) = 20.763$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(9, 390) = 15.688$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 105 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.135	.128**
Sex	-3.769	.746	-.241**		
Relationship Status	3.486	.818	.205**		
Distance from Partner	-1.423	.740	-.091		
Step 2				.299	.283**
Sex	-3.018	.705	-.193**		
Relationship Status	3.515	.760	.206**		
Distance from Partner	-1.089	.679	-.069		
Suspicion of Partner	-.196	.155	-.063		
Worry over Rival	.405	.118	.173**		
Anger	.200	.053	.209**		
Fear	.179	.075	.146*		
Guilt	.058	.071	.049		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.106	.046	.106*		

Note. $N = 400$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .135$, $F(3, 396) = 20.576$, $p < .001$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .164$, $F(6, 390) = 15.253$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(9, 390) = 18.508$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 106 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.008	.000
Sex	.883	.884	.051		
Relationship Status	.110	.968	.006		
Distance from Partner	-1.284	.877	-.074		
Step 2				.270	.253**
Sex	2.046	.796	.118*		
Relationship Status	.714	.857	.038		
Distance from Partner	-.923	.766	-.053		
Suspicion of Partner	-.102	.175	-.030		
Worry over Rival	.243	.133	.094		
Anger	-.019	.060	-.018		
Fear	.413	.085	.305**		
Guilt	.319	.080	.242**		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.119	.052	.108*		

Note. $N = 400$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .008$, $F(3, 396) = 1.012$, $p = .387$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .263$, $F(6, 390) = 23.402$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(9, 390) = 16.053$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 107 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.026	.020*
Sex	-6.053	2.758	-.161*		
Step 2				.486	.465**
Sex	-4.051	2.109	-.107		
Suspicion of Partner	1.363	.475	.203**		
Worry over Rival	.559	.421	.097		
Anger	1.083	.171	.500**		
Fear	-.116	.256	-.038		
Guilt	.254	.207	.091		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.427	.167	.144*		

Note. $N = 184$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .026$, $F(1, 182) = 4.817$, $p = .029$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .460$, $F(6, 176) = 26.226$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(7, 176) = 23.740$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 108 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Rival Communication-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.000	-.005
Sex	.249	1.221	.015		
Step 2				.192	.160**
Sex	.354	1.154	.021		
Suspicion of Partner	.111	.260	.038		
MJSC Rival Worry	.334	.231	.133		
Anger	.304	.094	.321**		
Fear	-.186	.140	-.137		
Guilt	.212	.114	.174		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.011	.091	.008		

Note. $N = 184$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .000$, $F(1, 182) = 0.042$, $p = .838$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .192$, $F(6, 176) = 6.976$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(7, 176) = 5.986$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 109 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Violence & Threats-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.010	.004
Sex	-1.217	.921	-.097		
Step 2				.253	.223**
Sex	-.846	.842	-.068		
Suspicion of Partner	.233	.190	.105		
Worry over Rival	-.369	.168	-.194*		
Anger	.324	.068	.451**		
Fear	-.091	.102	-.089		
Guilt	-.008	.083	-.009		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.382	.067	.390**		

Note. $N = 184$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .010$, $F(1, 182) = 1.746$, $p = .188$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .243$, $F(6, 176) = 9.547$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(7, 176) = 8.503$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 110 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Withdrawal-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.014	.009
Sex	-2.183	1.356	-.119		
Step 2				.352	.326**
Sex	-1.338	1.157	-.073		
Suspicion of Partner	.630	.261	.192*		
Worry over Rival	-.067	.231	-.024		
Anger	.361	.094	.341**		
Fear	.085	.141	.056		
Guilt	.257	.114	.189*		
Joy / Sexual Arousal	.268	.092	.186**		

Note. $N = 184$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .014$, $F(1, 182) = 2.592$, $p = .109$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .338$, $F(6, 176) = 15.287$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(7, 176) = 13.648$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 111 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.042	.037**
Sex	-3.067	1.088	-.205**		
Step 2				.147	.113**
Sex	-2.664	1.080	-.178*		
Suspicion of Partner	-.067	.243	-.025		
Worry over Rival	.320	.216	.140		
Anger	.210	.088	.243*		
Fear	.021	.131	.017		
Guilt	-.010	.106	-.009		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.111	.085	.095		

Note. $N = 184$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .042$, $F(1, 182) = 7.955$, $p = .005$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .105$, $F(6, 176) = 3.621$, $p = .002$. Final model: $F(7, 176) = 4.339$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 112 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Experience Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.018	.013
Sex	2.332	1.264	.136		
Step 2				.229	.199**
Sex	2.442	1.178	.142*		
Suspicion of Partner	.064	.265	.021		
Worry over Rival	.325	.235	.124		
Anger	-.192	.096	-.194*		
Fear	.295	.143	.209*		
Guilt	.418	.116	.329**		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.182	.093	.135		

Note. $N = 184$. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .018$, $F(1, 182) = 3.404$, $p = .067$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .211$, $F(6, 176) = 8.037$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(7, 176) = 7.488$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 113 Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Expression and Jealousy-Related Goals – Undergraduate Sample

	Surveillance & Comp.	Rival Comm.	Violence & Threats	Withdrawal	Affect. Integ. Comm.	Comp. Restoration
Relationship Maintenance	.23**	.19**	-.05	.09	.35**	.48**
Self-Esteem Preservation	.25**	.25**	.09	.20**	.19**	.23**
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.47**	.38**	.09	.22**	.27**	.37**
Relationship Re-assessment	.39**	.34**	.17**	.33**	.14**	.17**
Equity Restor. Retal.	.51**	.36**	.52**	.39**	.09	.13*

Note. $N = 400$. Surveillance & Comp. = Surveillance & Competition; Rival Comm. = Rival Communication; Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; Comp. Restoration = Compensatory Restoration; Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 114 Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Expression and Jealousy-Related Goals – Community Resident Sample

	Surveillance & Comp.	Rival Comm.	Violence & Threats	Withdrawal	Affect. Integ. Comm.	Comp. Restoration
Relationship Maintenance	.06	.02	-.14	-.02	.21**	.31**
Self-Esteem Preservation	.30**	.18*	.14	.23**	.24**	.17*
Reduce Uncertainty – Rival	.47**	.42**	-.00	.28**	.22**	.14
Relationship Re-assessment	.28**	.28**	.05	.22**	.15*	.05
Equity Restor. Retal.	.61**	.38**	.51**	.43**	.20**	-.05

Note. $N = 184$. Surveillance & Comp. = Surveillance & Competition; Rival Comm. = Rival Communication; Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication; Comp. Restoration = Compensatory Restoration; Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 115 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.013	.006
Sex	-3.806	1.688	-.115*		
Relationship Status	-.064	1.850	-.002		
Distance from Partner	.405	1.675	.012		
Step 2				.381	.368**
Sex	-1.945	1.361	-.059		
Relationship Status	2.159	1.497	.060		
Distance from Partner	2.220	1.350	.067		
Relationship Maintenance	.238	.174	.065		
Self-Esteem Preservation	-.192	.268	-.034		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.937	.174	.275**		
Relationship Re-assessment	.373	.177	.107*		
Equity Restor. Retal.	1.598	.186	.387**		

Note. $N = 400$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .013$, $F(3, 396) = 1.746$, $p = .157$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .368$, $F(5, 391) = 46.465$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(8, 391) = 30.071$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 116 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Rival Communication-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.012	.004
Sex	.934	.735	.065		
Relationship Status	-.999	.805	-.064		
Distance from Partner	-.857	.729	-.059		
Step 2				.236	.220**
Sex	1.682	.658	.117*		
Relationship Status	-.162	.723	-.010		
Distance from Partner	-.224	.652	-.016		
Relationship Maintenance	.087	.084	.054		
Self-Esteem Preservation	.089	.129	.036		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.322	.084	.217**		
Relationship Re-assessment	.179	.085	.118*		
Equity Restor. Retal.	.416	.090	.232**		

Note. $N = 400$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .012$, $F(3, 396) = 1.576$, $p = .195$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .224$, $F(5, 391) = 22.955$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(8, 391) = 15.102$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 117 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Violence & Threats-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.016	.008
Sex	.402	.612	.033		
Relationship Status	-.966	.670	-.074		
Distance from Partner	.962	.607	.080		
Step 2				.299	.284**
Sex	.401	.526	.033		
Relationship Status	-.578	.578	-.044		
Distance from Partner	1.486	.522	.123**		
Relationship Maintenance	-.013	.067	-.010		
Self-Esteem Preservation	-.049	.103	-.024		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	-.092	.067	-.075		
Relationship Re-assessment	-.003	.068	-.002		
Equity Restor. Retal.	.839	.072	.560**		

Note. $N = 400$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .016$, $F(3, 396) = 2.122$, $p = .097$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .283$, $F(5, 391) = 31.557$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(8, 391) = 20.826$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 118 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Withdrawal-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.031	.024**
Sex	-3.075	.879	-.176**		
Relationship Status	-1.317	.963	-.069		
Distance from Partner	.018	.872	.001		
Step 2				.207	.191**
Sex	-2.607	.810	-.150**		
Relationship Status	-.358	.890	-.019		
Distance from Partner	.731	.803	.042		
Relationship Maintenance	.019	.103	.010		
Self-Esteem Preservation	.045	.159	.015		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.019	.103	.010		
Relationship Re-assessment	.328	.105	.178**		
Equity Restor. Retal.	.664	.111	.306**		

Note. *N* = 400. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .031$, $F(3, 396) = 4.262$, $p = .006$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .176$, $F(5, 391) = 17.375$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(8, 391) = 12.788$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 119 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.135	.128**
Sex	-3.769	.746	-.241**		
Relationship Status	3.486	.818	.205**		
Distance from Partner	-1.423	.740	-.091		
Step 2				.243	.228**
Sex	-2.994	.711	-.191**		
Relationship Status	3.643	.781	.214**		
Distance from Partner	-.867	.705	-.055		
Relationship Maintenance	.400	.091	.229**		
Self-Esteem Preservation	.106	.140	.039		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.207	.091	.129*		
Relationship Re-assessment	.001	.092	.001		
Equity Restor. Retal.	.053	.097	.027		

Note. $N = 400$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .135$, $F(3, 396) = 20.576$, $p < .001$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .108$, $F(5, 391) = 11.195$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(8, 391) = 15.706$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 120 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.008	.000
Sex	.883	.884	.051		
Relationship Status	.110	.968	.006		
Distance from Partner	-1.284	.877	-.074		
Step 2				.285	.271**
Sex	2.196	.764	.127**		
Relationship Status	.133	.840	.007		
Distance from Partner	-.305	.757	-.018		
Relationship Maintenance	.790	.097	.410**		
Self-Esteem Preservation	.106	.150	.036		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.360	.098	.202**		
Relationship Re-assessment	-.129	.099	-.070		
Equity Restor. Retal.	.134	.104	.062		

Note. $N = 400$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .008$, $F(3, 396) = 1.012$, $p = .387$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .278$, $F(5, 391) = 30.386$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(8, 391) = 19.512$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 121 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Surveillance & Competition-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.026	.020*
Sex	-6.053	2.758	-.161*		
Step 2				.449	.431**
Sex	-3.907	2.130	-.104		
Relationship Maintenance	-.071	.300	-.015		
Self-Esteem Preservation	.715	.385	.115		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	1.087	.277	.273**		
Relationship Re-assessment	-.326	.244	-.089		
Equity Restor. Retal.	2.121	.300	.484**		

Note. $N = 184$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .026$, $F(1, 182) = 4.817$, $p = .029$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .423$, $F(5, 177) = 27.216$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(6, 177) = 24.061$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 122 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Rival Communication-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.000	-.005
Sex	.249	1.221	.015		
Step 2				.235	.209**
Sex	.633	1.097	.038		
Relationship Maintenance	-.162	.155	-.077		
Self-Esteem Preservation	.138	.198	.051		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.558	.143	.320**		
Relationship Re-assessment	.060	.126	.037		
Equity Restor. Retal.	.408	.155	.213**		

Note. $N = 184$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .000$, $F(1, 182) = 0.042$, $p = .838$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .234$, $F(5, 177) = 10.844$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(6, 177) = 9.045$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 123 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Violence & Threats-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.010	.004
Sex	-1.217	.921	-.097		
Step 2				.329	.306**
Sex	-.394	.779	-.032		
Relationship Maintenance	-.041	.110	-.026		
Self-Esteem Preservation	.078	.141	.038		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	-.297	.101	-.225**		
Relationship Re-assessment	-.156	.089	-.128		
Equity Restor. Retal.	.929	.110	.640**		

Note. $N = 184$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .010$, $F(1, 182) = 1.746$, $p = .188$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .320$, $F(5, 177) = 16.870$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(6, 177) = 14.476$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 124 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealously-Related Goals Predicting Withdrawal-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.014	.009
Sex	-2.183	1.356	-.119		
Step 2				.211	.185**
Sex	-1.434	1.245	-.078		
Relationship Maintenance	-.163	.176	-.069		
Self-Esteem Preservation	.332	.225	.109		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.259	.162	.133		
Relationship Re-assessment	-.009	.143	-.005		
Equity Restor. Retal.	.702	.176	.328**		

Note. $N = 184$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .014$, $F(1, 182) = 2.592$, $p = .109$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .197$, $F(5, 177) = 8.857$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(6, 177) = 7.906$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 125 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Affective Integrative Communication-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.042	.037**
Sex	-3.067	1.088	-.205**		
Step 2				.140	.111**
Sex	-2.589	1.058	-.173*		
Relationship Maintenance	.271	.149	.141		
Self-Esteem Preservation	.319	.191	.129		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.165	.138	.104		
Relationship Re-assessment	-.017	.121	-.012		
Equity Restor. Retal.	.199	.149	.114		

Note. $N = 184$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .042$, $F(1, 182) = 7.955$, $p = .005$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .098$, $F(5, 177) = 4.038$, $p < .002$. Final model: $F(6, 177) = 4.801$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 126 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy-Related Goals Predicting Compensatory Restoration-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.018	.013
Sex	2.332	1.264	.136		
Step 2				.139	.110**
Sex	2.639	1.216	.153*		
Relationship Maintenance	.585	.171	.266**		
Self-Esteem Preservation	.355	.220	.125		
Red. Uncertain. Rival	.146	.158	.080		
Relationship Re-assessment	-.044	.139	-.026		
Equity Restor. Retal.	-.155	.171	-.078		

Note. $N = 184$. Red. Uncertain. Rival = Reducing Uncertainty about Rival; Equity Restor. Retal. = Equity Restoration through Retaliation. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .018$, $F(1, 182) = 3.404$, $p = .067$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .121$, $F(5, 177) = 4.977$, $p < .001$. Final model: $F(6, 177) = 4.776$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 127 Bivariate Correlations between Jealousy Experience and Jealousy Expression and Relationship Satisfaction

	Relationship Satisfaction	
	Undergraduates (<i>N</i> = 400)	Community Residents (<i>N</i> = 184)
Jealousy Experience		
Suspicion of Partner	-.38**	-.43**
Worry over Rival	-.16**	-.22**
Anger	-.06	-.10
Fear	-.03	-.01
Guilt	-.09	-.00
Joy/Sexual Arousal	-.07	-.14
Jealousy Expression		
Surveillance & Competition	-.20**	-.21**
Rival Communication	-.12*	-.06
Violence & Threats	-.23**	-.14
Withdrawal	-.19**	-.22**
Affect. Integ. Comm.	.11*	.06
Compensatory Restoration	-.03	-.02

Note. Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 128 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Expression & Experience Predicting Relationship Satisfaction-Undergraduate Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.101	.094**
Sex	-.132	.775	-.008		
Relationship Status	5.528	.849	.318**		
Distance from Partner	.419	.769	.026		
Step 2				.207	.188**
Sex	.404	.765	.025		
Relationship Status	4.548	.823	.262**		
Distance from Partner	.201	.736	.013		
Suspicion of Partner	-1.033	.168	-.325**		
Worry over Rival	-.020	.128	-.009		
Anger	-.038	.057	-.039		
Fear	.065	.082	.052		
Guilt	.003	.077	.003		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	-.028	.050	-.028		
Step 3				.244	.214**
Sex	.100	.802	.006		
Relationship Status	4.267	.839	.246**		
Distance from Partner	.677	.738	.042		
Suspicion of Partner	-.801	.179	-.252**		
Worry over Rival	-.053	.131	-.022		
Anger	.025	.063	.026		
Fear	.094	.085	.075		

Table 128—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Guilt	.000	.079	.000		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	.004	.079	.003		
Surveillance & Competition	-.103	.042	-.214*		
Rival Communication	.146	.076	.132		
Violence & Threats	-.098	.076	-.074		
Withdrawal	-.084	.050	-.091		
Affect. Int. Comm.	.115	.057	.113*		
Compensatory Restoration	.016	.053	.017		

Note. *N* = 400. Affect. Int. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .101$, $F(3, 396) = 14.809$, $p < .001$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .106$, $F(6, 390) = 8.676$, $p < .001$, Step 3: $\Delta R^2 = .037$, $F(6, 384) = 3.120$, $p = .005$. Final model: $F(15, 384) = 8.246$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 129 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Jealousy Expression and Jealousy Experience Predicting Relationship Satisfaction-Community Resident Sample

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	Adj. <i>R</i> ²
Step 1				.006	.001
Sex	-1.393	1.296	-.079		
Step 2				.212	.181**
Sex	-2.004	1.214	-.114		
Suspicion of Partner	-1.467	.273	-.470**		
Worry over Rival	.186	.243	.070		
Anger	-.010	.099	-.010		
Fear	-.018	.147	-.013		
Guilt	.012	.119	.009		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	-.140	.096	-.102		
Step 3				.256	.199**
Sex	-1.886	1.269	-.108		
Suspicion of Partner	-1.247	.283	-.400**		
Worry over Rival	.111	.249	.042		
Anger	.061	.112	.061		
Fear	.003	.149	.002		
Guilt	.065	.127	.050		
Joy/Sexual Arousal	-.068	.107	-.049		
Surveillance &	-.087	.058	-.186		
Competition					
Rival Communication	.098	.095	.092		
Violence & Threats	-.052	.117	-.037		

Table 129—continued

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	Adj. R^2
Withdrawal	-.131	.082	-.137		
Affect. Integ. Comm.	.235	.101	.200*		
Compensatory Restoration	-.040	.084	-.039		

Note. $N = 184$. Affect. Integ. Comm. = Affective Integrative Communication. Step 1: $\Delta R^2 = .006$, $F(1, 182) = 1.156$, $p = .284$, Step 2: $\Delta R^2 = .206$, $F(6, 176) = 7.664$, $p < .001$, Step 3: $\Delta R^2 = .043$, $F(6, 170) = 1.656$, $p = .135$. Final model: $F(13, 170) = 4.491$, $p < .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

DISCUSSION

This study was an attempt to investigate personality as an antecedent factor to the experience and expression of romantic jealousy. The assessment of jealousy followed the conceptualization of Guerrero and Andersen's (1998) Componential Model of Jealousy Experience and Expression. Analyses involved examining the relation between measures of personality and measures of each component in the model. This approach is based upon the arguments proposed by White and Mullen (1989)—that discrete elements of the jealousy complex should be linked to antecedent factors.

Previous research that examined the relation between personality and jealousy did not tend to break down jealousy into its discrete elements, instead using a single measure or factors derived through structural analyses that do not theoretically differentiate between the components of jealousy experience and expression. Even when this differentiation has been made while examining individual differences as an antecedent factor to jealousy, researchers tended to focus upon a limited set of variables (e.g., adult attachment styles). The present study attempts to both measure the discrete elements of jealousy and include a more comprehensive array of personality and individual difference measures within the same study.

Although personality is revealed to be an important antecedent to jealousy, it is difficult to provide a broad summary of the current study. One problem is that specific findings did not always replicate from the bivariate correlations to the regression analyses. Additionally, significant effects frequently did not replicate from one sample to the other. The following sections address these issues more specifically by examining each research question and hypothesis in turn. An additional section presents general integrated conclusions and discusses some implications of these findings. Although they may not hold in each sample or type of analyses, they do provide a general overview. Finally, limitations of the present study and suggested future directions are discussed.

In the following paragraphs, I will discuss the present results in relation to previous findings and the current hypotheses. Several of these hypotheses were developed under the assumption that specific elements of jealousy experience and expression would emerge in structural analyses. However, these elements did not always emerge or did not emerge as unique dimensions.

The Experience and Expression of Jealousy in the Current Study

The affective elements of jealousy experience were represented by four variables in the present study—anger, fear, guilt, and joy/sexual arousal. These variables essentially replicated the four variables utilized in Guerrero et al.'s (2005) first study. They are also all present in White and Mullen's (1989) theoretical affective elements of jealousy and Guerrero et al.'s second study. However, guilt did not emerge as a unique cluster in Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick's hierarchical cluster analysis and item content reflective of sexual arousal or positive affect did not appear to be part of the jealousy prototype of their participants.

Affective elements that have been supported by previous research that did not emerge in the present study include sadness and envy. As previously stated, sadness content tended to split across the other factors in structural analyses, whereas item content reflective of envy exhibited low communalities. Although uniquely present in White and Mullen's theoretical elements, envy did not emerge as a separate cluster or component in other previous research described. In Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick's analysis it was part of their idealized jealousy cluster, which included a variety of terms not subsumed by sadness, anger or fear. Envy did not emerge in Guerrero et al.'s first study and loaded with Fear in their second study. Participants in the present study may have been primed to disregard envy content as the questionnaire instructions provided a differentiation between romantic jealousy and envy over another's possessions, stating

explicitly that the former was of interest but the latter was not. As a result of envy not emerging as a separate factor or composing any of the content for the other factors, hypotheses regarding the role of envy—specifically a relation with self-esteem and in the context of cognitive social comparison with the rival—could not be evaluated.

The cognitive elements of jealousy experience were represented by two variables in the present study. The first assessed suspicion of the partner's involvement with someone else. The three items that compose this scale reflect belief in the partner's actual involvement with someone else and not just an attraction towards another, as those items did not replicate in the structural analyses. This may, in part, explain the relatively lower endorsement rate for this cognitive element of jealousy. The second cognitive jealousy scale assessed worry over a rival attempting to "poach" the partner. These two scales theoretically related to White and Mullen's conceptualization of primary appraisal—a process through which the individual assesses whether or not a threat to their relationship is present.

Guerrero and Afifi's (1999) jealousy-related goals, or functions, were not explicitly proposed as part of the jealousy experience; however, they are conceptually related and provide a parallel for White and Mullen's (1989) secondary appraisal categories (e.g. motives assessment, etc.). As in Guerrero and Afifi's original research, the goal of reducing uncertainty about the primary relationship did not emerge as a separate factor in the present study. Based upon reliability and discriminant correlations, however, they argued for retaining the scale. In the current study, the scale was not retained due to its inconsistent factor loadings across the two samples.

The fourteen scale CRJ was reduced to six scales in the present study to address the problem of poor discriminant validity between the scales. Although this content reduction does not allow for the finer theoretical distinctions proposed by the fourteen scales, it more accurately reflects the data and maintains some consistency with previous research and conceptualizations of jealousy expression or responses. For example,

Affective Integrative Communication and Compensatory Restoration fall into the category of partner-enhancing tactics in Rich's (1991) dichotomy and in D. M. Buss's (1988) category of positive inducements. These would also fall within constructive responses as presented in Table 4. The other four variables in the present study—(a) Surveillance and Competition, (b) Rival Communication, (c) Violence and Threats, and (d) Withdrawal—fall into Rich's category of partner-attacking tactics and D. M. Buss's direct guarding and negative inducements. Buss further distinguishes between intersexual and intrasexual negative inducements. This distinction is modeled in the current study by assessing Rival Communication as a separate factor.

As previously stated, some item content from the CRJ is not well represented in the current study. No items from Distributive Communication were retained within any of the current scales. Only one of the six Manipulation Attempt items was retained in the Surveillance and Competition scale. Only two items from Relationship Threats were retained. The denial content from the Avoidance/Denial scale also was not retained in the current study.

Personality as an Antecedent to Jealousy

Personality and Jealousy Experience

Guerrero (1998) found that individuals with attachment-based negative models of the self reported higher levels of cognitive jealousy than individuals with positive models of the self. Fear and Sadness tended to exhibit similar patterns in Guerrero's study. These results form the basis for hypothesis #4—that individuals reporting high ECR Anxiety will report higher levels of cognitive jealousy and jealousy-related fear and sadness than individuals low in ECR Anxiety. Although sadness did not emerge as a separate element of jealousy experience in the current study, the remainder of this hypothesis was supported. ECR Anxiety exhibited some of the strongest correlations with measures of cognitive jealousy and jealousy-related Fear and emerged as a

significant predictor in five of the relevant six regressions. However, this is qualified by the fact that ECR Anxiety also exhibited strong bivariate correlations with jealousy-related Anger and Guilt and was a significant predictor of these variables in three of the four relevant analyses. This provides substantial evidence of ECR Anxiety as a strong, nonspecific predictor of jealousy experience. Previous research has stated that the anxiety dimension of attachment tends to exhibit strong correlations with single measures of jealousy (Brennan et al., 1998). This seems to generalize to differentiated measures of the elements of jealousy experience as well. Although this is theoretically consistent with conceptualizations of jealousy and attachment, it may also be partially attributable to the pervasive nature of negative emotionality being assessed by scales that tend to share items that include words such as “worry,” etc. (Clark & Watson, 1995).

Arguing somewhat against this notion, however, hypothesis #6 in the present study—that negative emotionality would be related to these same jealousy experience measures—only received mixed support. It was only a significant predictor of jealousy-related Fear in the undergraduate sample. It may not have emerged as a predictor due to shared variance with other variables—such as ECR Anxiety—but the bivariate correlations—particularly in the community resident sample—reveal that the cognitive measures of jealousy are essentially unrelated to negative emotionality. The other higher-order measure of personality also did not show its hypothesized relations with jealousy. Hypothesis #7—that agreeableness would be inversely related to jealousy-related anger—was not supported by either the bivariate correlations or the regression analyses.

Although ECR Anxiety did not differentiate between elements of jealousy experience, some distinctions were evident when examining ECR Avoidance. Previous research has found mixed results with regard to the relation between jealousy and the avoidant dimension of attachment (Brennan et al., 1998; Gehl & Watson, 2003; Knobloch et al., 2001). In the current study, Suspicion of the Partner was significantly

predicted by ECR Avoidance in both samples and exhibited a stronger correlation with ECR Avoidance than ECR Anxiety in the community resident sample. Although not explicitly hypothesized, this relation is not unexpected. Individuals high in ECR Avoidance tend to view others—even including their own romantic partner—as untrustworthy.

It was hoped that examining the relation between self-esteem and the elements of jealousy experience would help to clarify the previous mixed findings regarding the relation between this construct and jealousy (White & Mullen, 1989; Guerrero et al. 2004). More specifically, it was hypothesized that individuals low in self-esteem would be more likely to engage in social comparison processes and thus, worry more over the rival and experience more fear and envy. The relation with envy could not be examined as previously explained. The Low Self-worth composite was used to evaluate the rest of this hypothesis (#5). Unfortunately, the previous mixed results were replicated within the current study. Low Self-worth approached significance as a predictor of Worry over the Rival in the community resident sample, but an examination of the bivariate relation between these variables reveals no relation. In the undergraduate sample the bivariate correlation was significant, but Low Self-worth did not emerge as a significant predictor. In short, hypothesis #5 was not supported and examining the different elements of jealousy experience still resulted in mixed—and relatively weak—findings with regard to self-esteem.

Hypotheses #8 through #10 were informed by previously described studies linking jealousy to aspects of certain personality disorders and maladaptive personality traits. These hypotheses received mixed support in the present study. Only one SNAP-2 scale—Aggression—was a significant predictor of jealousy experience—specifically, jealousy-related Anger—in the undergraduate sample. However, in the undergraduate sample, several SNAP-2 scales approached significance as predictors of the two measures of cognitive jealousy. Examining these predictors in the undergraduate sample and the

bivariate correlations in both samples reveals a few consistent patterns. Mistrust, Aggression and Self-harm tend to be related to cognitive measures of jealousy, though this relation is stronger with suspicion of the partner than with worry over the rival. Mistrust and Aggression are moderately related to jealousy-related Anger. Jealousy-related Fear exhibits moderate relations with the 3VDI measures of Love and Exploitable Dependence, but relations with SNAP-2 scales are not consistent across the samples. Guilt tends to be related to Mistrust, Self-Harm, Low Self-worth and Exploitable Dependence. Of the SNAP-2 scales, Mistrust tends to exhibit the most consistent relations with jealousy experience.

Collectively, these results suggest that personality variables are fairly important in predicting jealousy experience. After accounting for sex—and relationship status and distance from partner in the undergraduate sample—personality accounts for an additional 25 – 32% of the variance in cognitive measures of jealousy experience. The anxiety dimension of adult attachment appears to be the most consistent predictor of the cognitive experience of jealousy. However, making the distinction between suspicion of one's own partner and worry over a rival reveals that the avoidant dimension of attachment is an important predictor of suspicion of one's own partner. This is not surprising, as both are characterized by mistrust of the partner. Maladaptive personality traits such as aggression, mistrust and dependency also contribute to the predictive role of personality; however, these traits do not perform as consistently or as strongly as the measures of attachment.

Personality also accounts for an additional 21 – 33% of the variance in jealousy-related Anger, Fear and Guilt. Once again, the anxious dimension of adult attachment plays a large role in these relations. Aggression and negative emotionality were predictive of experiencing anger and fear, respectively, when jealous. These findings were more pronounced in the undergraduate sample. The one measure of jealousy

experience that personality does not seem to play as important a role in predicting is jealousy-related Joy/Sexual Arousal.

Personality and Jealousy-related Goals

In general, personality tended to be less correlated with jealousy-related goals than with measures of jealousy experience. Additionally, the relations between personality and jealousy-related goals do not replicate very well across the two samples. In the regression analyses only two significant predictors replicate across both samples: (a) ECR Anxiety predicting Relationship Maintenance and (b) Aggression predicting Equity Restoration through Retaliation. The bivariate correlations between these variables also replicate these relations, except that ECR Anxiety was unrelated to Relationship Maintenance in the community resident sample. Apparently the relation only appears as a function of the other predictors in the model. A closer inspection of the bivariate relations reveals that not only are different personality traits significantly related to Relationship Maintenance in each sample, but also that some traits actually exhibit the opposite relation. An undergraduate who reported being concerned with relationship maintenance was also likely to be higher in ECR Anxiety, various forms of Dependency—and to a lesser extent—Negative Emotionality, Propriety, and Mistrust. They also were likely to be lower in ECR Avoidance. In contrast, a married adult with these same concerns was more likely to be higher in Agreeableness, Exploitable Dependence and Love Dependence; they also were more likely to be lower in ECR Avoidance, as well as Aggression, Manipulativeness, and Negative Emotionality.

The goal of Self-esteem Preservation seemed to be more related to personality in the community resident sample; although a few correlations replicated in the undergraduate sample, they are fairly weak. Reducing Uncertainty about the Rival and Relationship Re-assessment tended to be weakly related to personality in both samples. A relatively consistent pattern emerged with regard to the goal of Equity Restoration

through Retaliation. As one might expect, individuals who express a desire for revenge exhibit lower levels of Agreeableness and higher levels of Aggression, Manipulativeness, Mistrust, ECR Anxiety and Negative Emotionality. In the undergraduate sample this goal also exhibited a moderate correlation with ECR Avoidance.

Of the jealousy-related goals, Equity Restoration through Retaliation most clearly exhibits an expected pattern of relations with personality variables. Relationship Maintenance, however, exhibits a different pattern between the two samples. Examining the two goals together, one sees that in the undergraduate sample some personality traits are correlated with both goals. However, in the community resident sample each personality variable either exhibits a significant correlation with only one of the goals or a positive relation with one goal and a negative relation with the other. Thus, it seems that the goals more directly oppose one another in the community resident sample. Examining the bivariate correlations between the goals reveals an inverse relation in the community resident sample and a positive relation in the undergraduate sample. However, these correlations are non-significant and so close to zero that little confidence should be placed in them.

To summarize, personality does not seem to be as related to jealousy-related goals as it is to jealousy experience. Additionally, the specific patterns of relations do not replicate well across the two samples. The two goals that personality variables do seem to predict are Relationship Maintenance and Equity Restoration through Retaliation, accounting for an additional 27 – 36% of the variance after accounting for the control variables. Once again, dimensions of adult attachment tend to be important predictors, though not as consistently as when examining jealousy experience. The two clearest conclusions seem to be that (a) individuals interested in relationship maintenance tend to be lower in avoidance and higher in exploitable and love dependence and (b) individuals interested in equity restoration through retaliation tend to exhibit maladaptive personality traits—in particular, aggression.

Personality and Jealousy Expression

The third research question was concerned with the relation between personality and jealousy expression, as measured by the six derived factors from the CRJ. A priori hypotheses were phrased utilizing wording from the prescribed CRJ scoring techniques, as the nature of the derived factor structure was unknown at that time. As the prescribed structure did not emerge in factor analyses the hypotheses were evaluated by examining the relevant derived factors for each hypothesis.

Hypotheses #11 through #13—which essentially predicted a replication of Guerrero (1998)—were largely supported across both samples and through both the bivariate and regression analyses. Participants high in ECR Avoidance were indeed less likely to engage in Affective Integrative Communication and Compensatory Restoration. They were also more likely to engage in Withdrawal, as expected. The effects were not always as large as expected, however. Although the bivariate correlations between ECR Avoidance and Compensatory Restoration were not significant, the former was a significant predictor of the latter in the undergraduate sample and approached significance in the community resident sample. Additionally, however, ECR Anxiety tended to exhibit a stronger relation with Compensatory Restoration than did ECR Avoidance; this suggests it is not just that avoidant tendencies prevent engaging in these responses, but that they are substantially motivated by anxious tendencies. An unexpected finding of note was the relation between ECR Avoidance and Violence and Threats in the undergraduate sample. Indeed, this was the strongest relation ECR Avoidance exhibited with any of the jealousy expression measures.

Previous research has suggested that jealousy may be related to various personality disorders or maladaptive traits (American Psychiatric Association, 1994; White & Mullen, 1989; Dutton, 1998). The remaining hypotheses regarding the relation between personality—specifically, SNAP-2 trait scales—and jealousy expression were primarily based upon these reports. However, these hypotheses did not receive a large

amount of support in these samples. The only effect that consistently replicated across both samples—and both the bivariate and regression analyses—was Aggression predicting Violence and Threats as a response to jealousy. Aggression also tended to be related to (a) Surveillance and Competition and (b) Rival Communication, but only emerged as a significant predictor of these responses in the undergraduate sample regressions. This link between aggression and jealousy is consistent with previous research linking hostility to jealousy (Gehl & Watson, 2003; Buunk, 1997).

Manipulativeness and DvC exhibited weak to moderate correlations with Violence and Threats, but these associations did not reach significance in the regression analyses. The hypothesized relation between (a) Mistrust and (b) Surveillance and Competition exhibited this same pattern of weak to moderate bivariate correlations coupled with non-significant regression results. This provides some support for the hypotheses, and it indicates that some of the tendencies found in studies primarily examining violent men can be replicated in a more heterogeneous sample of men and women. However, as noted, these findings tended to be quite limited, as the SNAP-2 trait measures of Exhibitionism and Entitlement generally were unrelated or weakly related to measures of jealousy expression despite predictions to the contrary. Other hypothesized results tended to be significant in one sample, but not the other (e.g. DvC was negatively correlated to Affective Integrative Communication in the undergraduate sample, but not the community resident sample).

To summarize, personality also seems to be an important predictor of jealousy expression. However, when examining jealousy expression, there tends to be greater differentiation between the predictors than when examining jealousy experience; this suggests that distinctions between different types of jealousy expression may indeed be important. Personality variables account for an additional 19 – 30% of the variance in measures of jealousy expression, with the one exception of Affective Integrative Communication.

Females—and in the undergraduate sample, those in a serious, committed relationship—are more likely to engage in Affective Integrative Communication. Individuals more likely to engage in the other constructive jealousy response, Compensatory Restoration, are likely to exhibit higher levels of the anxious dimension of attachment and—as suggested by the regression—lower levels of the avoidant dimension.

In contrast, individuals higher in the avoidant dimension of attachment are more likely to engage in Withdrawal as a response to jealousy. Anxious attachment and maladaptive personality traits—in particular, aggression—seem to be the best predictors of the remaining destructive responses to jealousy, as described earlier.

The Relation between Jealousy Expression, Experience, and Related Goals

Jealousy Experience and Expression

With only a few exceptions, measures of jealousy experience tended to exhibit a consistent pattern of positive correlations with measures of jealousy expression. With regard to specific hypotheses, this means that those that predicted positive correlations tended to find support, whereas those that predicted inverse correlations did not find support. However, this also means that in several cases, relations exist that were not specifically predicted; moreover, these unexpected associations sometimes exhibit correlations similar in strength to those that were hypothesized. The regression analyses, however, do provide some further distinction with regard to which elements of jealousy experience are more predictive of certain types of jealousy expression.

As predicted, jealousy-related Anger was significantly related to all of the destructive responses to jealousy in both the undergraduate and community resident samples. However, it was also positively correlated with Affective Integrative Communication in both samples and Compensatory Restoration in the undergraduate sample. This last relation was expected to be of an inverse nature, as in previous research

(Guerrero et al., 2005). This positive relation between jealousy-related Anger and the measures of jealousy expression was also found in the majority of the regression analyses. One exception was in the context of the community resident regression analyses, in which the hypothesized inverse relation received some support—jealousy-related Anger approached significance as an inverse predictor of Compensatory Restoration. However, jealousy-related Guilt and Fear tended to be better—and more consistent—predictors of Compensatory Restoration. Additionally, the hypothesized inverse relation between cognitive Worry over the Rival and Compensatory Restoration was not supported. Once again, a positive relation was instead found between the variables, counter to previous findings (Guerrero et al., 1995).

Previous research found that jealousy-related Guilt tended to be positively related to withdrawal responses and negatively related to violence, threats, and surveillance behaviors (Guerrero et al., 2005). This could possibly suggest that individuals who experience guilt as part of their jealousy are less likely to act upon it in ways that may seem inappropriate and instead withdraw. However, the current study found positive correlations between jealousy-related Guilt and both (a) Surveillance and Competition and (b) Withdrawal. The correlation with Violence and Threats was only significant in the undergraduate sample. These results suggest an alternative explanation. Perhaps acting upon feelings of jealousy with surveillance behaviors can result in the feeling of jealousy-related guilt.

Perhaps the most surprising result with regard to the relation between jealousy experience and jealousy expression involves Joy/Sexual Arousal. Guerrero et al. (2005) found that passion was a significant predictor of contacting the rival in one of their studies. In the current study, the bivariate correlations between jealousy expression and jealousy-related Joy/Sexual Arousal largely were not significant. The exception tended to be a moderate positive correlation with Violence and Threats. However, in the context of the regression analyses, Joy/Sexual Arousal became a significant predictor in several

models. Apparently, the seemingly counter-intuitive experience of Joy or Sexual Arousal while jealous is able to predict variance in jealousy expression that is not explained by jealous cognitions or feelings of anger, fear, or guilt. Perhaps arousal levels play a role in motivating behavior regardless of the type of arousal. More research is needed to investigate this possibility more thoroughly.

To summarize, jealousy-related Anger is the most consistent predictor of measures of jealousy expression—in particular, the destructive responses—as suggested by both the bivariate and multivariate analyses. However, examining the bivariate correlations reveals a fairly consistent pattern of moderate to strong relations between measures of jealousy experience and expression in general. Jealousy experience explains the largest amount of observed variance in Surveillance and Competition (44% in the undergraduate sample and 46% in the community resident sample). On the other hand, although remaining important, jealousy experience does not explain as large a proportion of variance in Affective Integrative Communication (16 and 11%, respectively). This is partially because sex—and in the undergraduate sample, relationship status—once again account for a significant amount of variance as well. Finally, jealousy-related Guilt and Fear seem to be more important than jealousy-related Anger in predicting the likelihood that an individual will engage in Compensatory Restoration.

Jealousy-Related Goals and Jealousy Expression

Participants concerned with the goal of Equity Restoration through Retaliation were more likely to engage in destructive responses to jealousy. These responses include Surveillance and Competition, Rival Communication, Violence and Threats, and Withdrawal. The former two responses, Surveillance and Competition and Rival Communication, also tended to be reported by individuals interested in Reducing Uncertainty about the Rival relationship. These findings replicate previous research examining the relation between jealousy-related goals and jealousy expression (Guerrero

& Afifi, 1999). In the present study, undergraduates concerned with Reducing Uncertainty about the Rival relationship also were more likely to report engaging in Compensatory Restoration as a response to their jealousy.

Participants concerned with Relationship Maintenance were more likely to engage in Compensatory Restoration and undergraduates concerned with this goal also were more likely to engage in Affective Integrative Communication. Guerrero and Afifi (1999) found similar results, reporting that this goal was predicted by Compensatory Restoration and Negative Affect Expression.

Finally, undergraduates concerned with Relationship Re-assessment were more likely to engage in the responses of (a) Withdrawal, (b) Surveillance and Competition, and (c) Rival Communication. The relation with Withdrawal is consistent with the Guerrero and Afifi (1999) finding that this goal was predicted by both Active Distancing and Avoidance/Denial. Relationship Re-assessment only approached significance as a predictor of the latter two responses in the current study. Guerrero and Afifi did find that the CRJ Manipulation Attempts scale was predictive of Relationship Re-assessment, which does contribute one item to Surveillance and Competition.

Although several previous findings were replicated in the current study, others were not. Guerrero and Afifi (1999) found inverse relations between the goal of Self-esteem Preservation and several responses to jealousy (e.g. Rival Contacts, Surveillance/Restriction). These inverse relations were not found in the present study. In fact, some of the factors composed of items from these scales exhibited positive correlations with Self-esteem Preservation.

Collectively, jealousy-related goals tend to account for the largest proportion of observed variance in Surveillance and Competition (an additional 37% in the undergraduate sample and 42% in the community resident sample). Equity Restoration through Retaliation and—to a lesser extent—Reducing Uncertainty about the Rival relationship, tend to be the best predictors of the destructive responses to jealousy. In

contrast, Relationship Maintenance goals tend to be predictive of the constructive responses of Compensatory Restoration and Affective Integrative Communication. However, once again, a significant amount of observed variance in Affective Integrative Communication is accounted for by the fact that females—and in the undergraduate sample, those in a serious, committed relationship—are more likely to engage in this response.

Jealousy and Relationship Satisfaction

Andersen et al. (1995) found that measures of jealousy expression predicted relationship satisfaction above and beyond relationship type (dating vs. married) and the MJS-Cognitive scale. The assessed measure of emotional jealousy did not contribute a significant amount of predictive power to the model. Integrative Communication and Negative Affect Expression were positive predictors of relationship satisfaction, whereas Distributive Communication and Active Distancing were inverse predictors. The bivariate correlations revealed an inverse relation between relationship satisfaction and Negative Affect Expression and no relation between relationship satisfaction and Integrative Communication. Based primarily on this research, Guerrero (2004) observed that Negative Affect Expression combined with Integrative Communication can exhibit positive correlations with relationship satisfaction. However, when Negative Affect Expression is combined with Distributive Communication it exhibits negative correlations with satisfaction.

To a certain extent, the current study replicated this pattern of findings. In the undergraduate sample those in a committed, long-term relationship reported more satisfaction than those in a casual dating relationship (accounting for 10% of the observed variance in satisfaction). In both samples, the cognitive measures of jealousy also exhibited significant bivariate correlations with satisfaction; moreover, Suspicion of the Partner was a significant inverse predictor of relationship satisfaction in the regression

analyses. Additionally, none of the measures of the emotional elements of jealousy experience were significantly related to relationship satisfaction. Measures of jealousy experience accounted for an additional 11% and 21% of observed variance in the undergraduate and community resident samples, respectively. The evidence for the influence of jealousy expression was not as strong in the current study, as the additional predictive contribution (approximately 4% of the observed variance in satisfaction) was only significant in the undergraduate sample; however, the pattern of predictors was similar. More specifically, Affective Integrative Communication—which is composed of items from Integrative Communication and Negative Affect Expression—approached significance as a predictor of relationship satisfaction in both samples. In the undergraduate sample, Surveillance and Competition also approached significance as an inverse predictor. This factor is composed of items from CRJ scales that were not included in Andersen et al.'s (1995) study but it is considered a destructive response, similar to distributive communication.

These results bolster the conclusions drawn by Andersen et al. (1995). First of all, the cognitive elements of jealousy experience exhibit a stronger relation with satisfaction than the emotional elements. Second, the combination of negative affect expression and integrative communication—assessed as Affective Integrative Communication in the present study—exhibits positive correlations with relationship satisfaction. In short, relationship satisfaction is not necessarily related to how one feels when jealous, but how one thinks and responds to that jealousy. It is tempting to make recommendations that someone experiencing jealousy should avoid cognitively dwelling on the jealousy and instead approach her/his partner to engage in constructive communication with her/him. However, this is assuming that the satisfaction level is the effect, rather than the cause. It is also possible that satisfied individuals are simply more likely to respond to jealousy in these ways. Further research—especially studies using a longitudinal design—could investigate this question more thoroughly.

Integration and Implications

The present study hoped to expand upon previous research by examining a wide range of personality variables as antecedent factors to the discrete elements of jealousy experience and expression. Previous research has examined the relation between adult attachment and these discrete elements; however, the present study expands upon this evidence by including a wide range of personality variables. As previous studies have suggested, adult attachment dimensions clearly offer an important approach to conceptualizing jealousy. In contrast, however, some personality variables exhibit more limited and specific relations with jealousy variables. The present study suggests that personality is indeed an important antecedent factor to jealousy. Furthermore, although this influence may primarily be reflected through anxious attachment, examining the influence of additional measures of personality provides important information about jealousy that would not be achieved by examining anxious attachment alone. More specifically, anxious attachment tends to be a general, non-specific predictor of whether or not an individual *will* experience and express jealousy. Avoidant attachment and personality traits such as dependency, aggression, mistrust, and manipulateness provide a more specific picture of exactly *how* an individual will experience and express their jealousy.

The avoidant dimension of attachment is much more specific in its relations than the anxious dimension as it primarily is related to experiencing suspicion of one's partner, engaging in withdrawal when jealous, and reporting less concern with maintaining the relationship. In general, individuals who exhibited higher levels of dependency and lower levels of self-worth were more likely to experience fear and guilt as part of their jealousy. They were also more likely to be concerned with maintaining their relationship and engage in behaviors directed towards this goal (e.g. increasing affection or giving gifts to their partner). In contrast, individuals who are mistrustful, manipulative, and aggressive are more concerned with getting revenge and are more

likely to be angry and suspicious of their partner. They are also more likely to engage in surveillance, derogation of rivals, violence, and threats of violence or infidelity.

Although these trends were evident in the present study, other hypothesized effects were not found—or at least not replicated across both samples. The higher-order Big Five personality measures did not consistently exhibit the expected relations with jealousy. Specifically, Agreeableness and Negative Emotionality were hypothesized to exhibit significant relations with measures of jealousy, but this tended not to be the case. As previously discussed, the more specific trait scales (e.g., SNAP trait scales) tended to exhibit more consistent, significant relations with jealousy measures. However, even when examining these more specific scales, the expected effects were not always found. More specifically, it was hypothesized that jealousy would be related to impulsivity, entitlement, and exhibitionism. In general, these hypotheses were not supported. One possible explanation for this lack of support may be that the influence of personality could be moderated by characteristics of the relationship or the partner (Guerrero & Andersen, 1998). For example, an individual high in entitlement—that is, someone who would typically be upset if s/he did not receive the recognition and privileges s/he felt that s/he deserved—may not experience jealousy if s/he happens to have a partner who idolizes her/him and provides the desired attention. It may be possible that personality and characteristics of the partner or relationship are the most important antecedent factors to jealousy. Furthermore, examining the influence of one category without acknowledging the other may provide an incomplete—or even inaccurate—picture. The implications of this notion are discussed further within the context of limitations of the present study and suggested future directions.

Although the two previously mentioned general trends—that is, the dependent, insecure individual and the mistrustful, aggressive individual—are, to a certain extent, gross simplifications of the multitude of relations in this study, they do provide useful conceptualizations. It is also important to note that comparisons can be drawn between

these findings and previous research I have conducted (Gehl & Watson, 2003). Of the three jealousy factors in this earlier study, two exhibited strong personality-related components. The first factor, Anxious Suspicion, tapped qualities relevant to the aggressive, mistrustful, manipulative individual. For example, high scorers on this factor are mistrustful of their partner, vigilant at interrogating and investigating their partner, and prone to responding with hostility. The second factor, Interpersonal Insecurity, captured qualities representative of the dependent jealous individual. For example, high scorers on this factor constantly need reassurance and tend to interpret their jealousy as a sign of true love. This motivates a desire to maintain the relationship as it provides a sense of self and meaning for the individual. Consistent with the current research, in this earlier study, anxious attachment tended to be correlated with both Anxious Suspicion and Interpersonal Insecurity, thereby emerging as a general, non-specific predictor; in contrast, however, avoidant attachment was only correlated with Anxious Suspicion.

These two factors of jealousy and the corresponding trends in the present study should not be viewed as explaining two different types of jealous individuals, as one individual may exhibit any combination of these factors, including high levels of both. That is, they may be aggressive, mistrustful, and manipulative as well as dependent and have low self-worth. These patterns could all be exhibited in the same individual.

The implications of these results for therapy become more evident when considering these patterns. If a couple presents with jealousy as a primary or contributing factor to their distress, the therapist may want to take different approaches depending upon the particular nature of the jealousy experience and expression that is involved. Initial intake information may suggest that the jealousy is not simply “normal” reactive jealousy as previously discussed. Instead this information may suggest that the jealousy has roots within the jealous individual’s personality. If an individual tends to experience anger and is concerned with revenge against the partner, there may be dispositional tendencies toward aggression and mistrust that need to be addressed very carefully.

However, if the individual is instead concerned with maintaining the relationship and experiences guilt and fear as part of their jealousy, dependency and low self-worth issues may need to be addressed. Of course, an individual may report a combination of these factors in which a variety of these tendencies would need to be addressed. This type of combination may lead the therapist into the realm of therapies aimed at personality disorders. In this case jealousy would most likely be one manifestation of larger interpersonal problems an individual may be having.

Limitations

Self-selection of Participants

One limitation of the present study is the self-selection of participants. The likelihood that this issue may have potentially biased the present samples may best be illustrated by occurrences during participant recruitment. Some individuals attempted to enroll their jealous partner and/or themselves in the study in place of their jealous partner. When it was clarified that the current study was interested in enrolling only the jealous partner and that this individual would have to enroll themselves, a not uncommon response from the individual was that their partner does not view herself/himself as jealous. The present study therefore did not include these individuals who would be labeled as jealous by their partners, but not by themselves. Furthermore, individuals who did enroll in the study, while acknowledging their experience with jealousy, may not acknowledge its full extent or intensity.

The limitations of self-selection may be more apparent in the community resident sample than the undergraduate sample. Undergraduate participants were sampled from introductory psychology courses across three semesters (a total population of a few thousand students). They participated in exchange for extra credit or to complete a research exposure requirement for their class. For some students an online study may have appeared attractive as they could complete it when and where they chose. These

advantages may have somewhat countered their hesitancy to participate in a study that required them to answer questions about jealousy or they may have led participants to accept a wider array of experiences as constituting jealousy in order to be eligible for the study. In contrast, the married community resident participants were recruited from the Midwestern United States through a variety of advertising methods. This is a much larger population from which to recruit and recruitment took longer than the undergraduate sample (which is twice as large). The jealous individuals who agreed to participate may have particular characteristics that led to them respond to an advertisement asking for individuals who had experienced jealousy in their romantic relationships. For example, the married community resident sample reported higher levels of jealousy-related guilt and suspicion of their partner than the undergraduate sample. It may be that individuals who feel guilty about their jealousy may be more likely to acknowledge its presence and respond to advertisements in the hope that participating in a study may alleviate some of their guilt. Perhaps individuals who are more suspicious of their partners enrolled in the study hoping to gain some insight into how researchers view jealousy in general and their own suspicions in particular.

Self-reported Recall and Fatigue

An additional limitation of the current study is the sole reliance upon participants' self-reported recall of experiences and events. Participants' memories of jealous situations may not be accurately recalled. According to White and Mullen's (1989) model, secondary cognitive processes of the jealousy experience often involve different forms of cognitive restructuring (e.g. deciding an event is not important or suppressing jealousy). These cognitive processes themselves would influence later recall of the initial event, which may have been experienced much differently than it is recalled. This is an inherent difficulty in research on jealousy or any event that may motivate similar cognitive processes. It is also important to note that although a theoretical differentiation

can be made between the cognitive and affective elements of jealousy experience, the measurement of the affective elements are inherently confounded with the cognitive element in simple self-report data; as a result, these affective elements are subject to the same cognitive biases. That is, self-report does not directly measure an individual's affective experience, but rather the individual's cognitive recall of that experience, which may not be the same thing.

Participant fatigue can also be a significant concern with self-report questionnaires. The present study asked participants to respond to nearly 700 items. Although a significant number of the items were either true/false responses or single word adjectives, this is still a large number of questions for an individual to answer, and it may have influenced the quality and validity of their responses. The online nature of the study did allow the participants the ability to logout of the questionnaire and log back in at a later time to complete the study if they wished to do so. Although the participants were made aware of this fact, they may have chosen to continue despite fatigue in an effort to complete the task without having to return to it later.

Finally, with regard to self-report, jealousy questionnaires frequently refer to factors that may or may not be a part of an individual's particular experience. For example, some individuals experience jealousy with a specific rival in mind; others, however, do not. These latter individuals may have difficulty answering questions that refer to a specific rival (e.g. communicating with the rival). Future studies could collect more information so that such individuals could be distinguished from one another. Relationship characteristics such as these are part of jealousy models but were not a primary focus of the present study and therefore not as thoroughly assessed.

Number and Choice of Variables Measured

A third category of limitations in the present study concerns the number and choice of variables for inclusion. The goal of the present study was to examine

personality as an antecedent factor to the experience and expression of romantic jealousy. The desire to be relatively comprehensive in the assessment of personality resulted in a large number of predictive variables—23 personality or individual difference variables—in the study. Following the recommendations of White and Mullen (1989) to measure the discrete elements of jealousy similarly resulted in a large number of criterion variables. These variables included (a) two measures of cognitive jealousy experience, (b) four measures of affective jealousy experience, (c) five measures of jealousy-related goals, and (d) six measures of jealousy expression. The personality variables were examined as predictors of each of these measures of jealousy. Additionally, the elements of jealousy experience and the jealousy-related goals were examined as predictors of jealousy expression. Finally, jealousy experience and expression were examined as predictors of relationship satisfaction. One must keep in mind that all of these analyses were conducted in two separate samples. This results in a very large number of analyses. Although an a priori alpha of $p < .01$ was utilized and the bivariate correlations were examined to aid in the interpretation of the large number of regressions, the experiment-wise Type I error rate is still quite large. These steps alone may not have been conservative enough to eliminate the likelihood of spurious results. Achieving the goals of the present study necessitated this large number of analyses, but readers should keep this limitation in mind while considering the results. The best way to address this issue—as well as the validity of specific findings obtained in the current research—is through accumulated replication and meta-analytic approaches.

Thus far, the discussion of this limitation has focused on the large number of variables that were included; however, weaknesses are also evident in the variables that were not included. White and Mullen (1989) and Guerrero and Andersen (1998) have both proposed thorough models to explain the process of jealousy and the individual's experience of jealousy, respectively. No individual study has addressed either model in its entirety and this study is no exception. Previous studies have primarily chosen to

select elements of the model(s) and focus on the role those particular elements play. The basic purpose of this study was to examine the role of the jealous individual's personality on the experience and expression of jealousy. Some additional elements were included in abbreviated or simplified form (e.g. relationship status and relationship satisfaction relate to two relatively broad characteristics of the relationship) while others were not explicitly included at all (e.g. cultural influences or differences). Personality variables may—or may not—interact with these other variables to influence the experience and expression of jealousy.

In hindsight, it has become evident that relationship characteristics could have been defined and operationalized more effectively. In the end, relationship status and distance from the partner were examined with MANOVAs and included as control variables in regressions (in the undergraduate sample only, as everyone in the community resident sample was married). However, relationship characteristics may have been better defined by variables assessing intimacy. For instance, Theiss and Solomon (2006) created an intimacy composite that included characteristics such as love, commitment and exclusivity. This may have proven a more useful control measure and been useful in both samples as it would have provided a more sensitive continuous measure than the simple long-term, committed versus casual relationship distinction utilized in the current study.

Additional concerns with the present study involve clarification of relationship specifics. As previously discussed, eighteen individuals were removed from the community resident sample because the nature of their relationships was unclear (i.e. they reported being married in the screener but then reported preferring a same-sex romantic partner in the questionnaire). Also, the participants were not instructed to focus exclusively on their current relationship. There also was no question assessing whether or not the reported jealousy was in the context of the current relationship or instead involved previous relationships. It is possible that a number of respondents were thinking

of a previous relationship or a blend of experiences across multiple relationships while participating in the study.

Future Directions

Future research could utilize a more refined and targeted set of predictor variables based upon the findings of the present study (e.g. dependency, mistrust, aggression, manipulativeness, etc.). Focusing on the smaller set of predictors that this research has suggested to be important could eliminate some of the extraneous experiment-wise Type I error in further attempts to examine the role of personality as an antecedent factor of jealousy. This future research also should take advantage of more complex modeling approaches, utilizing multiple measures to create latent variables and testing relations between multiple stages of the model at one time.

As previously discussed, some individuals contacted the experimenter to enroll their jealous spouse in the study; however, upon clarification of the enrollment procedures, they admitted that they believed their spouse would not self-identify as jealous. Dyadic data would not only be useful to examine these levels of agreement or disagreement with regard to the different elements of jealousy, but also to measure additional aspects of models of jealousy (White & Mullen, 1989; Guerrero & Andersen, 1998). White and Mullen's (1989) procedural model of jealousy incorporates three individuals into their scheme: the jealous individual, the partner or "beloved," and the real or imagined rival. Each of these individuals has the potential to influence the others. The nature of these influences could be better understood by gaining information from each of them. In particular, jealousy expression is conceptualized as communicative in nature. Therefore, the effectiveness of—and response to—this communication would be important to understand from the partner or rival's perspective.

Longitudinal data would have the ability to examine how couples deal with jealousy over the course of time, potentially even across multiple dating or marital

relationships. More specifically, with regard to personality, one could examine the important issue of whether chronic patterns of jealousy experience and expression emerge in some individuals across multiple romantic relationships regardless of their partner's specific characteristics. If these patterns did emerge, it would provide further support that how jealousy is experienced and expressed can indeed be strongly influenced by such stable characteristics as an individual's personality.

Combining a dyadic with a longitudinal approach could provide a number of advantages. In addition to measuring additional relationship characteristics and examining potential chronic jealousy patterns, a longitudinal dyadic study could examine the process of jealousy experience and expression across time from multiple perspectives in the relationship. The initial jealousy expressions could be examined from the perspective of both individuals. The partner would respond to the jealousy expression in some way and their responses would then, in turn, influence future responses by the jealous individual, as outlined in both models previously discussed (White & Mullen, 1989; Guerrero & Andersen, 1998). It is possible that some responses to jealousy may precede others (e.g. Affective Integrative Communication could be followed by Surveillance and Competition if the individual is suspicious of their partner and their partner's response does not satisfy them). It would be interesting to examine what factors influence jealousy expression in the long-term. Perhaps jealousy expression may be deeply rooted in the jealous individual's personality. Alternatively, perhaps it is more related to the specific experience that precedes it. Finally, it could be dependent upon the jealous individual's interpretation of feedback from their partner after previous expressions of jealousy. An in-depth longitudinal dyadic study could examine questions such as these by directly comparing the different possible explanations.

Conclusion

The present study, while suffering from several acknowledged limitations, provides an important examination of the role of personality as an antecedent factor to the experience and expression of romantic jealousy. Previous studies examining the role of personality tended not to examine the different components of jealousy. Previous studies utilizing the componential model of jealousy have only examined personality in the context of adult romantic attachment styles. Although these adult attachment styles tended to be the strongest predictors of the elements of jealousy experience and expression, other personality variables tended to exhibit important, meaningful—and often more discriminant—relations as well. That is, while adult attachment tends to be the best predictor whether or not someone *will* experience and express jealousy, avoidant attachment and certain personality traits suggest *how* an individual may experience and express that jealousy. As expected, these other personality variables tended to contain elements of negative emotionality at their core. Dependent tendencies tended to be related to different types of jealousy experience and expression than aggressive, mistrustful and manipulative tendencies.

The present study also provided replication of several relations between elements of the componential model of jealousy. Although the specific measurement approaches were not necessarily replicated (e.g. the CRJ), the basic structure was evident. This provides support for the continued use of the model as a framework, while at the same time suggesting specific measurement approaches may need to be refined.

REFERENCES

- Afifi, W. A. & Reichert, T. (1996). Understanding the role of uncertainty in jealousy experience and expression. *Communication Reports*, 9, 93-103.
- Agrawal, H. R., Gunderson, J., Holmes, B. M., & Lyons-Ruth, K. (2004). Attachment studies with borderline patients: A review. *Harvard review of psychiatry*, 12, 94-104.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Andersen, P. A., Eloy, S. V., Guerrero, L. K., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1995). Romantic jealousy and relational satisfaction: A look at the impact of jealousy experience and expression. *Communication Reports*, 8, 77-85.
- Aune, K.S., & Comstock, J. (1997). Effect of relationship length on the experience, expression, and perceived appropriateness of jealousy. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 137, 23-31.
- Aylor, B. & Dainton, M. (2001). Antecedents in romantic jealousy experience, expression, and goals. *Western Journal of Communication*, 65, 370-391.
- Barnett, O.L., Martinez, T.E., Bluestein, B.W. (1995). Jealousy and romantic attachment in martially violent and nonviolent men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10, 473-486.
- Barone, L. (2003). Developmental protective and risk factors in borderline personality disorder: A study using the adult attachment interview. *Attachment & Human Development*, 5, 64-77.
- Bartholomew, K. & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226-244.
- Baxter, L.A., & Wilmot, W. (1984). Secret tests: Social strategies for acquiring information about the state of the relationship. *Human Communication Research*, 11, 171-201.
- Baumgart, H. (1990). *Jealousy: Experiences and solutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O.P. (1998). Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7, 729-750.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Volume 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Volume 2. Separation: Anxiety and Anger*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Volume 3. Loss*. New York: Basic Books.

- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Brennan, K. A. & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Attachment styles and personality disorders: Their connections to each other and to parental divorce, parental death, and perceptions of parental caregiving. *Journal of Personality*, *66*, 835-878.
- Bringle, R. G. (1981). Conceptualizing jealousy as a disposition. *Alternative Lifestyles*, *4*, 274-290.
- Bringle, R. (1991). Psychosocial aspects of jealousy: A transactional model. In P. Salovey (Eds.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 103-131). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Bringle, R. G. & Buunk, B. (1985). Jealousy and social behavior: A review of person, relationship, and situational determinants. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, *6*, 241-264.
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: Guilford.
- Bryson, J. B. (1991). Modes of response to jealousy-evoking situations. In P. Salovey (Eds.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 178-207). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Buss, A.H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *63*, 452-259.
- Buss, D. M. (1988). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *9*, 291-317.
- Buss, D. M. (2000). *The dangerous passion: Why jealousy is as necessary as love and sex*. New York: The Free Press.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science*, *3*, 251-255.
- Buss, D. M. & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). From vigilance to violence: Mate retention tactics in married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 346-361.
- Buunk, B. (1982). Strategies of jealousy: Styles of coping with extramarital involvement of the spouse. *Family Relations*, *31*, 13-18.
- Buunk, B. (1997). Personality, birth order and attachment styles as related to various types of jealousy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *23*, 997-1006.
- Buunk, B. P. & Hupka, R. B. (1987). Cross-cultural differences in the elicitation of sexual jealousy. *Journal of Sex Research*, *23*, 12-22.

- Carson, C.L., & Cupach, W.R. (2000). Fueling the flames of the green-eyed monster: The role of ruminative thought in reaction to romantic jealousy. *Western journal of Communication, 64*, 308-329.
- Clanton, G. & Smith, L. G. (Eds.). (1977). *Jealousy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Clark, L.A. (1993). *Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality (SNAP)*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Clark, L. A., Simms, L. J., Wu, K. D., & Casillas, A. (in press). *SNAP-2: Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality – 2nd Edition*.
- Clark, L. A. & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*, 309-319.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, S. J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 3*, 11-27.
- de Silva, P. (1987). An unusual case of morbid jealousy treated with role reversal. *Sexual and Marital Therapy, 2*, 179 – 182.
- de Silva, P. (1997). Jealousy in couple relationships: Nature, assessment and therapy. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 35*, 973-985.
- Dutton, D. G. (1998). *The abusive personality: Violence and control in intimate relationships*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Dutton, D.G., Saunders, K., Starzomski, A., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Intimacy-anger and insecure attachment as precursors of abuse in intimate relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 1367-1386.
- Dutton, D. G., van Ginkel, C., Landolt, M. A. (1996). Jealousy, intimate abusiveness, and intrusiveness. *Journal of Family Violence, 11*, 411-423.
- Fitness, J. & Fletcher, G. J. O. (1993). Love, hate, anger and jealousy in close relationships: A prototype and cognitive appraisal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 942-958.
- Fleischmann, A. A., Spitzberg, B. H., Andersen, P. A., & Roesch, S.C. (2005). Tickling the monster: Jealousy induction in relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*, 49-73.
- Fonagy, P., Leigh, T., Steele, M., Steele, H., Kennedy, R., Mattoon, G., Target, M., & Gerber, A. (1996). The relation of attachment status psychiatric classification, and response to psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 22-31.
- Fossati, A., Feeney, J.A., Carretta, I., Grazioli, F., Milesi, R., Leonardi, B., & Maffei, C. (2005). Modeling the relationships between adult attachment patterns and borderline personality disorder: The role of impulsivity and aggressiveness. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 24*, 520-537.

- Gehl, B. K. & Vaidya, J. G. (2004, January). *Sex differences in jealousy: The role of response formats and validity of constructs*. Poster presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, 2004, Austin, TX.
- Gehl, B. K. & Watson, D. (2003, February). *Defining the structure of jealousy through factor analysis*. Poster presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting 2003, Los Angeles.
- Gehl, B. K. & Watson, D. (in preparation). *Defining the structure of jealousy through factor analysis*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Guerrero, L. K. (1998). Attachment-style differences in the experience and expression of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships, 5*, 273-291.
- Guerrero, L. K. (2004, July). *Communicative responses to jealousy*. Invited Talk at International Association for Relationship Research Conference 2004, Madison, WI.
- Guerrero, L. K. & Afifi, W. A. (1998). Communicative responses to jealousy as a function of self-esteem and relationship maintenance goals: A test of Bryson's dual motivation model. *Communication Reports, 11*, 111-122.
- Guerrero, L. K. & Afifi, W. A. (1999). Toward a goal-oriented approach for understanding communicative responses to jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication, 63*, 216-248.
- Guerrero, L. K. & Andersen, P. A. (1998). Jealousy experience and expression in romantic relationships. In P. A. Andersen & L. K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications, and contexts* (pp. 155-188). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., Jorgensen, P. F., Spitzberg, B. H., & Eloy, S. V. (1995). Coping with the green-eyed monster: Conceptualizing and measuring communicative responses to romantic jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication, 59*, 270-304.
- Guerrero, L.K., Eloy, S.V., Jorgensen, P.F., Andersen, P.A. (1993). Hers or His? Sex differences in the experience and communication of jealousy in close relationships. In Kalbfleisch, P.J. (Ed.), *Interpersonal Communication: Evolving Interpersonal Relationships* (pp. 109-131). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Guerrero, L. K., Spitzberg, B. H., & Yoshimura, S. M. (2004). Sexual and emotional jealousy. In J. Harvey, A. Wenzel, & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *The handbook of sexuality in close relationships* (pp. 311-345). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guerrero, L.K., Trost, M.R., & Yoshimura, S.M (2005). Romantic jealousy: Emotions and communicative responses. *Personal Relationships, 12*, 233-252.
- Harris, C. R. (2003). A review of sex differences in sexual jealousy, including self-report data, psychophysiological responses, interpersonal violence, and morbid jealousy. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7*, 102-128.
- Haslam, N. & Bornstein, B. H. (1996). Envy and jealousy as discrete emotions: A taxometric analysis. *Motivation and Emotion, 20*, 255-272.

- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- Heyman, R. E., Sayers, S. L., & Bellack, A. S. (1994). Global marital satisfaction versus marital adjustment: An empirical comparison of three measures. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 8, 432-446.
- Holzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J. C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, G. L. (2003). Do subtypes of maritally violent men continue to differ over time? *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 71, 728-740.
- Hupka, R. B. (1984). Jealousy: Compound emotion or label for a particular situation? *Motivation and Emotion*, 8, 141-155.
- Hupka, R. B., Buunk, B., Falus, G., Fulgosi, A., Ortega, E., Swain, R., et al. (1985). Romantic jealousy and romantic envy: A seven-nation study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 16, 423-446.
- Keenan, P. S. & Farrell, D. P. (2000). Treating morbid jealousy with eye movement desensitization and reprocessing utilizing cognitive inter-weave – a case report. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 13, 175-189.
- Kelley, H. H. (1983). Love and commitment. In H. H. Kelley, E. Bercheid, A Christensen, J. H. Harvey, T. L. Huston, G. Levinger, E. McClintock, L. A. Peplau, & D. R. Peterson (Eds.). *Close relationships* (pp. 89-115). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Knobloch, L. K., Solomon, D. H., & Cruz, M. G. (2001). The role of relationship development and attachment in the experience of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships*, 8, 205-224.
- Marks, M. & de Silva, P. (1991). Multi-faceted treatment of a case of morbid jealousy. *Sexual and Marital Therapy*, 6, 71-78.
- Mathes, E. W. & Severa, N. (1981). Jealousy, romantic love, and liking: Theoretical considerations and preliminary scale development. *Psychological Reports*, 49, 23-31.
- Mead, M. (1931/1977). Jealousy: Primitive and Civilized. In G. Clanton & L. G. Smith (Eds.), *Jealousy* (pp. 115-127). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Melamed, T. (1991). Individual differences in romantic jealousy: The moderating effect of relationship characteristics. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, 455-461.
- Murphy, C.M., Meyer, S.L., O'Leary, K.D. (1994). Dependency characteristics of partner assaultive men.
- Norton, R. (1983). Measuring marital quality: A critical look at the dependent variable. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 141-151.
- Nowlis, V. (1965). Research with the Mood Adjective Check List. In S.S. Tomkins & C.E. Izard (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and personality: Empirical studies* (pp. 352-389). New York: Springer.
- Parrott, W. G. (1991). The emotional experiences of envy and jealousy. In P. Salovey (Eds.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy*. New York: The Guilford Press.

- Parrott, W. G. & Smith, R. H. (1993). Distinguishing the experiences of envy and jealousy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*, 906-920.
- Pfeiffer, S. M. & Wong, P. T. P. (1989). Multidimensional jealousy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *6*, 181-196.
- Pincus, A.L. & Wilson, K.R. (2001). Interpersonal variability in dependent personality. *Journal of Personality*, *69*, 223-251.
- Puente, S. & Cohen, D. (2003). Jealousy and the meaning (or nonmeaning) of violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*, 449-460.
- Rich, J. (1991). A two-factor measure of jealous responses. *Psychological Reports*, *68*, 999-1007.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Salovey, P. (Ed.). (1991a). *The psychology of jealousy and envy*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Salovey, P. (1991b). Social comparison processes in envy and jealousy. In J. Suls & T. A. Wills (Eds.), *Social comparison: Contemporary theory and research* (pp. 261-285). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Salovey, P. & Rodin, J. (1986). The differentiation of social-comparison jealousy and romantic jealousy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*, 1100-1112.
- Salovey, P. & Rodin, J. (1988). Coping with envy and jealousy. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *7*, 15-33.
- Sharpsteen, D. J. (1993). Romantic jealousy as an emotion concept: A prototypes analysis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *10*, 69-82.
- Sharpsteen, D. J. & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1997). Romantic jealousy and adult romantic attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 627-640.
- Theiss, J. A. & Solomon, D. H. (2006). Coupling longitudinal data and multilevel modeling to examine the antecedents and consequences of jealousy experiences in romantic relationships: A test of the relational turbulence model. *Human Communication Research*, *32*, 469-503.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L.A. (1994). *The PANAS-X: Manual for the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule-Expanded Form*. Unpublished manuscript [updated 8/99], University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.
- White, G. L. (1981). A model of romantic jealousy. *Motivation and Emotion*, *5*, 295-310.
- White, G. L. & Mullen, P. E. (1989). *Jealousy: Theory, research, and clinical strategies*. New York: The Guilford Press.

APPENDIX A-CRJ

Jealousy is a common human emotion. In fact, most people experience jealousy at some point in their romantic relationships. Jealousy occurs when a person believes that a third party (sometimes called a "rival") threatens his or her romantic relationship in some way.

Please think about the times you have felt jealous. The following questions ask you to evaluate how often you have used various behaviors to respond to jealousy. Please be as honest as possible when answering the statements.

Please indicate the extent to which you used the following behaviors when you were jealous:

When I felt jealous I:

Integrative Communication:

- 14. explained my feelings to my partner
- 16. shared my jealous feelings with my partner
- 46. discussed bothersome issues with my partner
- 50. tried to talk to my partner and reach an understanding
- 51. calmly questioned my partner

Distributive Communication:

- 10. quarreled or argued with my partner
- 13. made hurtful or mean comments to my partner
- 18. yelled or cursed at my partner
- 29. acted rude toward my partner
- 37. confronted my partner in an accusatory manner

Negative Affect Expression:

- 1. appeared sad and depressed
- 7. cried or sulked in front of my partner
- 12. let my partner see how upset I was
- 23. vented my frustration when with my partner
- 24. appeared hurt in front of my partner
- 34. wore displeasure on my face for my partner to see

Active Distancing:

- 9. ignored my partner
- 11. gave my partner the "silent treatment"
- 25. physically pulled away from my partner
- 26. gave my partner cold or dirty looks
- 27. decreased affection toward my partner

Avoidance/Denial:

- 17. stopped calling or initiating communication with my partner

- 19. got quiet and didn't say much
- 20. became silent
- 22. acted like I didn't care
- 32. denied feeling jealous
- 42. pretended nothing was wrong

Violent Communication:

- 28. pushed, shoved or hit my partner
- 33. used physical force with my partner
- 36. threatened to harm my partner
- 39. became physically violent

Rival Derogation:

- 8. called the rival bad names
- 41. said mean things about the rival
- 57. made negative comments about the rival
- 67. tried to convince my partner that the rival is not a nice person.

Relationship Threats:

- 15. told my partner that I wanted to break up
- 31. told my partner that I will start dating other people too
- 38. threatened to terminate the relationship if s/he saw the rival anymore
- 44. forced my partner to choose between me and the rival
- 66. threatened to be unfaithful

Manipulation Attempts:

- 2. tried to make my partner feel guilty
- 3. flirted with others in front of my partner
- 4. brought up the rival's name to see how my partner reacted
- 49. tried to get revenge on my partner
- 61. tried to make my partner feel jealous too
- 62. tricked my partner to test her/his loyalty

Surveillance/Restriction:

- 6. looked through my partner's belongings for evidence of a rival relationship
- 40. kept closer tabs on my partner
- 43. spied on or followed my partner
- 45. restricted my partner's access to the rival
- 52. tried to determine my partner's whereabouts
- 53. repeatedly called my partner
- 54. tried to prevent my partner from seeing the rival
- 58. "checked up" on my partner more than usual

Compensatory Restoration:

- 5. tried to prove to my partner I love her/him
- 21. told my partner how much I need her/him

- 30. increased affection toward my partner
- 35. bought gifts or did special things for my partner
- 55. tried to be the “best” partner possible
- 56. spent more time with my partner than usual
- 59. tried to be more attractive or appealing than the rival
- 60. told my partner how much I care for her/him

Rival Contact:

- 47. told the rival not to see my partner anymore
- 63. confronted the rival
- 68. talked to the rival

Violent Behavior:

- 48. slammed doors
- 64. hit or threw objects

Signs of Possession:

- 65. made sure rivals know my partner is “taken”
- 69. let rivals know that my partner and I are in a close relationship
- 70. showed my partner extra affection when rivals were around

APPENDIX B-DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Sex: M F
2. Age: _____
3. Ethnic Identity
 - a. African-American/Black
 - b. Asian or Pacific Islander
 - c. Caucasian
 - d. Latino or Hispanic
 - e. American Indian or Alaskan Native
 - f. Arabic
 - g. Mixed Ethnicity
 - h. Ethnic Background Not Listed
4. Do you prefer a male or female romantic partner? M F
5. Relationship Status
 - a. Casual Dating Relationship
 - b. Committed Long-Term Relationship
 - c. Living with Partner
 - d. Engaged
 - e. Married
6. Please indicate the length of time you have been in a romantic relationship with your partner (specify days, months or years) _____
7. Please indicate the length of time you have known your partner including the time before you were dating (specify days, months or years) _____
8. How many “serious romantic relationships” have you had? _____
9. Is your current relationship a long-distance relationship? Y N

APPENDIX C-3VDI

Please indicate how well each statement describes you on the following scale.

Exploitable Dependence

1. I find it difficult to say “no” to people
2. I find it very difficult to say “no” to the requests of friends
3. I am more apologetic to others than I need to be
4. I am afraid of hurting other people’s feelings
5. If I think somebody might be upset at me, I want to apologize
6. I worry a lot about offending or hurting someone who is close to me
7. I do things that are not in my best interest in order to please others
8. I am very sensitive to others for signs of rejection
9. anger frightens me

Submissive Dependence

10. I don’t have what it takes to be a good leader
11. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence
12. I am entirely self-confident (R)
13. I feel confident in my ability to deal with most of the personal problems I am likely to meet in life (R)
14. I am very confident about my own judgment (R)
15. I usually expect to succeed in things I do (R)
16. I would rather be a follower than a leader
17. I have a lot of trouble making decisions by myself
18. In social situations, I tend to be very self-conscious

Love Dependence

19. I would feel like I’d be losing an important part of myself if I lost a very good friend
20. Having close bonds with other people makes me feel secure
21. The idea of losing a close friend is terrifying to me
22. I often find myself thinking about friends or family
23. I find it difficult to be separated from the people I love
24. Being isolated from others is bound to lead to unhappiness
25. Being able to share experiences with other people makes them much more enjoyable for me
26. I frequently ask people for advice
27. The lack of permanence in human relationships does not bother me (R)