2015

Self-Monitoring and Romantic Relationships: Individual Differences in Romantic Jealousy

Tiffany Lucille Andolina
University of North Florida, n00904068@ospreys.unf.edu

SELF-MONITORING AND ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS: INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN ROMANTIC JEALOUSY

by

Tiffany Lucille Andolina

A thesis submitted to the Department of Psychology

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in General Psychology

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

December, 2015

Certificate of Approval

This Thesis of Tiffany Lucille Andolina is approved: (Date)

_____ _____

Dr. Christopher Leone

_____ _____

Dr. Paul Fuglestad

Accepted for the Psychology Department:

_____ _____

Dr. Lori Lange

Accepted for the College of Arts and Sciences:

_____ _____

Dr. Barbara Hetrick

Accepted for the University:

_____ _____

Dr. John Kantner
Dean of the Graduate School

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my mother and father. Their love and support has given me the strength to pursue my goals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am immensely grateful for my mentor, Dr. Christopher Leone. I appreciate the time he took to share his wisdom and scientific knowledge with me over the past few years. His sincere guidance and candid feedback has shaped me into the well-rounded researcher that I am today. I could not have asked for a more dedicated mentor and professor. I also could not have reached this monumental milestone without the support and guidance of LouAnne Hawkins. She fostered an invaluable learning environment that helped me develop into a young professional and scholar. I feel blessed to have had this opportunity to work with her and her students. I would also like to thank Dr. Paul Fuglestad for being my second reader. His thorough review and feedback on this manuscript helped me see my work in new ways. I also am grateful for Taylor Drury's diligent assistance in collecting data. I would also like to thank Bobby Moulder for being a great teacher and for sharing his knowledge of fancy statistics and software programs with me. I am also thankful for the love and support of Stephanie Cazeau throughout this process. I also want to thank the members of the Person x Situation Research Team for their support over these past few years. Last, I would like to thank UNF's Graduate school for believing that my research is worthy enough to fund.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

To extend the research on self-monitoring and romantic relationships, we explored the connection between self-monitoring and romantic jealousy using a between-subjects design. We hypothesized high self-monitors (like men) would find sexual infidelity more distressing than emotional infidelity, whereas low self-monitors (like women) would find emotional infidelity more distressing than sexual infidelity. Participants completed the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974) and 6 hypothetical infidelity scenarios (Buss et al., 1999). To statistically control for third variables, participants also completed the 11-item Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (Gangestad & Simpson, 1991). Although we found a main effect for self-monitoring in romantic jealousy, these results did not support our hypotheses. That is, these reliable differences in self-monitoring reflected more or less distress by emotional infidelity. Limitations (e.g., third variables, directionality) and future directions (e.g., potential moderators/mediators for self-monitoring differences in romantic jealousy) of this research are discussed.

Keywords: self-monitoring, romantic jealousy, infidelity, sociosexual orientation

Self-Monitoring and Romantic Relationships: Individual Differences in Romantic Jealousy

Individuals differ in their underlying motives that guide their behavior. Some individuals are motivated to be situationally appropriate, whereas other individuals are motivated to be self-congruent (see, for review, Fuglestad & Snyder, 2009). Using expressive control as a framework to explain individual differences in impression management, Snyder (1974) developed the theory of self-monitoring to capture systematic differences in individuals' willingness and ability to engage in self-presentation (e.g., Fuglestad & Snyder, 2009; Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Snyder, 1974, 1987). Snyder (1974) originally defined self-monitoring as the propensity to monitor and manage one's self-presentation. Snyder suggested there are two types of people in this world: high self-monitors (i.e., individuals who are motivated by social status) and low self-monitors (i.e., individuals who are motivated by self-congruency). These individuals systematically differ across the five dimensions of self-monitoring: Attention, motivation, ability, use of ability, and behavioral consistency (see also Fuglestad & Snyder, 2009; Snyder, 1974).

Prototypical high self-monitors are concerned with being "the right person at the right place at the right time" (Snyder, 1974, p. 352). With that motivation in mind, high self-monitors attend to external information (e.g., situational features) for inferring socially appropriate behavior. Their strong focus on interpersonal contexts gives high self-monitors a vast knowledge of a multitude of social roles. Using their broad repertoire of social knowledge, high self-monitors are able to quickly identify appropriate social identities to strategically manage their public images. Given that environmental contexts vary from situation to situation, high self-monitors' behavior is situationally specific.

Prototypical low self-monitors, on the other hand, are concerned with being true to themselves (Snyder, 1974). With that motivation in mind, low self-monitors attend to internal information (e.g., attitudes, beliefs, values) for enacting personal behaviors. Their strong focus on personal states allows low self-monitors to develop a thorough understanding of the self. In order to be self-congruent, low self-monitors use their well-developed sense of self to verify that their behavior matches exactly with their internal states. Given that personal attributes remain relatively stable across situations, low self-monitors' behavior is cross-situationally consistent.

Self-monitors have different ideas and goals for managing their close relationships (for a review, see Leone & Hawkins, 2006). High self-monitors prefer to compartmentalize their social worlds so they can fulfill their various social roles with ease. Low self-monitors, on the other hand, create an integrated social world that allows them to be true to their self with little to no internal conflict. These distinct views that high self-monitors and low self-monitors have about their social worlds in general carryover into specific kinds of interactions like dating relationships.

There are several aspects of dating worlds (e.g., partner preferences, levels of commitment, sexual history) that systematically differ among high self-monitors and low self-monitors (for a review, see Snyder & Simpson, 1987). These individual differences are evident in the partner preferences of low and high self-monitors (Jones, 1993; Snyder, Berscheid, & Glick, 1985). When reviewing profiles of prospective dates, low self-monitors focus their attention on internal attributes (e.g., personality traits) of a potential dating partner, whereas high self-monitors focus their attention on external characteristics (e.g., physical appearance) of a potential dating partner (Snyder, Berscheid, & Glick, 1985). Even when time spent assessing both internal and external attributes are comparable, low self-monitors give more weight to indicators of personal

compatibility than do those high in self-monitoring. Conversely, high self-monitors give more weight to indicators of physical attractiveness than do those low in self-monitoring (Jones, 1993).

High self-monitors and low self-monitors also have divergent orientations toward levels of commitment in romantic relationships (for a review, see Snyder, 1987). High self-monitors typically adopt an uncommitted orientation (i.e., willingness to engage in casual sex) toward romantic relationships (Snyder, Simpson, & Gangestad, 1986). That is, high self-monitors tend to experience less psychologically close and less exclusive relationships than do low self-monitors. Low self-monitors, on the other hand, typically adopt a committed orientation (i.e., unwillingness to engage in casual sex) toward romantic relationships. That is, low self-monitors tend to experience more psychologically close and exclusive relationships than do high self-monitors. Consequences of these divergent orientations are evident in reported willingness to substitute a current dating partner for an alternative partner (Snyder & Simpson, 1984). That is, high self-monitors are more likely than low self-monitors to choose an alternative other-sex skilled activity partner over their current romantic partner for a specified activity.

Self-monitoring differences are also evident in other aspects of dating relationships. When they are in a "steady" relationship, high self-monitors report having dated their recent romantic partner for an average of 11 months; if they are, however, not involved in an exclusive relationship, then high self-monitors report having dated six romantic partners with in the last 12 months (Snyder & Simpson, 1984). Conversely, when low self-monitors are in a "steady" relationship, they report having dated their recent romantic partner for an average of 20 months; if they are, however, not in an exclusive relationship, then low self-monitors report having dated three to four romantic partners within the last 12 months (Snyder & Simpson, 1984). High self-

monitors also reported having had more sexual partners within the last year than did their low self-monitoring counterparts (Snyder, Simpson, & Gangestad, 1986). For low self-monitors, love is seen as a long-lasting and profound investment with their "one true love"; for high self-monitors, however, love is seen as a casual affair that could develop with virtually anyone (Neto, 1993; Oner, 2002).

Although a great deal is known about the romantic relationships of high self-monitors and low self-monitors, more research is needed regarding the dissolution of romantic relationships in the worlds of self-monitors (Leone & Hawkins, 2006). There are many factors involved in the dissolution of relationships (e.g., Le, Dove, Agnew, Korn, & Musto, 2010; Simpson, 1987). An interesting line of inquiry that is related to the termination of such relationships involves romantic jealousy.

Romantic Jealousy

According to Bringle and Buunk (1991) as well as White and Mullen (1989), jealousy is a complex set of emotional reactions (e.g., hurt, fear, anger), cognitive processes (e.g., worry, suspicion) and behavioral manifestations (e.g., surveillance, violence). Consequences of jealousy are triggered by real or imagined threats to the self or to a valued relationship (Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982; DeSteno & Salovey, 1995; Hupka, 1981; Mathes & Severa, 1981; Pines, 1992; Symons, 1979; Trivers, 1972; White, 1981). One such threat often involves cues of infidelity (i.e., emotional infidelity, sexual infidelity) on the part of one's partner in a romantic relationship (Buss, Larsen, & Westen, 1996; Buss, Larsen, Westen, & Semmelroth, 1992).

Although men and women find both types of infidelities distressing, researchers also find robust sex differences in responses to infidelity (cf. Buss, 2000; Carpenter, 2012; Harris, 2003;

Sagarin et al., 2012). Men relative to women report sexual infidelity as more distressing than emotional infidelity (Buss et al., 1992; Buss et al., 1999; Buunk, Angleitner, Oubaid, & Buss, 1996; Sagarin et al., 2012). Conversely, women relative to men report emotional infidelity as more distressing than sexual infidelity (Buss et al., 1992; Buss et al., 1999; Sagarin et al., 2012). Researchers have found these sex differences in other countries such as the Netherlands and Germany (Buunk et al., 1996) and Korea and Japan (Buss et al., 1999) as well as in China (Geary, Rumsey, Bow-Thomas, & Hoard, 1995).

Humans may have adapted a psychological mechanism to solve universal problems associated with successful reproduction (Buss, 2003; Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Gangestad & Simpson, 2000; Symons, 1979). According to evolutionary psychologists (e.g., Buss et al., 1992; Daly et al., 1982; Darwin, 1871; Symons, 1979; Trivers, 1972), men and women faced different reproductive challenges. Buss et al. (1992) used this theory of evolved sex differences to explain which of the cues of infidelity would predict jealousy for men and for women. Based on certain sexual selection pressures for men and for women, our ancestors developed an adaptive psychological mechanism (i.e., jealousy) to optimize their detection of threats involving intersexual competitions. Selection pressures such as paternal uncertainty and paternal investment may in part explain these sex-differentiated responses in romantic jealousy (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Men who reacted with more jealousy to cues of sexual infidelity may decrease their likelihood of being cuckolded compared to men who reacted with less jealousy (Sagarin et al., 2012). By contrast, women who reacted with more jealousy to cues of emotional infidelity compared to women who reacted with less jealousy may have increased their likelihood of maintaining their partner's resources (Sagarin et al., 2012).

Jealousy has been assessed using forced-choice hypothetical scenarios in which participants were asked to imagine that their current romantic partner had become involved with someone else (Buss et al., 1992; Buss et al., 1999). Participants then chose one of two scenarios that was perceived to be more distressing. There is a substantial debate concerning whether these sex differences reflect either true differences between men and women's reactions of jealousy or simply measurement artifacts (cf. Berman & Frazier, 2005; Carpenter, 2012; DeSteno, Bartlett, Braverman, & Salovey, 2002; Harris, 2000, 2003a; Sagarin et al., 2012). Some researchers have replicated these sex differences using a continuous measure of jealousy (Edlund & Sagarin, 2009), whereas other researchers have failed to replicate these sex differences using a continuous measure of jealousy (cf. DeSteno et al., 2002; Green & Sabini, 2006; Harris, 2002). However, Sagarin et al. (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of 199 jealousy effects across 47 studies and found most sex difference effects were robust across continuous measures and forced-choice measures of jealousy. Therefore, sex difference effects of jealousy are clearly not artifacts of measurement.

Given what researchers have discovered about those distinct orientations self-monitors adopt toward committed relationships, we wanted to expand our knowledge of the dating worlds of high and low self-monitors. For our study, we explored links between self-monitoring and romantic jealousy. Is there a relationship between self-monitoring propensities and experiences of romantic jealousy? If an association between individual differences in self-monitoring and romantic jealousy exists, do self-monitoring differences in romantic jealousy parallel sex differences in romantic jealousy?

We developed this line of thinking because men (who are disproportionately high self-monitors) tend to adopt an unrestricted sociosexual orientation toward sexual relationships,

whereas women (who are disproportionately low self-monitors) tend to adopt a restricted orientation toward sexual relationships (Snyder, Simpson, & Gangestad, 1986). Individuals with a restricted orientation (females, low self-monitors) initiate relationships with a particular person with whom they feel a strong psychological and emotional connection (Simpson, Wilson, & Winterheld, 2014). Therefore, a rival with whom one's partner might form a strong emotional bond (emotional infidelity) may trigger jealousy more for low self-monitors than for high self-monitors. In contrast, individuals with an unrestricted orientation (males, high self-monitors) are willing to engage in casual sexual relationships more often and with little need for psychological closeness (Simpson et al., 2014). However, high self-monitors might not be so comfortable with their partners' engaging in extra-relations sex. To the extent that it becomes known to others, sexual infidelity by a partner may be especially threatening to the public image of high self-monitors. Therefore, a rival who one's partner might find sexually attractive (sexual infidelity) may trigger jealousy more for high self-monitors than for low self-monitors. We therefore hypothesized that low self-monitors would be more distressed by emotional rather than sexual infidelity, whereas high self-monitors would be more distressed by sexual rather than emotional infidelity.

Method

Participants

Our sample was 113 students (87 females, 26 males) enrolled in psychology courses at the University of North Florida. Participants used an online SONA system to elect to participate in our study titled "Individual Differences in Romantic Jealousy." Participants received and applied an extra credit to their psychology courses. Those students who did not want to

participate in this study had alternative means of earning extra credit. Participants had to be at least 18 years of age to participate in our study.

Participants' self-reported ethnicity was 68.1% White/Caucasian, 10.6% Black/African-American, 3.5% Hispanic/Latino, 11.5% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 6.2% Other. Participants' age ranged from 18 to 46 years old (M= 22.8, SD = 5.1). In terms of current relationship status, 15.9% of participants were single, 22.1% of participants were casually dating, 41.6% of participants were in committed relationships, 14.2% of participants were cohabitating, and 6.2% of participants were married. Participants' length of current relationship if any was measured using months (M= 34.4, SD = 35.3). A majority (81.4%) of participants had previously been in one or more committed relationships. A majority (69.0%) of participants had previously been in one or more sexually active relationships.

We used Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct to protect rights of all participants (American Psychological Association, 2010). All participants signed an informed consent document. None of our participants withdrew from this study.

Procedure

Participants completed this study individually. As soon as participants arrived at our lab, a research assistant directed each participant to a computer, opened up MediaLab v2010, and entered a participant number. Once all participants were present, that research assistant provided every participant with an informed consent document and explained our purpose of this study was to examine individual differences in romantic jealousy. As participants read an informed consent document, this research assistant emphasized that participation was voluntary, responses to this survey were anonymous, and withdrawal without penalty was permissible at any time.

That research assistant was present during this study to assist participants who showed any sign of emotional distress or who had questions. This research assistant secured a signed informed consent document from every participant, asked participants to think about their current or most recent dating partner, and instructed participants to begin this MediaLab survey. Participants completed the six hypothetical infidelity scenarios (Buss et al., 1992; Buss et al., 1999), the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974) and then the 11-item Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991).

Measures

Romantic Jealousy. We measured romantic jealousy using six forced choice infidelity scenarios (Buss et al., 1992; Buss et al., 1999). To ensure veracity of any replicated sex differences in our study, we kept Buss' et al. (1992) original wording across all six-infidelity scenarios. Buss et al. (1992) used two scenarios to depict sexual infidelity and emotional infidelity. Using instructions adapted from those used by Buss et al. (1992), we instructed our participants "to think of a serious committed romantic relationship that you have had in the past, that you currently have, or that you would like to have. Imagine that you discover that the person with whom you've been seriously involved became interested in someone else." In one of these two scenarios, we asked participants, "What would upset or distress you more: (A) Imagining your partner forming a deep emotional attachment to that other person (*emotional infidelity*), or (B) Imagining your partner enjoying passionate sexual intercourse with that other person (*sexual infidelity*)?" In the second of these two scenarios, we asked participants, "What would upset or distress you more: (A) Imagining your partner falling in love with that other person (emotional infidelity) or, (B) Imagining your partner trying different sexual positions with that person (sexual infidelity)?" Those two original scenarios were worded such that emotional infidelity

occurred without sexual infidelity and that sexual infidelity occurred without emotional infidelity.

Buss et al. (1999) used four additional scenarios to depict sexual infidelity and emotional infidelity. Using instructions adapted from those used by Buss et al. (1999), we instructed participants, "Imagine your partner *both* formed an emotional attachment to another person *and* had sexual intercourse with that other person." We then asked participants, "Which aspect of your partner's involvement would upset you more: (A) the sexual intercourse with that other person, or (B) the emotional attachment to that other person?" Those three other scenarios were also worded such that sexual infidelity and emotional infidelity had not occurred together (e.g., "Imagining your partner having sexual intercourse with that person, but you are certain that they will *not* form a deep emotional attachment", or "Imaging your partner forming a deep emotional attachment to that person, but you are certain that they will *not* have sexual intercourse."). To eliminate order effects, we counterbalanced order of response options to all six infidelity scenarios (i.e., sexual infidelity versus emotional infidelity, emotional infidelity versus sexual infidelity).

We scored responses in a direction of sexual jealousy. That is, if a participant chose a sexual infidelity option, we assigned that response with a score of 1 and if a participant chose emotional infidelity option, we assigned that response with a score of 0. We summed responses to all six scenarios. Scores ranged from 0 to 6. Higher scores indicated increasingly more sexual jealousy than emotional jealousy. Conversely, lower scores indicated increasingly more emotional jealousy than sexual jealousy.

There is evidence of reliability in scores for these forced choice infidelity scenarios (Buss et al., 1999). Researchers measure reliability of scores across items using an internal consistency index (Furr, 2011). Several researchers used those six infidelity scenarios and found a minimum Cronbach's alpha of .79 (Becker, Sagarin, Guadagno, Millvo, & Nicastle, 2004; Bohner, Echterhoff, Glab, Patrzek, & Lampridis, 2010; Brase, Adair, & Monk, 2014; Burchell & Ward, 2011; Miller & Maner, 2009). Shackelford, Buss, and Bennett (2002) used the two original Buss et al. (1992) infidelity scenarios and found a phi coefficient of .41. Phi is an index of associations from scores on categorical variables (Cohen, 1988). We found a Cronbach's alpha of .66 in our sample.

There is evidence of convergent validity in scores for these six infidelity scenarios (Becker et al., 2004; Buss et al., 1999). Convergent evidence occurs when two methods of measuring a single construct have correlated results (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Furr, 2011). Physiological measures of electrodermal activity (e.g., sweating), electromyographic activity (e.g., brow muscles used when frowning), and pulse rate (e.g., heart rate) were used to measure an individual's distress toward sexual infidelity and emotional infidelity (Buss et al., 1992; but see Harris, 2000, for a counterargument). All participants showed an increase in pulse rate, an increase in brow contraction, and an increase in sweat while reading the two original scenarios. Schützwohl (2004) measured participants' reaction time for choosing which infidelity type was distressing. Men showed faster reaction times for choosing sexual infidelity than emotional infidelity. Conversely, women showed faster reaction times for choosing emotional infidelity than sexual infidelity. Several researchers also have found participants' responses to the two original scenarios with a forced choice answer format are positively correlated with responses to

the two original infidelity scenarios with a continuous answer format (cf., Becker et al., 2004; Cann & Baucom, 2004; Tagler, 2010; Tagler & Gentry, 2011).

There is evidence of discriminant validity in scores for these six infidelity scenarios. Discriminant validity occurs when measures of conceptually unrelated constructs have uncorrelated scores (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Furr, 2011, Nunnally, 1990). Researchers conducted a meta-analytic review of sex differences in responses to jealousy to examine whether these robust interactions between sex of participant and type of infidelity exist across several methodological variations: participants' age, random versus convenience sampling, forced-choice versus continuous response formats, unipolar versus bipolar response scales, student versus nonstudent populations, published versus unpublished articles. In short, there was no evidence that these sex differences in reactions to different kinds of infidelity were artifacts of measurement procedures (cf., Harris, 2003; Sagarin et al., 2012). Additionally, Bassett (2005) found no relationship between race of potential rivals and reactions towards infidelity scenarios.

There is also evidence that these scenarios are useful in substantiating theoretically derived hypotheses concerning romantic jealousy. Several researchers have replicated sex-differentiated responses to sexual infidelity and emotional infidelity in the United States (e.g., DeSteno & Salovey, 1996; Harris, 2003; Shackleford et al., 2002; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1993), in Japan and Korea (e.g., Buss et al., 1999), in Sweden (e.g., Wiederman & Kendall, 1999), and in Germany as well as the Netherlands (e.g., Buunk et al., 1996). Sex differences in responses to infidelity scenarios are related with sex differences in responses to mate value (e.g., Brown & Moore, 2003; Buss, 1989a; Buss & Shackelford, 1997), mating strategies (e.g., Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Mathes, 2005) as well as infidelity forgiveness (e.g., Buss, 2013). These sex differences in sexual jealousy are also related with sex differences in mate retention tactics such as spousal

abuse and spouse homicide (Buss, 1994; Daly & Wilson, 1988). Researchers also have discovered a correlation between participants' relationship status, sociosexuality, and responses toward infidelity (Buss, 2000; Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Treger & Sprecher, 2011).

Self-Monitoring. We measured individual differences in self-monitoring using Snyder's (1974) 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Snyder (1974) developed 25 self-descriptive items to measure self-monitoring in terms of five dimensions: motivation (e.g., "I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or to win their favor."), attention (e.g., "When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues."), ability (e.g., "I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations."), use of ability (e.g., "I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them."), and behavioral consistency (e.g., "In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons."). Each dimension was comprised of five individual items, and participants responded to individual items using a *true-false* answer format.

Thirteen items were positively worded statements (e.g., "I would probably make a good actor.") such that a response option of *true* indicated high self-monitoring. Twelve items were negatively worded statements (e.g., "I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.") such that a response option of *false* indicated high self-monitoring. That is, if a participant chose a true response option, we assigned that response with a score of 1. If a participant chose a false response option, we assigned that response with a score of 2. We summed responses to all six scenarios. Scores ranged from 25 to 48. We reverse scored negatively worded items. We scored all responses in a direction of high self-monitoring such that higher scores indicated higher degrees of self-monitoring. We summed responses to all 25 items and classified participants either as a high self-monitor or a low self-monitor based on a median split of this full range of

scores in this sample for the Self-Monitoring Scale. Participants whose scores were at or above this median on the Self-Monitoring Scale were classified as high self-monitors. Conversely, participants whose scores were below this median on the Self-Monitoring Scale were classified as low self-monitors.

Researchers have found evidence of reliability in scores for the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Fuglestad & Snyder, 2009; Snyder, 1974). Internal reliability is a consistency index of scores across items on a scale (Furr, 2011). Snyder (1974) found a KR20 of .70 for scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Gangestad and Snyder (1984) found a KR20 of .66 for scores on the 25-item Self-monitoring Scale. Several researchers have found Cronbach's alphas of .69 or larger for scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale (e.g., Ahmed, Garg, & Braimoh, 1986; Briggs, Cheek, & Buss, 1980; Day, Schleicher, Uckless, & Hiller, 2002; Glick, 1985; Girvin, Weaver, & Snyder, 2010). In our sample, we found a Cronbach's alpha of .80.

There is evidence of temporal reliability of scores for the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Researchers use test-retest consistency to measure reliability of scores on a scale across time (Furr, 2011). Snyder (1974) found at one-month interval a temporal reliability correlation of .83 for scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Girvin et al. (2010) found over a four-week interval a test-retest correlation of .73 for scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale.

Several researchers found evidence of convergent validity in scores for the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Convergent validity occurs when two measures of a conceptually related construct have positively correlated scores (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Furr, 2011). Snyder (1974) conducted a sociometric study of peer ratings and found convergent validity in scores for his 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Snyder instructed members of a male fraternity to rate themselves as

well as six of their fellow fraternity brothers on these five dimensions of self-monitoring. Self-reported scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale positively correlated with respective peer ratings (Snyder, 1974). Snyder also found convergent validity of scores by examining groups of individuals whose behaviors often resemble high self-monitoring propensities or low self-monitoring propensities. Professional actors, for example, scored significantly higher on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale than those participants who were not professional actors. Psychiatric patients, for example, scored significantly lower on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale than those participants who were not hospitalized (Snyder, 1974). Snyder and Gangestad (1986) assessed similarity between scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale and scores on the 13-item Lennox and Wolfe (1984) measure and found a correlation coefficient of .72.

There is evidence of discriminant validity for scores on the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Discriminant validity occurs when measures of conceptually unrelated constructs have uncorrelated scores (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Furr, 2011). Snyder (1974) found weak negative correlations between scores on his Self-Monitoring Scale and scores on Marlowe-Crown Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964), Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Psychopathic Deviate scale (McKinley & Hathaway, 1944), the *c* scale of the Performance Style Test (Ring & Wallston, 1968). Snyder (1974) found no significant correlations between scores on his 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale and scores on Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970), Achievement Anxiety Test (Alpert-Haber, 1960), and inner-other directedness (Kassarjian, 1962; but see Howells, 1993, for an alternative view). Snyder and Monson (1975) found a weak correlation coefficient between scores on the Self-Monitoring Scale and scores on the Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966).

There is also evidence that the Self-Monitoring Scale is useful in substantiating theoretically derived hypotheses concerning romantic relationships. Individual differences in the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale are related with individual differences in conceptions of love (e.g., Neto, 1993), mate preferences (e.g., Jones, 1993), sociosexual orientation (e.g., Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Individual differences in the 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale are also related to individual differences in number of sexual romantic partners as well as longevity of romantic relationship (e.g., Snyder & Simpson, 1984).

Sociosexual Orientation. We measured individual differences toward sociosexual orientation using the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Simpson and Gangestad (1991) identified 11 items that are intended to measure three domains of sociosexual orientation: overt sociosexual behavior (e.g., "With how many different partners have you had sex on one and only one occasion?"), covert sociosexual behavior (e.g., "How frequently do you think about sex?"), and sociosexual attitude (e.g., "Sex without love is OK."). Participants responded to three overt behavioral items using a free response format. Participants responded to two covert behavioral items using a 9-point response scale (1 = *virtually never,* 9 = *almost all of the time*) and responded to another cover behavioral item using an 8-point response scale (1 = *never,* 8 = *at least once a day*). Participants responded to three attitudinal items using a 9-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree,* 9 = *strongly agree*).

Two attitudinal items were positively worded statements (e.g., "I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying casual sex with different partners.") such that a response in *agreement or often* indicated an unrestricted sociosexual orientation. One attitudinal item was a negatively worded statement (i.e., "I would have to be closely attached to someone (both emotionally and psychologically) before I could feel comfortable and fully enjoy having sex with

him or her.") such that a response in *disagreement or never* indicated an unrestricted sociosexual orientation. We reverse scored responses to that negatively worded item. We scored individual responses to each of the 11 items in a direction of unrestricted sociosexual orientation such that higher scores indicated higher degrees of unrestricted orientation (e.g., willingness to engage in casual sex). Based on recommendation of Simpson and Gangestad (1991), we used a weighting scheme to standardize responses to all 11 items. Participants with higher scores on the Sociosexual Inventory have increasingly unrestricted orientations toward close relationships.

There is evidence of reliability in scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Researchers measure reliability of scores across items using an internal consistency index (Furr, 2011). Simpson and Gangestad (1991, 1992) found a Cronbach's alpha of .73 and .74 in scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. Several researchers found a Cronbach's alpha of .72 or larger in scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (e.g., Jonason, Teicher, & Schmitt, 2011; Jones, 1993; Schmitt, 2005; Schmitt & Buss, 2000; Walker, Tokar, & Fischer, 2000). Russell and Harton (2005) also found a Cronbach's alpha of .80 for scores on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. Webster and Bryan (2007) found a Cronbach's alpha of .85. In our sample, we found a Cronbach's alpha of .69 for scores on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory.

There is evidence of temporal reliability of scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. Researchers use test-retest consistency to measure reliability of scores on a scale across time (Furr, 2011). Simpson and Gangestad (1989a) found at two-month interval a temporal reliability correlation of .94 for scores on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory.

There is evidence of convergent validity in scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Convergent validity occurs when two measures of a conceptually related construct have positively correlated scores (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Furr, 2011). Simpson and Gangestad (1991) conducted a sociometric study of couple-ratings and found convergent validity in scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. Simpson and Gangestad (1991) instructed 144 heterosexual couples to rate themselves on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory as well as to indicate length of time prior to having sex with their current partner. Within-couples' scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory were positively correlated with one another (r = .30). Individuals whose scores were low on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory were more likely than those individuals whose scores were high on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory to report extended pre-sex time with their current partner.

Simpson and Gangestad (1991) also found further evidence of convergent validity in scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory by examining participants' self-reported extra dyadic sexual involvement. Simpson and Gangestad (1991) asked participants to rate themselves on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory as well as to indicate whether that participant has engaged in sexual activities with someone other than their current partner. Men and women who reported involvement in sexual activities with someone other than their current partner, for example, scored significantly higher on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory than those participants who reported no involvement. Simpson and Gangestad (1991) also found positive correlations between scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory and scores for Eysenck's (1976) measures of permissiveness and impersonal sex (rs ranged from .32 to .54). Bailey, Gaulin, Agyel and Gladue (1994) also found a correlation coefficient of .76 between scores for

the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory and scores for Bailey's et al. (1994) Interest in Uncommitted Sex scale.

There is evidence of discriminant validity in scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Discriminant validity occurs when measures from theoretically unrelated constructs are found to be uncorrelated (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Furr, 2011). Simpson and Gangestad (1991) found weak negative correlations between scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory and scores for Eysenck's (1976) Inventory of Attitudes to Sex (e.g., sexual satisfaction subscale, sexual anxiety subscale, neurotic sex subscale). Meston, Heiman, Trapnell, and Paulhus (1998) found non-significant weak correlations between scores on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory and scores on the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1989) as well as scores on the Maslowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Maslowe & Crowne, 1964).

There is also evidence that the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory is useful in substantiating theoretically derived hypotheses concerning sexuality. Individual differences in sociosexual orientation are related with individual differences in partner attributes (e.g., Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Simpson & Gangestad, 1992), number of lifetime sexual partners (e.g., Webster & Bryan, 2007), and in propensities of self-monitoring (e.g., Gangestad & Simpson, 1990; Simpson & Gangestad, 1991, 1992) as well as short-term mating strategies (e.g., Greiling & Buss, 2000). Individual differences in sociosexual orientation are also related with individual differences in attachment orientation (e.g., Brennan & Shaver, 1995). Simpson and Gangestad (1991) also have found individual differences in the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory are related with individual differences in Lund's Commitment Scale (Lund, 1985) and in Rusbult's Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980) as well as in Rubin's Love Scale (Rubin, 1970).

Treger and Sprecher (2011) also found evidence of validity in scores for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory by examining participants' sociosexual orientation and those participants' reactions to six infidelity scenarios. Participants with sexually unrestricted orientations were more likely than were participants with sexually restricted orientations to be distressed by sexual infidelity. Conversely, participants with sexually restricted orientations were more likely than were participants with sexually unrestricted orientations to be distressed by emotional infidelity.

Demographics. We asked participants to identify basic demographic information such as their age (free response), sex (*male* or *female*) as well as race (*White/Caucasian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander,* or *Other*). We assessed participants' current relationship status (i.e., "What is your current romantic relationship status?"). Response options were labeled *Single, Single (casually dating), Single (committed relationship), Single (cohabitating),* or *Married*. We asked participants to indicate length of current relationship using months (free response). We also measured participants' experience in a committed relationship (i.e., "Have you ever been in a serious or committed relationship?"). Participants responded to that previous item using a forced choice format with response options labeled *yes* or *no.* If a participant indicated yes, then we asked that participant "Was this a sexual relationship?" Participants responded to that previous item using a forced choice format with response options labeled *yes* or *no*. We also asked participants to indicate a total number of committed relationships (free response). We then asked participants to determine the length of their longest committed relationship using months (free response).

Results

Preliminary Analyses

We conducted several preliminary analyses to determine whether participants' biological sex was confounded with self-monitoring differences in our sample. Because we simply measured individual differences in self-monitoring, there may be other variables that moderate or mediate any relationships we found in this study. In a meta-analysis, several researchers provided evidence that participants' biological sex and self-monitoring are consistently confounded (Day et al., 2002). Individuals who are categorized as low self-monitors are usually female. Contrarily, individuals who are categorized as high self-monitors are usually male. Recall that we used a median split of the full range of scores in our sample to classify participants as either high or low self-monitors. Both of these variables are categorical in nature with two levels each: biological sex (male vs. female) and self-monitoring (high vs. low).

To examine a potential confound between participants' biological sex and self-monitoring scores, we ran a chi-square analysis to examine whether males were more likely to be high self-monitors than low self-monitors and whether females were more likely to be low self-monitors than high self-monitors in this study. In our sample, we did not find a significant relationship between participants' biological sex and self-monitoring scores χ^2 (1, N = 113) < 1. Females were no more likely to be low self-monitors (49.4%) than high self-monitors (50.6%). Males were no more likely to be high self-monitors (50%) than low self-monitors (50%). Through our preliminary analyses, we established that participants' biological sex is not a confounding variable in this study.

We also examined another plausible third variable that is theoretically and empirically linked with self-monitoring (Leck & Simpson, 1999; Sakaguchi, Sakai, Ueda, Hasegawa, 2007; Snyder, Simpson, & Gangestad, 1985). As previously mentioned, scores from sociosexual orientation inventory describes a person's willingness (or lack thereof) to engage in casual sex (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Given that high self-monitors often adopt an unrestricted approach toward sexual relationships and low self-monitors often adopt a restricted approach toward sexual relationships, we anticipated participants' sociosexuality might be confounded with self-monitoring.

Because self-monitoring (predictor variable) has two levels (high vs. low) and sociosexuality (potential confound) is continuous, we used a two-tailed independent *t*-test to examine whether high and low self-monitors differed in their sociosexual orientation. We did not find a significant difference in sociosexuality between these two groups, $t\ (110) = .06$, $p = .475$. High self-monitors ($M = 79.33$, $SD = 48.41$) and low self-monitors ($M = 80.13$, $SD = 85.7$) did not reliably differ in their sociosexual orientation in this sample. Through our preliminary analyses, we established that these predictor variables are independent in this sample.

Main Analysis

We hypothesized that low self-monitors would be more distressed by emotional rather than sexual infidelity, whereas high self-monitors would be more distressed by sexual rather than emotional infidelity. Our predictor variable (i.e., self-monitoring) was categorical with two and our outcome variable (i.e., romantic jealousy) was continuous. We expected to find a significant difference between high and low self-monitors in romantic jealousy.

We tested this hypothesis using a two-tailed independent samples *t*-test. We expected to find a significant difference between high and low self-monitors in their scores of romantic jealousy. In this sample, we in fact found a significant difference in romantic jealousy between high and low self-monitors, t (111) = 2.62, p = .010. Low self-monitors (M = 2.25, SD = 1.84) scored higher than did high self-monitors (M = 1.45, SD = 1.36) on romantic jealousy. That is, high self-monitors were more distressed than were low self-monitors by emotional infidelity. Our hypothesis was not supported with these findings in this sample.

Ancillary Analyses

Although there were no sex differences in self-monitoring propensities in our sample, sex differences could potentially moderate self-monitoring differences in romantic jealousy. To evaluate this potential moderation, we conducted a 2 (high vs. low self-monitor) x 2 (male vs. female) ANOVA with romantic jealousy as our continuous outcome variable. The effects of the *t*-test previously reported were corroborated by the results from this ANOVA, such that high self-monitors were more distressed than were low self-monitors by emotional infidelity, F (1,109) = 4.08, p = .046. There was also a marginally reliable main effect of biological sex on scores for romantic jealousy, F (1,109) = 2.89, p = .092. Women (M = 1.70, SD = 1.56) were more distressed than were men (M = 2.35, SD = 1.94) by emotional infidelity. The interaction between biological sex and self-monitoring was not statistically significant, $F < 1$. Thus, although there were sex differences in romantic jealousy, those differences did not moderate self-monitoring differences in romantic jealousy in our sample.

Although there were no sociosexual orientation differences in self-monitoring propensities in our sample, differences in sociosexual orientation could moderate self-monitoring

differences in romantic jealousy. To evaluate this potential moderation, we conducted a multiple regression analysis using sociosexual orientation as a continuous predictor variable, self-monitoring as a categorical predictor variable, and romantic jealousy as a continuous outcome variable. The effects of the *t*-test previously reported were corroborated by the results from this ANOVA, such that high self-monitors were more distressed than were low self-monitors by emotional infidelity, F (1,108) = 6.18, p = .015. There was also a marginally reliable main effect of sociosexual orientation on scores for romantic jealousy, F (1,108) = 3.20, p = .077. Individuals who were more distressed by sexual infidelity than emotional infidelity also had an increasingly unrestricted sociosexual orientation. Conversely, individuals who were more distressed by emotional infidelity than sexual infidelity also had an increasingly restricted sociosexual orientation. The interaction between self-monitoring and sociosexual orientation was not significant, F (1,108) = 1.06, p = .305. Thus, although there were marginally reliable sociosexual differences in romantic jealousy, these differences did not moderate the relationship between self-monitoring and romantic jealousy.

Discussion

We explored how individual differences in self-monitoring were related to romantic jealousy. Given their restricted and committed orientation toward romantic relationships, we expected low self-monitors (like females) would report more distress from emotional infidelity than from sexual infidelity. Given their unrestricted and uncommitted orientation toward romantic relationships, we expected high self-monitors (like males) would report more distress from sexual infidelity than from emotional infidelity. However, we did not find support for this hypothesis in our sample.

Although these results were contrary to our hypothesis, we did find a reliable main effect for self-monitoring in romantic jealousy. Our sample as a whole found the emotional aspect of infidelity distressing. Hence, these reliable differences we found in self-monitoring reflected more or less distress by emotional infidelity. Although both low self-monitors and high self-monitors found emotional infidelity more distressing than sexual infidelity, high self-monitors were more distressed by emotional infidelity than were low self-monitors.

There are some plausible alternative explanations for these findings. One explanation might involve the biased nature of our sample. Approximately three quarters of our sample was female. Empirically, females tend to report more distress from emotional infidelity than from sexual infidelity (e.g., Buss et al., 1992; Buss et al., 1999; DeSteno & Salovey, 1996a). For our sample as a whole, that is in fact what we found. If we had a larger number of males and a number that approximated the number of females in our sample, then we may have at least observed our predicted self-monitoring differences among males.

However, even if we had observed our expected self-monitoring differences in romantic jealousy, there still could be an alternative explanation for this finding. One such explanation might be individual differences in sociosexual orientation (Simpson & Gangestad, 1992). There is theoretical and empirical evidence linking self-monitoring propensities with orientations toward sexual relationships (Fuglestad & Snyder, 2009; Sakaguchi et al., 2007). That is, high self-monitors tend to have an unrestricted sociosexual orientation whereas low self-monitors tend to have a restricted sociosexual orientation. Consistent with those aforementioned findings, individuals high in self-monitoring compared to individuals low in self-monitoring typically report dating a large number of partners of relatively short durations, feeling lower levels of intimacy relative to their partner, and engaging in more one-night stands (Simpson & Gangestad,

1992). This possible confound however can be ruled out given results of our analyses. That is, we found no relationship between self-monitoring and sociosexual orientation. However, we cannot rule out other plausible explanations for these findings.

Limitations

Other potential limitations of our study involve its correlational design. Our non-experimental design leaves our results prone to two problems commonly associated with correlational designs (Hoyle & Leary, 2009; Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2010). One problem in conducting correlational research is an unknown causal direction between variables. Another problem commonly associated with correlational design deals with identifying and eliminating confounding variables.

Those aforementioned problems limit our ability to make causal inferences concerning why two or more variables are related (Hoyle & Leary, 2009; Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2010). Even if we had found a connection between self-monitoring and romantic jealousy, we could not infer self-monitoring propensities caused romantic jealousy because we did not manipulate self-monitoring. However, we speculate self-monitoring propensities precede individual differences in romantic jealousy for two reasons. One reason is such that development of self-monitoring occurs early in life (i.e., self-monitoring propensities are observed in children as young as 6 years) (Graziano, Leone, Musser, & Lautenschlager, 1987). Another such reason is that experiences involving romance typically occurs post puberty. Given that puberty occurs well after the development of self-monitoring, we speculate individual differences in self-monitoring precede individual differences in romantic jealousy.

However, each of these variables could be caused by a third variable. Third variables (i.e., confounding variables) may systematically vary with our variables of interest and can be problematic (Hoyle & Leary, 2009; Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2010). Two variables might be related and neither could be a cause of the other. Instead, two variables might only be related because they have a common cause (i.e., a third variable). Even if we had obtained our predicted relationship, other variables could be responsible for this relationship.

One such third variable might be the type of jealousy experienced by low self-monitors and high self-monitors. In a recent investigation, Leone and Andolina (unpublished manuscript) found self-monitoring differences in experiences of emotional and behavioral jealousy. Low self-monitors, compared to their high self-monitoring counterparts, experienced greater levels of emotional jealousy than behavioral jealousy. Given that low self-monitors' use their internal affective states as a guide for expressing their thoughts and feelings, these individuals may be prone to experience jealousy in reaction to a partner's emotional transgression only because those low self-monitors are emotionally jealous in general. High self-monitors, on the other hand, experienced greater levels behavioral jealousy than emotional jealousy. Given high self-monitors' openness toward sexual variety, these individuals may project their unrestricted orientation onto their partners and as a result engage in surveillance-related behaviors to protect their social image more so than low self-monitors. High self-monitors may therefore report more jealousy in response to a partner's sexual transgression only because those high self-monitors are behaviorally jealous in general. Although these initial findings highlight potential self-monitoring differences in romantic jealousy, additional investigations are needed to identify and eliminate other plausible alternative explanations.

Future Directions

Exploring and identifying causal factors of romantic jealousy for high self-monitors and low self-monitors could be a focus for subsequent studies. For high self-monitors, one such causal factor might be an environmental context of a partner's infidelity (i.e., public affairs vs. private affairs). Given high self-monitors' relatively high concern with social status (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Fuglestad & Snyder, 2009), the public nature of a partner's affair may have a greater impact on high self-monitors' ability to maintain a desirable social image. Therefore, this type of affair might cause high self-monitors to engage in behavioral tactics for mitigating damage to their social image. However, high self-monitors might experience less emotional distress following a private affair, because a transgression that does not involve people outside of the relationship would not threaten high self-monitors' social status (Snyder, 1987).

For low self-monitors, one such causal factor of romantic jealousy might be levels of relational investment (i.e., high investment vs. low investment). Given the relatively high investments that low self-monitors have with their relatively few close relationships (Snyder & Simpson, 1984), a partner's transgression (regardless of the public/private nature of an affair) may have a greater emotional impact on low self-monitors who are highly invested in their relationship. That being said, low self-monitors may experience relatively more emotional distress following a partner's affair, because a transgression when high involvement is present represents a significant threat to the stability of a valued relationship. As we can see from those aforementioned speculations, identifying situational and relational moderators could potentially be valuable for understanding self-monitoring differences in experiences and expressions involved in romantic jealousy.

In regard to expressions of romantic jealousy, communicative responses to one's partner (or rival) can provoke negative consequences to that individual as well as to that relationship. One such consequence is enduring psychological and physical abuse from a partner or spouse (e.g., Barnett, Martinez, & Bluestein, 1995; Buss, 2000; Daly et al., 1982; Follingstad, Bradley, Laughlin, & Burke, 1999; Peters, Shackelford, & Buss, 2002). Those effects of intimate partner violence can range from depression and isolation to hospitalization and homicide (see, for a review, Johnson, 2006). Given this range of psychological and physical effects of romantic jealousy on individuals and relationships (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2006), it is thus important to investigate any impact these consequences might have on an individuals' overall well-being.

In order to help people cope with these relationship transgressions, researchers have examined the impact of relationship distress on individuals' mental and physical health (Falconier, Nussbeck, Bodenmann, Schneier & Bradbury, 2015; Kawachi & Berkman, 2001; Langner & Stanley, 1963; Stanton & Campbell, 2014). Consequences of relationship distress can be costly to an individual such as a carry-over of depression or anger into other relationships (e.g., Duckworth & Levitt, 1985; Sheppard, Nelson, & Andreoli-Mathie, 1995; Traupmann & Hatfield, 1981) as well as to society such as decreased productivity for businesses and stresses on capacity of health care systems. Therefore, health care providers may want to give patients an opportunity to disclose information about their relationship transgressions. Asking patients to describe their relational transgressions could help health care professionals identify stressors that may be associated with romantic jealousy. In sum, additional research concerning processes and consequences of relationship transgressions is needed to better understand this link between relational distress and romantic jealousy.

References

American Psychological Association (2010). *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct.* Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/

Ahmed, S. M. S., Garg, R., & Braimoh, G. (1986). Psychometric properties of Snyder's self-monitoring of expressive behavior scale. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 63*(2), 495-500. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.390

Alpert, R., & Haber, R. N. (1960). Anxiety in academic achievement situations. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *61*(2), 207. doi:10.1037/h0045464

Bailey, J. M., Gaulin, S., Agyei, Y., & Gladue, B. A. (1994). Effects of gender and sexual orientation on evolutionarily relevant aspects of human mating psychology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*(6), 1081 doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.66.6.1081

Barnett, O. W., Martinez, T. E., & Bluestein, B. W. (1995). Jealousy and romantic attachment in maritally violent and nonviolent men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *10*(4), 473-486.

Bassett, J. F. (2005). Sex differences in jealousy in response to a partner's imagined sexual or emotional infidelity with a same or different race other. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *7*(1), 71-84. doi: 10.1007/s10896-012-9466-9

Becker, D. V., Sagarin, B. J., Guadagno, R. E., Millevoi, A., & Nicastle, L. D. (2004). When the sexes need not differ: Emotional responses to the sexual and emotional aspects of infidelity. *Personal Relationships*, *11*(4), 529-538. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00096.x

Berman, M. I., & Frazier, P. A. (2005). Relationship power and betrayal experience as predictors of reactions to infidelity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*(12), 1617-1627. doi: 10.1177/0146167205277209

Bohner, G., Echterhoff, G., Glaß, C., Patrzek, J., & Lampridis, E. (2010). Distress in response to infidelities committed by the partners of close others: Siblings versus friends. *Social Psychology*, *41*(4), 223. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000030

Brase, G. L., Adair, L., & Monk, K. (2014). Explaining sex differences in reactions to relationship infidelities: comparisons of the roles of sex, gender, beliefs, attachment, and sociosexual orientation. *Evolutionary Psychology: An International Journal of Evolutionary Approaches to Psychology and Behavior*, *12*(1), 73-96. doi: 10.1007/s40806-015-0010-z

Brennan, K. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1995). Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation, and romantic relationship functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*(3), 267-283. doi: 10.1177/0146167295213008

Briggs, S. R., Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1980). An analysis of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*(4), 679. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.38.4.679

Bringle, R. G., & Buunk, B. P. (1991). Extradyadic relationships and sexual jealousy. In K. McKinney & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Sexuality in Close Relationships* (pp. 135-153). England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Broemer, P., & Diehl, M. (2004). Romantic jealousy as a social comparison outcome: When similarity stings. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 393-400. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2003.08.002

Brown, W. M., & Moore, C. (2003). Fluctuating asymmetry and romantic jealousy. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 24*(3), 113-117. Retrieved from http://isiarticles.com/bundles/Article/pre/pdf/36457.pdf

Buck, A. A., & Neff, L. A. (2012). Stress spillover in early marriage: The role of self-regulatory depletion. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *26*(5), 698. doi: 10.1037/a0029260

Burchell, J. L., & Ward, J. (2011). Sex drive, attachment style, relationship status and previous infidelity as predictors of sex differences in romantic jealousy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *51*(5), 657-661. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.06.002

Buss, D.M. (1988a). The evolution of human intrasexual competition: Tactics of mate attraction. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 54*, 616-628. doi: 0022-3514/88

Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and brain sciences, 12*(01), 1-14. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X00023992

Buss, D. M. (1995). Psychological sex differences: Origins through sexual selection. *American Psychologist, 50*(3), 164-168. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.50.3.164

Buss, D.M. (2000). *The dangerous passion: Why jealousy is as necessary as love and sex?* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Buss, D. M. (2013). Sexual jealousy. *Psychological Topics*, *22*(2), 155-182. Retrieved from http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/HomePage/Group/BussLAB/pdffiles/Sexual%20Jealousy%20-%20FINAL%20PUBLISHED%202013.pdf

Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., & Westen, D. (1996). Special section commentary: Sex differences in jealousy: Not gone, not forgotten, and not explained by alternative hypotheses. *Psychological Science*, *7*(3), 373-375. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.1999.tb00215.x

Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science*, *3*, 251-255. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.1992.tb00038.x

Buss, D. M., & Haselton, M. (2005). The evolution of jealousy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 9*(11), 506-507. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2005.09.006

Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. *Journal of Research Personality, 31*, 193-221. Retrieved from http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/HomePage/Group/BussLAB/pdffiles/susceptibility%20to%20infidelity-jrp-1997.pdf

Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Choe, J., Buunk, B. P., & Dijkstra, P. (2000). Distress about mating rivals. *Personal Relationships, 7*(3), 235-243. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2000.tb00014.x

Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Kirkpatrick, L. A., Choe, J. C., Lim, H. K., Hasegawa, M., Hasegawa, T., & Bennett, K. (1999). Jealousy and the nature of beliefs about infidelity: Tests of competing hypotheses about sex differences in the united states, korea, and japan. *Personal Relationships*, *6*(1), 125-150. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.1999.tb00215.x

Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: an evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological review, 100*(2), 2004. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.100.2.204

Buunk, B. P., Angleitner, A., Oubaid, V., & Buss, D. M. (1996). Sex differences in jealousy in evolutionary and cultural perspective: Tests from the Netherlands, Germany, and the United States. *Psychological Science*, *7*(6), 359-363. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.1996.tb00389.x

Buunk, A.P., & Dijkstra, P., (2006). Temptations and threat: Extradyadic relations and jealously. In A.L. Vangelisti, & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships* (pp. 533-555). Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*(2), 81. doi: 10.1037/h0046016

Cann, A., & Baucom, T. R. (2004). Former partners and new rivals as threats to a relationship: Infidelity type, gender, and commitment as factors related to distress and forgiveness. *Personal Relationships, 11*(3), 305-318. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00084.x

Carpenter, C. J. (2012). Meta-analyses of sex differences in responses to sexual versus emotional infidelity men and women are more similar than different. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 36*(1), 25-37. doi: 10.1177/0361684311414537

Christie, R. & Geis, F. (1970). *Studies in machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive.* New York: Wiley.

Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. Hawthorne, New York: Aldine.

Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, S.J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *3*, 11-27. doi: 10.1016/0162-3095(82)90027-9

Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of man and selection in relation to sex.* London: Murray.

Day, D. V., Shleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 390-401. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.390

DeSteno, D., Bartlett, M. Y., Braverman, J., & Salovey, P. (2002). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolutionary mechanism or artifact of measurement? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(5), 1103-1116. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.91.4.626

DeSteno, D. A., & Salovey, P. (1995). Jealousy and envy. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *The Blackwell encyclopedia of social psychology* (pp. 342-343). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

DeSteno, D. A., & Salovey, P. (1996). Evolutionary origins of sex differences in jealousy? Questioning "the fitness" of the model. *Psychological Science,* 7(6), 367-372.

DeWeerth, C., & Kalma, A. P. (1993). Female aggression as a response to sexual jealousy: A sex role reversal? *Aggressive Behavior*, *19*(4), 265-279. doi: 10.1002/1098-2337

Dijkstra, P., & Buunk, B. P. (1998). Jealousy as a Function of Rival Characteristics: An Evolutionary Perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*, 1158-1166. doi: 10.1177/01461672982411003

Duckworth, J., & Levitt, E. E. (1985). Personality analysis of a swingers' club. *Lifestyles*, *8*(1), 35-45. doi: 10.1007/BF01435913

Edlund, J. E., & Sagarin, B. J. (2009). Sex differences in jealousy: Misinterpretation of nonsignificant results as refuting the theory. *Personal Relationships, 16*(1), 67-78. Retrieved from http://www.niu.edu/user/tj0bjs1/papers/es09.pdf

Eysenck, H. J. (1976). *Sex and Personality.* London: Open Books.

Follingstad, D. R., Bradley, R. G., Laughlin, J. E., & Burke, L. (1999). Risk factors and correlates of dating violence: The relevance of examining frequency and severity levels in a college sample. *Violence and victims, 14*(4), 365-380.

Fuglestad, P. T., & Snyder, M. (2009). Self-monitoring. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 574-591). New York: Guilford.

Fuglestad, P.T., & Snyder, M. (2010). Status and the motivational foundations of self-monitoring. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 4*, 1031-1041. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00311.x

Furr, M. (2011). *Scale construction and psychometrics for social and personality psychology*. Washington, DC: SAGE Publications.

Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (1990). Toward an evolutionary history of female sociosexual variation. *Journal of Personality, 58*(1), 69-96. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1990.tb00908.x

Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of human mating: Trade-offs and strategic pluralism. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 23*(4), 573-644. doi:10.1017/S0140525X0000337X

Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(4), 530-555. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.126.4.530

Geary, D. C., Rumsey, M., Bow-Thomas, C. C., & Hoard, M. K. (1995). Sexual jealousy as a facultative trait: Evidence from the pattern of sex differences in adults from China and the United States. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 16*(5), 355-383. doi:10.1016/0162-3095(95)00057-7

Glick, P. (1985). Orientations toward relationships: Choosing a situation in which to begin a relationship. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 21*(6), 544-562. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(85)90024-1

Graziano, W. G., Leone, C., Musser, L. M., & Lautenschlager, G. J. (1987). Self-monitoring in children: A differential approach to social development. *Developmental Psychology, 23*(4), 571. Retrieved from http://annenberg.usc.edu/sites/default/files/2015/04/29/Self-Monitoring%20and%20AgeSheila%20Murphy.pdf

Green, M. C., & Sabini, J. (2006). Gender, socioeconomic status, age, and jealousy: Emotional responses to infidelity in a national sample. *Emotion, 6*(2), 330-334. doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.6.2.330

Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (1985). Proneness to romantic jealousy and responses to jealousy in others. *Journal of Personality*, *53*(3), 468-479. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1985.tb00377.x

Greiling, H., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Women's sexual strategies: The hidden dimension of extra-pair mating. *Personality and individual Differences, 28*(5), 929-963. Retrieved from http://www.marcblumberg.ca/userfiles/1080541/file/Women's%20sexual%20strategies%20-%20the%20hidden%20dimension%20of%20extra-.pdf

Harris, C. R. (2000). Psychophysiological responses to imagined infidelity: The specific innate modular view of jealousy reconsidered. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 1082–1091. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.78.6.1082

Harris, C. R. (2002). Sexual and romantic jealousy in heterosexual and homosexual adults. *Psychological Science, 13*(1), 7-12. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.00402

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*(2), 102-128. Retrieved from http://charris.ucsd.edu/articles/Harris_PSPR2003.pdf

Howells, G. N. (1993). Self-monitoring and personality: Would the real high self-monitor please stand up? *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 8,* 59-72. doi: 1993-37503-001

Leary, M. R., & Hoyle, R. H. (2009). *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior.* New York: Guilford Press.

Hupka, R.B. (1991). The motive for arousal of romantic jealousy: Its cultural origin. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 252-270). New York: Guilford Press.

Ickes, W. (2000). Methods of studying close relationships. In W. Ickes & S. Duck (Eds.), The Social Psychology of Personal Relationships (pp. 157-180). Chichester: Wiley.

Johnson, M. P. (2006). Violence and abuse in personal relationships: Conflict, terror, and resistance in intimate partnerships. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 557-576). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jonason, P. K., Teicher, E. A., & Schmitt, D. P. (2011). The TIPI's validity confirmed: Associations with sociosexuality and self-esteem. *Individual Differences Research*, *9*(1), 52-60. Retrieved from http://peterjonason.com/uploads/TIPI_validity.pdf

Jones, M. (1998). Sociosexuality and Motivations for Romantic Involvement. *Journal of Research in Personality, 32*, 173-182. doi: 10.1006/jrpe.1997.2212

Jones, M. (1993). Influence of self-monitoring on dating motivations. *Journal of Research in Personality, 27*(2), 197-206. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1993.1014

Jostman, N.B., Karremans, J., & Finkenaver, C. (2005). When love is not blind: Rumination impairs implicit affect regulation in response to romantic relationship threat. *Cognition and Emotion, 25*(3), 506-578. doi: 10.1080/02699931.2010.541139

Kassarjian, W. M. (1962). A study of Riesman's theory of social character. *Sociometry, 25*(3), 213-230. doi:10.2307/2786125

Kawachi, I., & Berkman, L. F. (2001). Social ties and mental health. *Journal of Urban Health, 78*(3), 458-467. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3455910/pdf/11524_2006_Article_44.pdf

Kenrick, D. T., Groth, G. E., Trost, M. R., & Sadalla, E. K. (1993). Integrating Evolutionary and Social exchange Perspectives on Relationships: Effects of Gender, Self-Appraisal, and Involvement Level on Mate Selection Criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(6), 951-969.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1970). *Foundations of behavioral research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kim, H. K., & McKenry, P. C. (2002). The relationship between marriage and psychological well-being a longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Family Issues, 23*(8), 885-911. doi: 10.1177/019251302237296

Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(6), 1349-1364. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.46.6

Leone, C., & Andolina, T. L. (2015). *Self-monitoring and romantic jealousy: Individual differences in the "green-eyed monster.* Unpublished manuscript.

Leone, C., & Hawkins, L. B. (2006). Self-Monitoring and close relationships. *Journal of Personality, 74*(3), 739-778. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00391.x

Lund, M. (1985). The development of investment and commitment scales for predicting continuity of personal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2*(1), 3-23. doi: 10.1177/0265407585021001

Mathes, E. W. (2005). Relationship between short-term sexual strategies and sexual jealousy. *Psychological Reports, 96*(1), 29-35. doi: 10.2466/pr0.96.1.29-35

Mathes, E. W., Roter, P. M., & Joerger, S. M. (1982). A convergent validity study of six jealousy scales. *Psychology Reports, 50*, 1143-1147. Retrieved from http://www.amsciepub.com/doi/pdf/10.2466/pr0.1982.50.3c.1143

Meston, C. M., Heiman J.R., Trapnell, P.D., & Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Social desirable responding and sexuality self-reports. *The Journal of Sex Research, 35*(2), 148-157. doi: 10.1080/00224499809551928

McKinley, J. C., & Hathaway, S. R. (1944). The Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory. V. Hysteria, hypomania and psychopathic deviate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 28*(2), 153. doi: 10.1037/h0061377

Miller, S. L., & Maner, J. K. (2009). Sex Differences in Response to Sexual Versus Emotional Infidelity: The Moderating Role of Individual Differences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46,* 287- 291. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2008.10.013

Neto, F. (1993). Love styles and self-representations. *Personality and Individual Differences, 14*(6), 795-803. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(93)90092-H

Norris, S. L., & Zweigenhaft, R. L. (1999). Self-monitoring, trust, and commitment in romantic relationships. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 139*(2), 215-220. doi:10.1080/00224549909598375

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Öner, B. (2002). Self-monitoring and future time orientation in romantic relationships. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary And Applied, 136*(4), 420-424. doi:10.1080/00223980209604168

Paulhus, D. L. (1989). Socially desirable responding: Some new solutions to old problems. In D. M. Buss, & N. Cantor (Eds.), *Personality Psychology* (pp. 201-209). New York: Springer.

Perlman, D., & Duck, S. (2006). The Seven Seas of the Study of Personal Relationships: From "The Thousand Islands" to Interconnected Waterways. In A. L. Vangelisti, & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 11-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peters, J., Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2002). Understanding domestic violence against women: Using evolutionary psychology to extend the feminist functional analysis. *Violence and Victims, 17*(2), 255-264. Retrieved from http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/HomePage/Group/busslab/pdffiles/domestic_violence_2002.pdf

Pfeiffer, S. M., & Wong, P. T. (1989). Multidimensional Jealousy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *6*(2), 181-196. doi: 10.1177/026540758900600203

Pines, A. M. (1992). Romantic Jealousy: Five Perspectives and an Integrative Approach. *Pyschotherapy*, *29*(4), 675-683. doi: 10.1037/0033-3204.29.4.675

Ring, K., & Wallston, K. (1968). A test to measure performance styles in interpersonal relations. *Psychological Reports, 22*(1), 147-154.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, *80*(1), 1. Retrieved from http://www.soc.iastate.edu/Sapp/soc512Rotter.pdf

Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *16*(2), 265. doi: 10.1037/h0029841

Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 16*(2), 172-186. Retrieved from http://www.carylrusbult.com/documents/6_Rusbult1980_JournalOfExperimentalSocialPsychology.pdf

Russell, E. B., & Harton, H. C. (2005). The "other factors": using individual and relationship characteristics to predict sexual and emotional jealousy. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social, 24*(4), 242-257. doi: 10.1007/s12144-005-1026-5

Sagarin, B. J., Martin, A. L., Coutinho, S. A., Edlund, J. E., Patel, L., Skowronski, J. J., Zengel, B. (2012). Sex differences in jealousy: A meta-analytic examination. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *33*(6), 595-614. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2012.02.006

Sakaguchi, K., Sakai, Y., Ueda, K., & Hasegawa, T. (2007). Robust association between sociosexuality and self-monitoring in heterosexual and non-heterosexual japanese. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*(4), 815-825. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2007.02.006

Schmitt, D. P. (2005). Sociosexuality from Argentina to Zimbabwe: A 48-nation study of sex, culture, and strategies of human mating. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 28,* 247-311. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X05000051

Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Sexual dimensions of person description: beyond or subsumed by the Big Five?. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *34*(2), 141-177. doi: 10.1006/jrpe.1999.2267

Schutzwohl, A. (2004). Which infidelity type makes you more jealousy? Decision strategies in a force-choice between sexual and emotional infidelity. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *2*, 121-128. doi: 10.1177/147470490400200118

Shackelford, T. K., Buss, D. M., & Bennett, K. (2002). Forgiveness or breakup: Sex differences in responses to a partner's infidelity. *Cognition and Emotion, 16*(2), 299-307. doi: 10.1080/02699930143000202

Shadish, W., Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (2010). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Sheppard, V. J., Nelso, E. S., & Andreoli-Mathie, V. (1995). Dating relationships and infidelity: Attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 21*(3), 202-212. doi: 10.1080/00926239508404399

Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1989a). Two month test-retest reliability of the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. Unpublished data, Texas A&M University.

Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual Differences in Sociosexuality: Evidence for Convergent and Discriminant Validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(6), 870-883. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.60.6.870

Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1992). Sociosexuality and romantic partner choice. *Journal of Personality*, *60*(1), 31-51. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00264.x

Simpson, J. A., Wilson, C. L., & Winterheld, H. A. (2004). Sociosexuality and romantic relationships. In J. H. Harvey, A. Wenzel, & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Handbook of sexuality in close relationships* (pp. 87–112). Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*(4), 526-537. doi:10.1037/h0037039

Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances/private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring.* New York: W. H. Freeman.

Snyder, M., Berscheid, E., & Glick, P. (1985). Focusing on the exterior and the interior: Two investigations of the initiation of personal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*(6), 1427-1439. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.48.6.1427

Snyder, M. & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(1), 125-139. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.1.125

Snyder, M., & Monson, T. C. (1975). Persons, situations, and the control of social behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32*, 637-644. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.32.4.637

Snyder, M., & Simpson, J.A. (1984). Self-monitoring and dating relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*(6), 1281-1291. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.47.6.1281

Snyder, M., & Simpson, J. A. (1987). Orientations toward romantic relationships. In D. Perlman, & S. Duck (Eds.), *Intimate relationships: Development, dynamics, and deterioration* (pp. 45-62). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Snyder, M., Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. (1986). Personality and sexual relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 181–190. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.1.181

Snyder, M., & Stukas, A. A. (1999). Interpersonal processes: The interplay of cognitive, motivational, and behavioral activities in social interaction. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50,* 273-303.

Snyder, M., & Tanke, E. D. (1976). Behavior and attitude: Some people are more consistent than others. *Journal of Personality, 44*, 501-517. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1976.tb00135.x

Stanton, S. C. E, & Campbell, L. (2014). Psychological and physiological predictors of health in romantic relationships: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Personality, 82*(6), 528-538. doi: 10.1111/jopy.12056

Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tagler, M. J. (2010). Sex differences in jealousy: comparing the influence of previous infidelity among college students and adults. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *1*(4), 353-360. doi: 10.1177/1948550610374367

Tagler, M. J., & Gentry, R. H. (2011). Gender, jealousy, and attachment: A (more) thorough examination across measures and samples. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *45*(6), 697-701. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2011.08.006

Traupmann, J., & Hatfield, E. (1981). Love and its effect on mental and physical health. In R. Fogel, E. Hatfield, S. Kiesler, & E. Shanas (Eds.), *Aging: Stability and change in the family* (pp. 253-274). New York: Academic Press.

Treger, S., & Sprecher, S. (2011). The influences of sociosexuality and attachment style on reactions to emotional versus sexual infidelity. *Journal of Sex Research*, *48*(5), 413-422. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2010.516845

Trivers, R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual Selection & the Descent of Man* (pp. 136-179). Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Company.

Walker, D. F., Tokar, D. M., & Fischer, A. R. (2000). What are eight popular masculinity-related instruments measuring? Underlying dimensions and their relations to sociosexuality. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *1*(2), 98-108. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.1.2.98

Webster, G. D., & Bryan, A. (2007). Sociosexual attitudes and behaviors: Why two factors are better than one?. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *41*(4), 917-922. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2006.08.007

Wiederman, M. W., & Allgeier, E. R. (1993). Gender differences in sexual jealousy: Adaptionist or social learning explanation?. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *14*(2), 115-140. doi: 10.1016/0162-3095(93)90011-6

Wiederman, M. W., & Kendall, E. (1999). Evolution, sex, and jealousy: Investigation with a sample from Sweden. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 20*, 121-128. doi: 10.1016/S1090-5138(98)00046-4

White, G. L. (1981). A model of romantic jealousy. *Motivation and Emotion*, *5*(4), 295-310. doi: 10.1007/BF00992549

White, G. L. (1981). Jealousy and partner's perceived motives for attraction to a rival. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *44*(1), 24-30. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3033859

White, G. L., & Mullen, P. E. (1989). *Jealousy: Theory, research, and clinical strategies*. New York: Guilford Press.

Vitae

Tiffany Lucille Andolina was born to Candice and John Andolina. During her undergraduate studies, she attended the College of Central Florida where she received a scholarship for her participation on the Speech and Debate Team. She graduated with her Associate of Arts in Sociology in 2010. She went on to pursue her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology at Saint Leo University. This is where she found her affinity for research and social psychology while working closely with Dr. Lara Ault. She presented findings from her undergraduate thesis at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association (SEPA). Lucy completed an undergraduate thesis and graduated cum laude with her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology in 2012. In 2013, Lucy pursued her Master's degree at the University of North Florida (UNF) where she conducted research under the supervision of Dr. Christopher Leone. During her graduate studies, she served as a Fellow in the Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR) where she advised undergraduates seeking personalized research experiences and other scholarly opportunities. Lucy also assisted in organizing two annual conferences: the Florida Undergraduate Research Conference (FURC) and the Showcase of Osprey Advancements in Research & Scholarship (SOARS). Lucy served as a mentor and co-author with undergraduate students who presented at these conferences. During her fellowship, she also served as a Teaching Assistant in courses supporting undergraduate research: Thesis Prospectus, Thesis Symposium, and Research Methods. Lucy presented research findings from her master's thesis at the annual meetings of the Society of Southeastern Social Psychologists (SSSP) and the Southeastern Psychological Association (SEPA). Lucy aspires to be an academic advisor at the college level. She also plans to pursue her doctoral degree in Social Psychology.