

1978

Coping abilities of high and low jealous individuals in a stressful situation

Elizabeth Roxanne Lindsey

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses>

Recommended Citation

Lindsey, Elizabeth Roxanne, "Coping abilities of high and low jealous individuals in a stressful situation" (1978). *Master's Theses*. Paper 423.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

COPING ABILITIES OF HIGH AND LOW JEALOUS
INDIVIDUALS IN A STRESSFUL SITUATION

BY

ELIZABETH ROXANNE LINDSEY

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
IN PSYCHOLOGY

AUGUST 1978

RUNNING HEAD: COPING ABILITIES

COPING ABILITIES OF HIGH AND LOW JEALOUS
INDIVIDUALS IN A STRESSFUL SITUATION

BY

ELIZABETH ROXANNE LINDSEY

APPROVED BY:

Matt E Gavelby
COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

7-15-78
DATE

Kenneth A Blich
COMMITTEE MEMBER

7/15/78
DATE

Warren P. Hopkins
COMMITTEE MEMBER

7-15-78
DATE

DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN

DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A warm thanks is extended to Dr. Kenneth Blick and Dr. Warren Hopkins for serving on my thesis committee. Their advice was invaluable and much appreciated.

Special appreciation is extended to Dr. Matthew Jaremko for serving as my thesis advisor. His concern and willingness to help made the completion of my thesis a much easier task.

Abstract

The major purpose of this study was to examine the coping abilities of high and low jealous individuals in a stressful laboratory situation involving self-disclosure. The hypothesis that high jealous individuals would not cope with the threat of self disclosure as well as low jealous individuals was not confirmed.

Eighty college students were given a battery of personality questionnaires to complete which measured jealousy, anxiety, locus of control, self esteem, self preoccupation and social desirability. The correlations revealed certain differences in characteristics of high and low jealous subjects including the fact that high jealous subjects had a significantly lower self esteem than low jealous subjects.

From the initial 80 subjects, 17 high jealous and 13 low jealous individuals participated in pretest and posttest phases of the experiment in which the subjects were asked to disclose information which they had designated as highly personal. Before the subjects disclosed themselves in the posttest, the experimenter discussed with each subject the use of the coping technique of reversal of affect for handling interpersonal

stress. Results showed that both high jealous and low jealous subjects were less anxious at the posttest. Results are discussed in terms of the reversal of affect technique reducing anxiety and the differences between high and low jealous individuals.

Coping Abilities of High and Low Jealous
Individuals in a Stressful Situation

Only a small amount of empirical research has been done in the area of jealousy. In the past, individuals attempting to examine this area have been hindered by a lack of measurement, as well as confusion in conceptually defining jealousy. Currently, however, several investigators are developing scales in order to assess jealousy, and are undertaking the task of defining its components.

Researchers of the seventies studying jealousy have constructed several working definitions which are helpful in better understanding this field. White (Note 1) defines jealousy as:

A complex of thoughts, feelings, and actions which follow threats to self-esteem and/or threats to the existence of the romantic relationship, when these threats are perceived to be generated by the existence of an attraction between one's partner and some (perhaps imaginary) rival. (p. 1).

Tipton, Benedictson, Mahoney, and Hartnett (Note 2) view jealousy as having three components: cognition, emotion, and behavior. The cognitive element is the belief by a

jealous individual that a significant person in his/her life is turning their attention away from the jealous person and toward a third person (rival). Jealousy is also perceived as a complex emotion which can involve feelings of fear, inferiority, anger, insecurity, guilt, and impotency. The behavioral facet of jealousy varies with the emotional arousal and previous experience of the jealous individual. Bryson (Note 3) describes jealousy as a complex of actions and feelings involving a triad of individuals A, B, and C. Individual A believes himself to have a previously established relationship with individual B, and any real or imagined attempts between B and C to form an equivalent relationship or to threaten the existing relationship constitutes a jealousy situation. Clanton and Smith (1977) believe jealousy to be a negative feeling accompanied by a fear of the loss of one's partner, or as discomfort over a real or imagined experience the partner has with another party. Jealousy was defined by Teismann (Note 4) as an emotional state involving anger and anxiety in which an individual feels the threat of losing something highly valued to a third party.

The results of several of the more recent studies on jealousy have shown that there are significant differences in certain characteristics between high and low

jealous individuals. Such results are important to more in depth investigations in the area of jealousy. Tipton et al. (Note 2), based on their definition of jealousy, constructed a scale for the assessment of jealousy. Factor analyses revealed four major factors of jealousy: need for loyalty, need for intimacy, moodiness/emotionality and self-confidence. The need for loyalty is concerned with the discomfort experienced when a person believes he is not receiving enough attention from his partner or that the partner is directing his attention toward another individual. The need for intimacy is related to the need for a secure, interdependent, and intimate relationship with another person. The factor of moodiness/emotionality is related to an individual's emotional reactivity and susceptibility as well as to the feelings of rejection. The self-confidence factor concerns an individual's perceived confidence in his abilities to fulfill his own needs and to possess the resources to develop other satisfying relationships. In an effort to test the external validation of the scale, Tipton et al. (Note 2) computed a correlation coefficient between subjects' scores on the Revised Janis-Field Scale (Robinson and Shaver, 1973), a measure of self-esteem, and each of the factor scores. Results showed that the highest

correlation ($r = .58$) was between self-confidence and self-esteem, indicating that the better an individual feels about himself as a person the more confident he is in his ability to have his needs met. The correlation between self-esteem and need for loyalty was $-.49$, and $-.52$ with the moodiness/emotionality factor. These two correlations suggest that the lower one's self-esteem, the more volatile is one's mood, and the more likely one is to have subjective experiences of jealousy. The need for intimacy factor was found to vary independently of self-esteem. The researchers suggest that this would be a factor in jealousy only in cases of low self-confidence. The investigators concluded from their research that the jealous individual is characterized by a high need for intimacy, lack of self-confidence, and a tendency towards easily brought about mood swings. Tipton et al. (Note 2) admitted that considerable research is still needed in order to refine their conceptual model and validate their scale for jealousy.

Teismann (Note 4) investigated the components of jealousy by having dating couples role-play both jealous and non-jealous situations. The investigator characterized how the subjects labeled their jealousy into three types: sexual jealousy is characterized primarily by obsessive attention to thoughts or images of one's

partner having sexual contact with a third party in which some type of threat results, time jealousy is characterized by attention to thoughts or images of one's partner spending time with a third party in such a way that some type of threat results, and resource jealousy is characterized by attention to images or thoughts of one's partner utilizing a limited resource (such as money) shared by the couple on a third party in such a way as to threaten the loss of security in the relationship. Results of the study showed that subjects acting out the role of the jealous partner used significantly more rejecting ($p < .05$), coercive ($p < .05$), and guilt-inducing statements ($p < .05$), and significantly less cognitive, resolving, reconciling, and appealing acts ($p < .05$) than subjects role-playing the non-jealous partner. A second finding was that males labeled their jealousy significantly more often as time jealousy ($p < .05$).

A study by Lindsey (Note 5) produced findings similar to those of Tipton et al. (Note 2) and Teismann (Note 4) in terms of characteristics of jealous individuals. The investigator used Tipton's Jealousy Scale (Note 2) in order to obtain a group of subjects extremely high and low in jealousy. The scores of subjects considered to be high ranged from 120 to 134. The low jealous subjects' scores

ranged from 75 to 103. These subjects were then shown a videotape of eight scenes involving individuals role-playing various types of situations including jealousy. The subjects then filled out a questionnaire related to the videotape, concerning what the subjects would have thought or felt in the situations depicted, if they had experienced such a situation. A scale to categorize subjects' answers was developed and answers were classified by independent raters. Inter-rater reliability was computed by the experimenter and found to be 83.5%. Results of the study showed that high and low jealous subjects differed on several characteristics. For example, high jealous subjects' answers to some scenes were characterized as "worry" significantly more than low jealous subjects. Low jealous subjects also described themselves as being significantly more understanding in one scene, while high jealous subjects' answers were classified as significantly more intolerant to the same scene. In another scene, a couple was depicted as visiting with another couple and the female visitor was left out of the conversation her male friend was having with the hostess. The subjects were asked how they would feel if they were the woman visitor. The answers were placed in the categories of "concerned" and "unconcerned". All of the high jealous subjects said they were concerned, while significantly more low jealous subjects said they would be

unconcerned. Finally, all of the high jealous subjects' answers to another scene were categorized as feeling inferior, while only one low jealous subject's answer was classified as inferior. The experimenter pointed out that the major problem of the study was the small number of subjects who participated in the second phase of viewing the videotaped scenes. Only nine high jealous subjects out of a possible 15 and nine low jealous subjects out of a possible 16 could be recruited to see the videotape.

Bringle, Roach, Andler, and Evenbeck (Note 6) developed the Self-Report Jealousy Scale for measuring individual differences concerning the tendency to react in a jealous manner towards a variety of jealousy-evoking situations. A factor analysis of the scale performed on the responses of 651 subjects produced four factors of jealousy: social jealousy, sexual jealousy, family jealousy, and work jealousy. The scale has been found to have relatively strong psychometric properties. Internal consistency assessed by alpha coefficient was over .90 (.91 with 100 subjects and .93 with 435 subjects), and a two week test-retest reliability coefficient based on 114 subjects was .73. It should be noted, however, that the response set of the jealousy scale has not been controlled for, and may have certain limitations. The set consists of nine choices

of responses from "not very jealous" (1) to "very jealous" (9). Using the scale, Bringle et al. (Note 6) performed independent studies correlating jealousy with certain other characteristics of individuals. The investigators first argued that since jealousy is a reaction to a real or imagined behavior of another, frequent or intense jealous reactions would make obvious to an individual the ability of others to control his feelings. Thus, one would expect that a jealous person is more likely to have an externally oriented locus of control. This idea was supported by their study (N = 144) in which jealousy was paired with the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967), the Rotter Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966), and a Life Satisfaction Scale (Robinson and Shaver, 1973). Results indicated that subjects who scored as being intensely jealous are also those who have a low self-esteem ($r = -.38, p < .01$), are dissatisfied with life ($r = -.46, p < .01$), and are externally controlled ($r = .30, p < .01$). In another study (N = 90), Bringle et al. (Note 6), used the Self-Report Jealousy Scale (Bringle et al. Note 6), the Zuckerman Anxiety Scale (Zuckerman, 1965), the Steiner Benevolent-Malevolent Scale (Steiner, 1974), and the Machiavellianism Scale (Christie and Geis, 1968). The jealousy scale did not correlate with the Mach V (Christie

and Geis, 1968) or the Social Desirability Scale of the Mach V (Christie and Geis, 1968). Results showed, however, that high jealous individuals tend to be anxious ($r = -.36$, $p < .01$), externally controlled as indicated by the B + M Scale ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), and to a less significant degree basically malevolent in their attitude as measured by the B - M Scale ($r = -.25$, $p < .05$), (Steiner, 1974). Finally, Bringle et al. (Note 6) investigated the relationship between dogmatism using a scale developed by Troidahl and Powell (1965) and jealousy ($N = 92$), and found that high jealous individuals tended to be dogmatic ($r = .35$, $p < .01$). In all of Bringle's et al. (Note 6) studies, self-reports of jealousy correlated highly with scores on the Self-Report Jealousy Scale (average $r = .58$). The investigators pointed out that although the correlations are moderate, the consistent pattern of confirming results seems to support the utility of the scale in understanding characteristics of the jealous individual. Bringle et al. (Note 6) also discusses the fact that causality concerning self-esteem and jealousy is still undetermined because the procedures in the study were correlational. Low self-esteem, for example, may cause an individual to doubt the possibility of a successful interpersonal relationship, causing jealous suspicions. It could be, however, that occurrences of jealousy lower an individual's self-esteem.

Bryson (Note 3) developed a questionnaire consisting of emotional reactions and behaviors and asked subjects to describe how well each delineated how they felt when jealous. Using a factor analysis, eight factors emerged from the subjects' responses which Bryson classified into two major categories of jealous reactions: attempts to improve the relationship, and attempts to improve, or maintain one's ego, self-esteem, or feeling of self-worth. In both cases, such attempts are not necessarily positive or rational. Bryson (Note 3) used videotapes of couples interacting in some way with a third party entering the scene and acting like a lover of one member of the couple. The attractiveness, as well as the sex of the interloper, was manipulated in the scenes. Subjects (N = 40 males and 40 females) were randomly assigned to see the different tapes and were asked what their response would be in such a situation. The subjects reported that they were more likely to feel angry or embarrassed if the interloper was unattractive. Male subjects stated they were more likely to feel angry, while female subjects reported that they would try to make themselves more attractive to their partners or cry alone. Results also showed males are more likely to respond to jealousy situations with self-esteem maintaining behaviors or by seeking retribution. Females, however, are more likely

to respond with actions to maintain the relationship.

White (Note 1) has taken a new and interesting approach to researching jealousy. He argues that an imbalance of power in a romantic relationship can cause jealousy, among other things. White (Note 1) defines power as the ability of an individual to control his own outcomes in relationships. He discusses the idea of involvement in a relationship and brings out the idea that one's self-esteem is even affected by the partner's evaluations of him. He proposes that the more involved individual in a relationship is more prone to jealousy. White (Note 1) uses the principle of Comparison Level for Alternatives or CL_{ALT} , developed by Thibaut and Kelly (1959) to explain his view. CL_{ALT} is defined as the lowest level of rewards a person will tolerate in a relationship before going to a more profitable relationship. Thus, the comparatively less rewarded partner is the one who has more power because of a greater tendency to leave the present relationship for another. Using the CL_{ALT} principle, White (Note 1) found in an initial study involving 150 romantically involved couples that individuals less involved in a present relationship rate themselves as more involved in previous relationships, feel less in love than their partners, have a greater number of opposite sex friends, feel it is likely

that they will date others, and are more likely to have a current alternative relationship. From this research, White (Note 1) hypothesized that the individual more involved in a relationship should display the characteristics of low-power position fears concerning feelings of inadequacy and loss of the relationship. Therefore, this individual would more likely be jealous in a relationship. In a second study, White (Note 1) developed scales to assess the relationship between involvement and jealousy. The self-esteem scale developed by Rosenberg (1965) was also used in correlation with the other scales. Results showed that self-report of jealousy was a function of the level of involvement ($F(2,275) = 5.056, p < .007$). The individual's report of his partner's jealousy was also a function of the level of the partner's involvement ($F(2,275) = 3.552, p < .09$). The more involved partner also felt there were more threats to the relationship ($F(2,275) = 3.334, p < .036$) and was significantly more jealous than the other individual ($F(2,174) = 4.52, p < .012$). In terms of self-esteem, individuals low in self-esteem are more likely to label themselves as jealous ($F(1,275) = 4.136, p < .041$), although their partners did not see them as being jealous. It was also shown that the more involved individual had lower self-esteem ($M = 54.8$) than those individuals

equally or less involved ($M = 59.3, 58.0, F(2,290) = 3.41, p < .033$). White (Note 1) mentions that because the study is cross sectional, it is not possible to determine if the availability of alternative relationships causes less involvement, or if being less involved leads an individual to seek alternative relationships.

In reviewing the research discussed above, certain characteristics of high and low jealous individuals begin to emerge. Tipton et al. (Note 2), Bringle et al. (Note 6), and White (Note 1) all found that high jealous subjects tend to have a lower self-esteem than low jealous subjects. Research by Tipton et al. (Note 2) also revealed that high jealous subjects tend to lack self-confidence. Investigators have found that high and low jealous individuals display different characteristics when involved in romantic relationships. Research by White (Note 1) showed that the more involved partners were most jealous and felt more threats to their relationships. Along the same lines, the results of a study by Tipton et al. (Note 2) revealed that high jealous individuals have a higher need for loyalty from their partners in relationships, than do low jealous individuals. Tipton et al. (Note 2) stated that this need for loyalty is concerned with the discomfort experienced when an individual believes he is not receiving enough

attention from his partner, or that the partner is directing his attention towards another individual.

The present study examined the coping abilities of high and low jealous individuals. An effort was also made to confirm some of the characteristics of high and low jealous individuals found by other investigators. These characteristics were measured through a battery of tests including the Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966), the Self Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967), and the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, Gorsuch, and Lushene, 1968).

Method

Subjects. The subjects for the study were 80 students taken from introductory psychology classes at the University of Richmond. From these 80 subjects, the 20 subjects scoring the highest and the 20 subjects scoring the lowest on the Self-Report Jealousy Scale (Bingle et al. Note 6) were asked to participate in the pretest and posttest phases of the experiment. Only 13 low jealous subjects, 7 males (53%) and 6 females (47%), and 17 high jealous subjects, 3 males (18%) and 14 females (82%), however, agreed to participate in the pretest and posttest phases. The 80 subjects were given one hour of research credit for their participation. The 30 subjects involved in the other phases of the study were given one hour of research credit for each phase. Thus, a student who participated

in the experiment in its entirety was given three hours of research credit. Appendix A is a flow chart depicting the subjects' participation in the experiment. All subjects were treated according to the American Psychological Association code of ethics as reported in Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants (1973).

Apparatus. The Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966) (Appendix B), Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967) (Appendix C), State Trait Anxiety Inventory A-Trait Scale (Spielberger et al. 1968) (Appendix D), Self-Analysis Scale (Jaremko and Noles, Note 7) (Appendix E), Self-Report Jealousy Scale developed by Bringle et al. (Note 6) (Appendix F), and the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Crowne and Marlowe, 1964) (Appendix G) were completed by the subjects in the initial screening.

During the pretest, each high and low jealous subject completed the 25-Item Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard, 1971) (Appendix H). These subjects also chose six most intimate items from the 40-Item Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard, 1971) (Appendix I). A tape-recorder was used to record the subjects' answers to the 40-Item Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard, 1971). Skin temperature changes were measured by the Cyborg J42 Feedback Thermometer. After the self-disclosure period,

subjects completed the Today Form of the Multiple Affect Adjective Check-List (Zuckerman and Lubin, 1965) (Appendix J). Independent raters later used the Haymes Technique for Measuring Intimacy of Self-Disclosure from Tape-Recorded Interviews (Haymes, 1969) (Appendix K).

Procedure. Initial screening of subjects: At initial group sessions, the following scales were used to measure personality characteristics of the 80 subjects: The Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966), Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967), State Trait Anxiety Inventory A-Trait Scale (Speilberger et al. 1968), Self-Analysis Scale (Jaremko and Noles, Note 7) and the Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Crowne and Marlowe, 1964). The Self-Analysis Scale (Jaremko and Noles, Note 7) is currently experimental, and the major reason for including the scale in the present study is to obtain further psychometric data on it. The subjects also completed the Self-Report Jealousy Scale (Bringle et al. Note 6). Prior to completing the questionnaires, subjects signed a consent/release form and provided information including name, age, sex, major, class, phone number, and social security number (Appendix L).

Pretest: Forty of the 80 subjects obtained from

the initial screening were first asked to participate in the pretest phase. These individuals consisted of the 20 subjects scoring the highest and the 20 subjects scoring the lowest on the Self-Report Jealousy Scale (Bringle et al. Note 6). Thirty subjects, 13 low jealous and 17 high jealous, agreed to participate in the pretest and posttest phases of the experiment. In individual sessions, the high and low jealous subjects were first given a consent form to sign (Appendix M). Next the subject completed the 25-Item Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard, 1971) in order to measure the threat value of self-disclosure. The subject then chose the six most intimate items from the 40-Item Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard, 1971) and rank ordered them from most intimate to least intimate. This questionnaire was used to determine the subject's area of difficulty in self-disclosure. Afterwards, the experimenter randomly selected either items one, three, and five, or two, four, and six for use in the pretest. The three items not used in the pretest were used in the posttest. Once the items were selected, the experimenter asked that the subject disclose something about himself in each of the three areas. For example, the subject may have decided that the question "what

do you feel guiltiest about, or most ashamed of in your past?" (Jourard, 1971) was one of the six most intimate items for him. The experimenter then explained that she would not be present during the disclosure. The subject, however, was instructed to tape his disclosures, and identify himself on the tape by his social security number. The thermal feedback apparatus was attached to the subject's non-dominant index finger to measure skin temperature. The subject was also asked to knock on the door when he began to disclose himself on tape. The knock allowed the experimenter to know when the disclosure began. During the disclosure, the experimenter recorded skin temperature readings of the subject at ten second intervals. After disclosure, the subject completed the Today Form of the Multiple Affect Adjective Checklist (Zuckerman and Lubin, 1965).

Two independent raters were trained by the experimenter to assess the intimacy of taped disclosures of each subject through the use of the Haymes Technique for Measuring Intimacy of Self-Disclosure from Tape-Recorded Interviews (Haymes, 1969). This technique involved placing the disclosed statements of the subjects into four categories of response: expressions of emotion, expressions of fantasies, strives, dreams and hopes, expressions

of needs, and expressions of self-awareness. Different types of statements were then rated on a certain number of points. For example, two points were given to disclosures of the defined types when they were first person references. Each type was rated by two blind raters. Inter-rater reliability was then computed.

Posttest: At the beginning of the posttest, subjects were trained to use the coping technique of reversal of affect. A written description of reversal of affect was given to the subjects to read as the experimenter explained the technique. This training involved three to five minutes of discussion with the subject. The experimenter began the discussion by defining reversal of affect. Basically this technique involved being optimistic or looking at the bright side of things which may have currently seemed difficult for the individual. Examples of this technique were discussed with the subject by the experimenter. One example given was that of an individual who disliked speaking in public. By applying the reversal of affect technique, it could be argued that it may be advantageous to him because, in time, he may improve with practice and find it enjoyable. After the experimenter gave the subject examples of situations in which the reversal of affect technique was used, she

asked the subject if he understood the technique. If so, the experimenter asked the subject to discuss examples which he could think of in which the technique would be applicable, or in which he had used such a strategy in the past. The experimenter then applied the reversal of affect technique to social stress and discussed its advantages in such situations with the subject. Finally, it was explained to the subject that this coping technique could also be applied to self-disclosure. The experimenter discussed the fact that disclosure was a good way of "getting things off your chest" and could be enjoyable. Appendix N is an outline of this reversal of affect training. The same procedure used in the pretest of recording subjects' answers and measuring thermal changes was repeated in the posttest except the subjects' remaining items from the 40-Item Self-Disclosure Questionnaire were used.

Any subject judged to be upset during the experiment was to be referred to one of the counseling center psychologists. All attempts were made to alleviate any fear. In no instance did any of the subjects need counseling. Upon completion of the study, the purpose of the experiment was disclosed and each subject was informed that his

disclosure tape would be erased. In addition, an ethical follow-up involved having the experimenter stress to the subject that she could be contacted if the subject was upset in any way by the experiment. The experimenter gave each subject her phone number for this purpose.

Results

Pearson product-moment correlations were performed on the original 80 subjects' scores on the Self-Report Jealousy Scale, Locus of Control Scale, State Trait Anxiety Inventory A-Trait Scale, Self-Esteem Inventory, Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale and the Self-Analysis Scale. Table 1 is a summary of the correlations.

Insert Table 1 about here

Inspection of this table reveals that the jealousy scale correlated with anxiety, self-esteem, self pre-occupation, and social desirability. Locus of control correlated with anxiety, self-esteem, and social desirability. The State Trait Anxiety Inventory correlated with all of the variables except the Self-Analysis Scale, as did the Self-Esteem Inventory. Since the

social desirability scale correlated with all scales, the results of these questionnaires should be interpreted with the idea of a social desirability response tendency in mind.

The statistical analyses for the experiment included five, two way analyses of variance with repeated measures on one factor. The two factors were high and low jealous individuals and pretest and posttest performance. The dependent measures were the Today Form of the Multiple Affect Adjective Check-List (Zuckerman and Lubin, 1965), skin temperature, and Haymes Technique for Measuring Intimacy of Self-Disclosure from Tape-Recorded Interviews (Haymes, 1969). Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for these measures.

Insert Table 2 about here

The Today Form of the Multiple Affect Adjective Check-List (Zuckerman and Lubin, 1965) consisted of three scales measuring anxiety, depression, and hostility. Three groups by trials analyses of variance with repeated measures on trials were performed on the subjects' scores from the check-list. The analysis of

the anxiety scale revealed a main effect on the groups factor that approached significance ($F(1, 28) = 3.55, p < .07$), possibly indicating that low jealous individuals may be less anxious than high jealous individuals. A main effect on the trials factor was obtained ($F(1, 28) = 7.41, p < .01$) suggesting that high jealous and low jealous subjects were less anxious at the post-test phase of the experiment. No interaction was obtained in the anxiety analysis. The groups by trials analysis of the depression scale approached significance on the groups factor ($F(1, 28) = 4.01, p < .07$) indicating that high jealous subjects may have been more depressed than low jealous subjects. There was no significant difference on the trials factor or the interaction. No significant differences were found in the analysis of the hostility scale.

The analysis performed on skin temperature revealed that high jealous and low jealous subjects did not differ in skin temperature. There was, however, a main effect on the trials factor ($F(1, 28) = 4.22, p < .05$) indicating that both high and low jealous subjects had a lower skin temperature at the posttest. There was no significant difference in coping abilities of the two groups as indicated by the lack of a

groups by trials interaction.

The Haymes Technique for Measuring Intimacy of Self-Disclosure from Tape-Recorded Interviews (Haymes, 1969) was analyzed and there were no differences in the groups, trials, or interaction of these data. An inter-rater reliability correlation coefficient for the Haymes Technique was also computed by correlating the scores of the two raters. The correlation of the two raters' scores was .91.

Three, one way analyses of variance were performed on the 25-Item Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard, 1971). Analysis of disclosing to "mother" as well as to "female friend" indicated no significant difference between high jealous and low jealous subjects in terms of difficulty of disclosure. There was a significant difference, however, in disclosing to a "male friend", revealing that high jealous subjects found it more difficult than low jealous subjects ($F = (1, 28) = 4.16, p < .07$). The summary tables of all of these analyses are presented in Appendix O. Appendix P contains the raw data for each individual in the study.

Discussion

The major hypothesis of this study, that high jealous individuals would not cope as well as low

jealous individuals in a stressful situation involving self-disclosure in the laboratory environment, was not confirmed. There are certain possible explanations for this lack of interaction. It could be that the stressor, self-disclosure of questions intimate to each subject, was not stressful enough to elicit a difference in the two groups. Perhaps, for example, if the subjects had been asked to discuss the intimate questions they chose with the experimenter present, the stress would have been greater. It is also possible that differences in certain characteristics of high and low jealous individuals is not really indicative of differences in coping abilities of the two groups. Replication of no differences between groups in studies using other stressors would support the last explanation.

Several characteristics of high and low jealous subjects emerged from this study. However, only a few of these have been supported by other investigators. The analysis of the depression scale of the Multiple Affect Adjective Check-List only approached significance, indicating that high jealous subjects may be more depressed than low jealous subjects. High jealous and low jealous subjects did not, however, differ in the characteristic of hostility. The two groups of subjects also did not differ significantly in terms of

disclosing to "female friends" and "mothers", however, it was shown that high jealous subjects found it more difficult to disclose to "male friends" than low jealous subjects. This finding could possibly be related to the fact that in the high jealous group 82% of the subjects were female, and only 18% were male. In the low jealous group, 47% of the subjects were female, and 53% were male.

Jealousy correlated positively with the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (Speilberger et al. 1968), indicating that high jealous individuals were significantly more anxious than low jealous individuals. Analysis of the anxiety scale of the Multiple Affect Adjective Check-List approached significance in the same direction. This finding is supported by Bringle et al. (Note 6).

High jealous subjects were also found to have a lower self-esteem than low jealous subjects, as indicated by the negative correlation between the Self-Report Jealousy Scale and the Self-Esteem Inventory. This finding is also supported by Bringle et al. (Note 6), White (Note 1), and Tipton et al. (Note 2). No significant difference was found between high and low jealous subjects in terms of locus of control.

The negative correlation between the Self-Report Jealousy Scale (Bringle et al. Note 6) and the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Crowne and Marlowe, 1964) indicated that there is a tendency for subjects to put themselves in a favorable light when filling out the jealousy scale. This points to an important problem in the measurement of jealousy. Other scales will need to reduce social desirability.

No specific predictions were made on the use of the coping technique of reversal of affect in the post-test because little research has been done in the area. Two findings, although speculative, may indicate that the technique helped both high jealous and low jealous subjects cope with self-disclosure. Findings on the Multiple Affect Adjective Check-List Anxiety Scale (Zuckerman and Lubin, 1965) indicate that both high and low jealous subjects were less anxious at the post-test than at the pretest. The skin temperature of both groups of subjects was also significantly lower at the posttest, perhaps indicating that the reversal of affect technique helped reduce anxiety. There is no definite proof for these results regarding the reversal of affect technique because a no treatment control group was not used in the study.

The findings of the present study, as well as others in the area of jealousy, clearly indicate that an extensive amount of research is still needed. The present study has confirmed some of the personality characteristics of jealous individuals and has shown that there are no differences in self disclosure between these two groups, as measured by the Haymes Technique for Measuring Intimacy of Self-Disclosure from Tape-Recorded Interviews. It is possible, however, that stressful situations outside of the laboratory environment may reveal differences in the coping abilities of high and low jealous individuals. Current studies in the area of jealousy, including the present one, need future research in order to clarify the existing results and provide a better overall understanding of the area.

Reference Notes

1. White, G. L. Inequality of emotional involvement, power, and jealousy in romantic couples. University of Maryland. Paper presented at the 85th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, 1977.
2. Tipton, R. M., Benedictson, C. S., Mahoney, J. M. and Hartnett, J. J. The development of a scale for the assessment of jealousy. Virginia Commonwealth University. Paper presented at the Southeastern Psychological Association, 1977.
3. Bryson, J. B. Situational determinants of the expression of jealousy. San Diego State University. Paper presented at the 85th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, 1977.
4. Teismann, M. W. Jealousy conflict: a study of verbal interaction and labeling of jealousy among dating couples involved in jealousy improvisations. University of Connecticut, 1973. Doctoral dissertation.
5. Lindsey, E. R. An investigation of the dimensions of jealousy. University of Richmond, 1977. Unpublished paper.

6. Bringle, R. G., Roach, S., Andler, C., and Evenbeck, S. Correlates of jealousy. Indiana University- Purdue University at Indianapolis. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, 1977.
7. Jaremko, M. E. and Noles, S. W. Self-Analysis Scale. University of Richmond, 1977. Unpublished paper.

References

- Barber, T. X. Toward a theory of pain: relief of chronic pain by prefrontal leuotomy, opiates, placebos, and hypnosis. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 430-460. (As cited in Appley, M. H. and Trumbull, R. Psychological stress. New York: Meredith Publishing Co., 1967, 337).
- Christie, R. and Geis. Machiavellianism. Columbia University, 1968. Unpublished manuscript. (As cited in Robinson, J. P. and Shaver, P. R., Measures of social psychological attitude. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1973).
- Clanton, G. and Smith, L. Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Committee on Ethical Standards in Psychological Research. Ethical principles in the conduct of research with human participants. Washington D. C.: American Psychological Association, Inc., 1973.
- Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.
- Crowne, D. P. and Marlowe, D. The approval motive. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964, 23-24.
- Haymes, M. Self-disclosure and the acquaintance process.

(As cited in Jourard, S. Self-disclosure: an experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971, 206-207).

Jourard, S. Self-disclosure: an experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971, 199-200, 206-207).

Lacy, J. I. Psychophysiological approaches to the evaluation of psychotherapeutic process and outcome. Research in psychotherapy. Washington D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1959. (As cited in Lazarus, R. S. Psychological stress and the coping process. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1966, 8).

Malmo, R. B. Activation: a neurophysiological dimension. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 367-386. (As cited in Lazarus, R. S. Psychological stress and the coping process. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1966, 8).

Robinson, J. F. and Shaver, P. R. Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1973. (As cited in Bringle, R. G., Roach, S., Andler, C. and Evenbeck, S. Correlates of Jealousy. Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, 1977).

Rosenberg, M. Society and the adolescent self-image.

- Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965. (As cited in White, G. L. Inequality of emotional involvement, power, and jealousy in romantic couples. University of Maryland, 1977).
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, (1 Whole No. 609).
- Speilberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L. and Lushene, R. State Trait Anxiety Inventory. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1968.
- Steiner, I. Benevolent vs. malevolent views of the environment. University of Massachusetts, 1974. (As cited in Bringle, R. G., Roach, S., Andler, C. and Evenbeck, S. Correlates of Jealousy. Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, 1977).
- Thibaut, J. W. and Kelley, H. H. The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley, 1959. (As cited in Bringle, R. G., Roach, S., Andler, C. and Evenbeck, S. Correlates of Jealousy. Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, 1977).
- Troldahl, V. C. and Powell, F. A. A short-form dogmatism scale for use in field studies. Social Forces, 1965, 44, 211-214. (As cited in Bringle, R. G., Roach, S., Andler, C. and Evenbeck, S. Correlates of Jealousy.

Indiana University- Purdue University at Indianapolis, 1977).

Zuckerman, M. The development of an affect adjective checklist for the measurement of anxiety. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 24, 457-462.

Table 1
Correlations

	Jealousy Scale	Locus of Control Scale	State Trait Anxiety Inventory	Self Esteem Inventory	Social Desirability Scale	Self Analysis Scale
Jealousy Scale	1.0	.12	.34*	-.24*	-.44*	-.22*
Locus of Control Scale		1.0	.31*	-.36*	-.37*	-.09
State Trait Anxiety Inventory			1.0	-.55*	-.54*	.10
Self Esteem Inventory				1.0	.52*	-.10
Social Desirability Scale					1.0	.29*
Self Analysis Scale						1.0

* = $p < .05$

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations
for each Group on all Measures

	High Jealous				Low Jealous			
	Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD
MAACL Anxiety	9.82	3.43	7.94	3.26	7.15	4.67	6.07	3.0
MAACL Depression	16.6	4.5	17.5	3.8	13.3	5.55	14.6	5.94
MAACL Hostility	9.35	3.6	9.76	3.27	7.6	2.99	8.23	4.49
Skin temperature *	2.14	.67	1.43	.65	2.22	.62	1.84	.81
Haymes Technique	7.1	1.73	6.41	1.62	6.38	2.3	7.8	.38

* Skin temperature data was obtained by computing the mean of each subject's baseline temperature and subtracting from it the lowest temperature reached during self-disclosure.

Appendix A

Flow Chart of Subjects'
Participation in Experiment

Initial Screening of Subjects

80 subjects from introductory
psychology classes



Pretest

From the initial 80 subjects:
17 high jealous subjects
13 low jealous subjects



Posttest

Same subjects as in pretest:
17 high jealous subjects
13 low jealous subjects

Appendix B

Locus of Control Scale

Rotter, 1966

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief: obviously there are no right or wrong answers. Circle the letter (a or b) of the alternative you have selected.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice.

In some instances, you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice: do not try to be influenced by your previous choices.

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.

- b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy on them.
2.
 - a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
 - b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
3.
 - a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
 - b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
4.
 - a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
 - b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
5.
 - a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
 - b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
6.
 - a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
 - b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7.
 - a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't

7. a. (continued) like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
8. a. Heredity plays the major in determining one's personality.
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.
9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to the course work that studying can be useless.
11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
b. There is some good in everybody.
15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we neither understand, nor control.
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There is really no such thing as luck.

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
20. a. It is hard to know whether a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced out by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.

- 25. b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
- 26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
- 27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletic abilities in high school.
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
- 28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
- 29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
b. In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government.

Appendix C

Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967)

Please mark each statement in the following way:

If the statement describes how you usually feel, put a check in the column, "Like Me."

If the statement does not describe how you usually feel, put a check in the column "Unlike Me."

	Like Me	Unlike Me
1. I spend a lot of time day-dreaming.	_____	_____
2. I'm pretty sure of myself.	_____	_____
3. I often wish I were someone else.	_____	_____
4. I'm easy to like.	_____	_____
5. My parents and I have a lot of fun together.	_____	_____
6. I never worry about anything.	_____	_____
7. I find it very hard to talk in front of a class.	_____	_____
8. I wish I were younger.	_____	_____
9. There are lots of things I'd change about myself if I could.	_____	_____
10. I can make up my mind without too much trouble.	_____	_____
11. I am a lot of fun to be with.	_____	_____

	Like Me	Unlike Me
12. I get upset easily at home.	_____	_____
13. I always do the right thing.	_____	_____
14. I'm proud of my academic work.	_____	_____
15. Someone always has to tell me what to do.	_____	_____
16. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.	_____	_____
17. I'm often sorry for the things I do.	_____	_____
18. I'm popular with people my own age.	_____	_____
19. My parents usually consider my feelings.	_____	_____
20. I'm never unhappy.	_____	_____
21. I'm doing the best work I can.	_____	_____
22. I give in very easily.	_____	_____
23. I can usually take care of myself.	_____	_____
24. I'm pretty happy.	_____	_____
25. I would rather interact with people younger than me.	_____	_____
26. My parents expect too much of me.	_____	_____
27. I like everyone I know.	_____	_____

Coping Abilities

48

Like Me

Unlike Me

28. I like to be called on in class.

29. I understand myself.

30. It's pretty tough to be me.

31. Things are all mixed up in my life.

32. People usually follow my ideas.

33. No one pays much attention to me at home.

34. I never get scolded.

35. I'm not doing as well in school as I'd like to.

36. I can make up my mind and stick to it.

37. I really don't like being a man/woman.

38. I have a low opinion of myself.

39. I don't like to be with other people.

40. There are many times when I'd like to leave home.

41. I'm never shy.

42. I often feel upset in school.

Coping Abilities

49

Like Me

Unlike Me

43. I often feel ashamed of myself.

44. I'm not as nice looking as most people.

45. If I have something to say, I usually say it.

46. People pick on me very often.

47. My parents understand me.

48. I always tell the truth.

49. My teachers make me feel I'm not good enough.

50. I don't care what happens to me.

51. I'm a failure.

52. I get upset easily when I'm scolded.

53. Most people are better liked than I am.

54. I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me.

55. I always know what to say to people.

56. I often get discouraged in school.

Coping Abilities

50

Like Me

Unlike Me

57. Things usually don't bother me. _____

58. I can't be depended on. _____

Appendix D

State Trait Anxiety Inventory, A-Trait

Spielberger, Gorsuch, and Lushene, 1968

Directions: A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then blacken in the appropriate circle to the right of the statement to indicate how you generally feel. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe how you generally feel.

	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
1. I feel pleasant -----	1	2	3	4
2. I tire quickly -----	1	2	3	4
3. I feel like crying -----	1	2	3	4
4. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be -----	1	2	3	4
5. I am losing out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough -----	1	2	3	4
6. I feel rested -----	1	2	3	4

Coping Abilities

52

	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
	1	2	3	4
7. I am "calm, cool, and collected" -----	1	2	3	4
8. I feel that difficulties are piling up so that I cannot overcome them. ---	1	2	3	4
9. I worry too much over something that really doesn't matter -----	1	2	3	4
10. I am happy -----	1	2	3	4
11. I am inclined to take things too hard -----	1	2	3	4
12. I lack self-confidence --	1	2	3	4
13. I feel secure -----	1	2	3	4
14. I try to avoid facing a crisis or difficulty ----	1	2	3	4
15. I feel blue -----	1	2	3	4
16. I am content -----	1	2	3	4
17. Some unimportant thought				

Coping Abilities

53

	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
	1	2	3	4
17. (continued) runs through my mind and bothers me --	1	2	3	4
18. I take disappointments so keenly that I can't put them out of my mind -----	1	2	3	4
19. I am a steady person ----	1	2	3	4
20. I get in a state of tension or turmoil when I think over my recent concerns and interests -----	1	2	3	4

Appendix E

Self-Analysis Scale

Jaremko and Noles, 1977

Please choose the number that most clearly describes how you generally feel about each statement. Try to be as honest and as open as you can be. Your first impression is usually the most accurate so don't spend too much time on any one item.

	Always		Sometimes			Never	
1. At a small gathering, I am concerned with the impression I am making.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I am aware of all the "right" people to know.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. When others laugh at me, I am able to be unaffected by it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. When my troubles are mounting up, I can still think of others less fortunate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I've had good experiences when I've	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Always			Sometimes			Never
5. (continued) tried to understand some- one who is angry at me.							
6. When I walk by a mirror, I usually look at how my clothes appear.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. At small parties, I am usually aware of who is looking at me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I wonder what it would be like to be famous.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. My opinions change depending on whom I'm with.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I agree with people even when I disagree so as to avoid conflict.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I enjoy being with important people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Being busy makes me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Coping Abilities

56

	Always		Sometimes		Never		
12. (continued) feel important.							
13. I like telling of other people's good fortune.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I find it difficult to fall in love.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I am conscious of how I look even when no one else is around.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I attempt to immitate people whom I feel are accepted by others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I am embarassed to be seen with unattractive people because of what others may think.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. I am generally uninterested in other people's affairs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I am concerned with getting ahead in life because it is	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Always

Sometimes

Never

19. (continued) important to be successful.

20. I feel I lack the necessary abilities to be successful. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix F

Self-Report Jealousy Scale

R. G. Bringle, S. Roach,

C. Andler, and S. Evenbeck, 1977

Below are 20 situations in which you may have been involved, or in which you could be involved. Rate them with regard to how jealous you would be if you were confronted with the situation by placing a check mark in a space on the scale.

1. You find out your spouse is having an affair.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

2. Spouse or steady looks at another.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

3. A close friend obtains goals which you value.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

4. Another person gets the promotion for which you were qualified.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

5. A friend is smarter and gets higher grades.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

6. Someone else gets the praise or credit for something you did.

Not Very : ___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

7. A spouse or steady spends increasingly more time with others.

Not Very : ___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

8. An outsider becomes close to your children.

Not Very : ___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

9. A group of people who would not include you in their activities.

Not Very : ___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

10. You are stood up, and learn that your date was out with another person.

Not Very : ___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

11. Friends who have more money and are able to buy clothes, etc.

Not Very : ___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

12. A brother or sister who excels in school.

12. (continued)

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

13. A classmate has superior athletic abilities.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

14. A brother or sister receiving presents, and
 you don't get any.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

15. Your steady expresses a desire to date others.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

16. Your brother or sister is given more freedom,
 such as staying up later, or driving the car.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

17. Another person is flirting with your date or
 spouse.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

18. A classmate gets more attention from a teacher.

Not Very : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very
 Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

19. Your brother or sister seems to be receiving more affection and/or attention from your parents.

Not Very :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Very
Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

20. A spouse or steady spends increasingly more time in outside activities.

Not Very :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Very
Jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Jealous

Appendix G

Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale

Crowne and Marlowe, 1964

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally.

- ___ 1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
- ___ 2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
- ___ 3. It is sometimes hard to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
- ___ 4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.
- ___ 5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
- ___ 6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
- ___ 7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.
- ___ 8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
- ___ 9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.

- ___ 10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
- ___ 11. I like to gossip at times.
- ___ 12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
- ___ 13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
- ___ 14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
- ___ 15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
- ___ 16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
- ___ 17. I always try to practice what I preach.
- ___ 18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.
- ___ 19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.
- ___ 20. When I don't know something, I don't at all mind admitting it.
- ___ 21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

- ___ 22. At times, I have really insisted on having things my own way.
- ___ 23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
- ___ 24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
- ___ 25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
- ___ 26. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
- ___ 27. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
- ___ 28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
- ___ 29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
- ___ 30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
- ___ 31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
- ___ 32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
- ___ 33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

Appendix H

The 25-Item Self-Disclosure Questionnaire

Jourard, 1971

Instructions: Below is listed a number of items of information about yourself. You are asked to indicate on the answer sheet the extent to which certain other people know this information about you through your telling it or confiding it to them. If you are certain that the other person knows this information fully- so that he or she could tell someone else about this aspect of you- write the number 1 in the appropriate space. If the other person does not know this information fully- if he or she has only a vague idea, or has an incomplete knowledge of this particular item, write in a zero. Remember, do not write in a 1 unless you are sure that you have given this information to the person in full enough detail, that they can describe you accurately in this respect to another person.

Information about Oneself

1. What do you like to do most in your spare time at home, e.g., read, sports, go out, etc.
2. The kind of party or social that you enjoy most.
3. Your usual and favorite spare time reading material, e.g., novels, nonfiction, science fiction,

3. (continued) poetry, etc.
4. The kinds of music that you enjoy listening to most, e.g., popular, classical, folk-music, opera.
5. The sports you engage in most, if any, e.g., golf, swimming, tennis, baseball, etc.
6. Whether or not you know and play any card games, e.g., bridge, poker, gin, rummy, etc.
7. Whether or not you will drink alcoholic beverages; if so, your favorite drinks- beer, wine, gin, brandy, whiskey, etc.
8. The foods you like best, and the way you like the foods prepared; e.g., rare steak, etc.
9. Whether or not you belong to any church; if so, which one and the usual frequency of attending.
10. Whether or not you belong to any clubs, fraternity, civic organizations, if so, the names of these organizations.
11. Any skills you have mastered, e.g., arts and crafts, painting, sculpture, wood-working, auto repair, knitting, weaving, etc.
12. Whether or not you have any favorite spectator sports; if so, what these are, e.g., boxing, wrestling, football, basketball, etc.
13. The places that you have travelled to, or lived

13. (continued) in during your life; other countries, cities, states.
14. What your political sentiments are at present; your views on state and federal government policies of interest to you.
15. Whether or not you have been seriously in love during your life before this year; if so, with whom, what the details were, and the outcome.
16. The names of the people in your life whose care and happiness you feel in some way directly responsible for.
17. The personal deficiencies that you would most like to improve, or that you are struggling to do something about at present, e.g., appearance, lack of knowledge, loneliness, temper, etc.
18. Whether or not you presently owe money; if so, how much, and to whom.
19. The kind of future you are aiming toward, working for, planning for, both personally and vocationally, e.g., marriage and family, professional status, etc.
20. Whether or not you are now involved in any projects that you would not want to interrupt at present—either socially, personally, or in your work; what these projects are.

21. The details of your sex life up to the present time; including whether or not you have had, or are now having sexual relations, whether or not you masturbate, etc.
22. Your problems and worries about your personality, that is, what you dislike most about yourself, any guilts, inferiority feelings, etc.
23. How you feel about the appearance of your body- your looks; figure, weight- what you dislike and what you accept in your appearance, and how you wish you might change your looks to improve them.
24. Your thoughts about your health, including any problems, worries, or concerns that you might have at present.
25. An exact idea of your regular income. (If a student, of your usual combined allowance and earnings, if any).

Answer Sheet

Mother

Male Friend

Female Friend

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Appendix I

The 40-Item Self-Disclosure Questionnaire

Jourard, 1971

Choose and then rank order six questions which are most intimate to you.

1. What do you dislike the most about having a complete physical examination?
2. How do you feel about engaging in sex activities prior to, or outside of marriage?
3. With whom have you discussed your sexual experiences?
4. What do you feel the guiltiest about, or most ashamed of in your past?
5. What questions in the area of sex are you most curious to know about?
6. With how many guys/girls have you "petted" in the last year?
7. How can you tell when you are getting sexually aroused?
8. On what parts of your body have you been kissed?
9. What thoughts have you had that repulse you?
10. What techniques of sex play do you know of?
11. What are your feelings about masturbation?
12. In what ways do you think various members of your family may be "maladjusted"?

13. How do you feel about your love life?
14. How frequently do you engage in sexual activities?
15. What are the persons like with whom you have had some type of sexual experience?
16. How do you feel if someone sees you naked?
17. How do you feel about having members of the same sex touch you?
18. How do you feel about having members of the opposite sex touch you?
19. Which (if either or both) of your parents do you think might have had premarital sexual relations?

Appendix J

Multiple Affect Adjective Check List

Today Form

Zuckerman and Lubin, 1965

Directions: On this sheet you will find words which describe different kinds of moods and feelings. Mark an X in the boxes beside the words which describe how you feel now - today. Some of the words may sound alike, but we want you to check all the words that describe your feelings. Work rapidly.

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 1. active | 16. bitter | 31. daring |
| 2. adventurous | 17. blue | 32. desperate |
| 3. affectionate | 18. bored | 33. destroyed |
| 4. afraid | 19. calm | 34. devoted |
| 5. agitated | 20. cautious | 35. disagreeable |
| 6. agreeable | 21. cheerful | 36. discontented |
| 7. aggressive | 22. clean | 37. discouraged |
| 8. alive | 23. complaining | 38. disgusted |
| 9. alone | 24. contented | 39. displeased |
| 10. amiable | 25. contrary | 40. energetic |
| 11. amused | 26. cool | 41. enraged |
| 12. angry | 27. cooperative | 42. enthusiastic |
| 13. annoyed | 28. critical | 43. fearful |
| 14. awful | 29. cross | 44. fine |
| 15. bashful | 30. cruel | 45. fit |

Coping Abilities

73

46. forlorn	70. joyful	94. quiet
47. frank	71. kindly	95. reckless
48. free	72. lonely	96. rejected
49. friendly	73. lost	97. rough
50. frightened	74. loving	98. sad
51. furious	75. low	99. safe
52. gay	76. lucky	100. satisfied
53. gentle	77. mad	101. secure
54. glad	78. mean	102. shaky
55. gloomy	79. meek	103. shy
56. good	80. merry	104. soothed
57. good-natured	81. mild	105. steady
58. grim	82. miserable	106. stubborn
59. happy	83. nervous	107. stormy
60. healthy	84. obliging	108. strong
61. hopeless	85. offended	109. suffering
62. hostile	86. outraged	110. sullen
63. impatient	87. panicky	111. sunk
64. incensed	88. patient	112. sympathetic
65. indignant	89. peaceful	113. tame
66. inspired	90. pleased	114. tender
67. interested	91. pleasant	115. tense
68. irritated	92. polite	116. terrible
69. jealous	93. powerful	117. terrified

- 118. thoughtful
- 119. timid
- 120. tormented
- 121. understanding
- 122. unhappy
- 123. unsociable
- 124. upset
- 125. vexed
- 126. warm
- 127. whole
- 128. wild
- 129. willful
- 130. wilted
- 131. worrying
- 132. young

Appendix K

The Haymes Technique for Measuring Intimacy of
Self - Disclosure from Tape-Recorded Interviews

Haymes, 1969

Code and Scoring Manual for Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure will include four major categories of response:

1. Expressions of emotion and emotional processes.
2. Expressions of needs.
3. Expressions of fantasies, strivings, dreams, hopes.
4. Expressions of self-awareness.

Self-disclosure will specifically exclude opinions about objects other than self unless the person obviously intends the opinion to be saying something about himself. Since this experiment deals with the acquaintance process, it is only rarely that one comes across such inferential statements without their being followed up by a clarifying remark which is scorable under one of the categories below. Although much self-disclosure of the types described below is stated in the first person singular, it is possible to make self-disclosing statements in the third person. Examples of both types are included below.

Scoring Procedures

A score of 2 points will be given to disclosures of the defined types when they are first person references.

A score of 1 point will be given to disclosures of the same types when they are reflexive third person references. These statements in the third person in which the word "you" is an obvious substitution for saying "I".

Non-reflexive third person references, such as "people always...", in which the person is not really revealing any information about himself will not be scored.

For this experiment, ratings will be given for each 30 seconds of interaction. In any 30 second segment, only the score for the maximally disclosing statement will be used. In other words, if a person makes 1, 2, or 10 2-point disclosures in any 30-second segment his score is 2 points for that segment. This avoids inaccurately scoring for speech pattern repetitions. Similarly, if a person makes a 1-point statement, and a 2-point statement in the same 30-second segment, his score is 2 points for the segment.

Examples

1. Expressions of emotions and emotional processes:

Irritation- "It really bugs me...", "You get peeved at...", "It makes me sick...", It drives me crazy..."

Also references to being agitated, irritated, testy, etc.

Anger, rage, hostility, hate, bitterness, resentment- "It gets me very angry when...", "You (I) just naturally hate people like her".

Excitement, involvement, concern, etc.- "I get all caught up in...", "It gets to me...", "It gets me going", "I'm really close to my father", "I'm excited by...". Also the opposite of involvement. "I can't seem to get into the material." "Boredom is one of my big problems."

Sad, blue, apathetic, cheerless, depressed, grief, mournful, pensive, gloomy, etc.- "It depresses me when...", "I get blue frequently."

Happy, contented, delighted, feeling great, secure, feeling well (strong, confident, etc.), assured, pleased, jovial, elated, euphoric, merry- "I feel great when she ...", "You really feel good when...". (Also the opposite of feeling well and strong i.e., discussion of health problems, physical complaints, expression of general lack of feeling of well being.) Expressions which have been leached of their emotional content are not scored.

2. Expressions of needs, demands made upon others in contact with self: "I demand a great deal of attention." "I don't feel too motivated to do much of anything."

"All I want is...". These will frequently be expressed in statement of self-awareness (see below).

3. Expressions of self-awareness, internal forces, processes, capabilities, and/or the lack of them. "You (I) tell yourself that...", "I rationalize that by...", "That's one of my handicaps." "I don't panic easily." "I get mad at myself...", "I have the worst time with writing." "It's not a natural thing for me...", "It's easy for me to...", "It's really bad for me when I...", "I'm torn between...", "I'm not mature." "I'm not too hot at...", "I can't possibly integrate all that stuff." "You (I) adjust to things...", "I can think logically, but math is just impossible." "I identify with people who...", "I get very sentimental when...", "I'm a night-time person."

4. Expressions of fantasies, hopes, strivings, long-range plans, etc. "I've wanted to be a doctor since I was five years old." "I frequently dream that I'm...", "I dream of the day when..."

Surprise, shock, astonishment, amazement. "She really shocked me terrifically with her openness." "I love being surprised."

Sorry, repentent, ashamed, guilty, etc. "I feel guilty about...", "I always feel sorry when..."

Pride, self-esteem, feelings of fulfillment, self-confidence. "I felt good about what I did for her."
"I've been feeling great lately."

Confused, perplexed, puzzled, cloudy, incoherent, disoriented, uncertain, etc. To be scored, the statement must indicate some emotional disorientation or confusion (i.e., "My math homework confuses me" is not scored.) "Situations like that puzzle the hell out of me." "I just don't know how I feel about it."

Anxious, tense, on-edge, overwrought, upset, distressed, worried, etc. "I really get tense in situations like this." "It worries me when...", "She scares me." "You (I) get frightened when..."

Love, tenderness, affection, warmth, caring-for another, passion, arousal (sexual), "withdrew at times like that".

Love, tenderness, affection, warmth, caring-for another, passion, arousal (sexual), etc. "I loved her before she...", "I was so hung up with her that I couldn't even..."

Appendix L
Informed Consent Form

Name: _____
Please Print

Roxanne Lindsey has explained my participation in the experiment. I am fully aware of the following points and I volunteer to participate.

1. I will be asked to fill out questionnaires about myself and my personal feelings. I may omit any question(s) of my own choosing.
2. Confidentiality will be assured. No one will be permitted to inspect my answers on these questionnaires except Ms. Lindsey and Dr. Matt Jaremko.
3. I may be asked to participate in further phases of this experiment. I will, however, not be required to do this and will not lose credit for any previous participation if I decline.
4. I may terminate my participation in this experiment at any time.

Signature of Participant

Date

Witness

Appendix L
Biographical Information
(Please Print)

Name _____ Age _____

Sex _____ Major _____

Class _____

Phone Number _____

Social Security Number _____

Appendix M

Informed Consent Form

This is an experiment to investigate individual differences in coping abilities in dealing with a stressful situation.

You will be required to do the following:

1. Disclose information onto a cassette tape which may be of a personal nature.
2. Complete questionnaires concerning your feelings about revealing information about yourself.
3. Allow the experimenter to record changes in the skin temperature of your hands.

All of your responses will remain anonymous. You will not be identified by name on any questionnaire or on the tape. Only Ms. Lindsey or Dr. Matt Jaremko will have access to the information. You may terminate your participation at any time.

I am aware of what this study entails and I volunteer to participate.

Signature

Date

Appendix N

Coping Technique of Reversal of Affect

- I. Purpose: The purpose of using the reversal of affect technique in this experiment is to give the subjects a strategy for coping with self-disclosure.
- II. Definition: The reversal of affect technique entails being optimistic or looking at the bright side of things which may currently seem difficult for an individual.
- III. Exemplification: The experimenter will discuss examples of this technique with the subject to make sure the subject understands reversal of affect.
- IV. The experimenter will then ask the subject to provide examples in which he thinks the technique would be applicable, or in which he has used such a strategy in the past.
- V. Social Stress: The experimenter will apply the reversal of affect technique to social stress and discuss its advantages in such situations.
- VI. Self-disclosure: The reversal of affect technique will be applied to self-disclosure. The experimenter will explain that disclosure can be a good way of "getting things off your chest" and can be enjoyable.

Appendix O
Analyses of Variance

MAACL Anxiety				
Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Total	59			
Between Subjects	29			
Between Groups	1	75.72	3.55	.07
Error	28	21.31		
Within Subjects	30			
Between Trials	1	35.26	7.41	.01
Groups X Trials	1	2.40	.50	NS
Error	28	4.76		

MAACL Depression

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Total	59			
Between Subjects	29			
Between Groups	1	146.76	4.01	.07
Error	28	36.57		
Within Subjects	30			
Between Trials	1	18.15	.15	NS
Groups X Trials	1	.49	0	NS
Error	28	119.2		

MAACL Hostility

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Total	59			
Between Subjects	29			
Between Groups	1	39.42	2.0	NS
Error	28	19.74		
Within Subjects	30			
Between Trials	1	3.75	.60	NS
Groups X Trials	1	.15	.02	NS
Error	28	6.27		

Skin Temperature

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Total	59			
Between Subjects	29			
Between Groups	1	1.19	1.92	NS
Error	28	.62		
Within Subjects	30			
Between Trials	1	1.35	4.22	.05
Groups X Trials	1	.11	.34	NS
Error	28	.32		

Coping Abilities

88

Haymes Technique

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Total	59			
Between Subjects	29			
Between Groups	1	1.81	.22	NS
Error	28	8.22		
Within Subjects	30			
Between Trials	1	.81	.01	NS
Groups X Trials	1	17.31	.17	NS
Error	28	102.07		

Self-Disclosure, Mother

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Total	29			
Between Groups	1	22.59	1.46	NS
Within Groups	28	15.49		

Self-Disclosure, Female Friend

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Total	29			
Between Groups	1	11.83	.34	NS
Within Groups	28	34.46		

Self-Disclosure, Male Friend

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Total	29			
Between Groups	1	135.84	4.16	.07
Within Groups	28	32.63		

Appendix P

Analyses of Individual Data

	MAACL Anx.		MAACL Dep.		MAACL Host.		Skin Temp.	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
High Jeal.								
Ss								
1	13	10	17	21	18	9	2.6	1.8
2	9	8	16	17	9	10	1.6	1.7
3	13	8	18	18	12	10	3.1	1.3
4	6	8	18	19	7	8	3.0	1.9
5	5	4	12	16	6	8	3.7	2.1
6	6	6	13	18	7	10	1.8	1.6
7	6	6	12	12	6	7	1.9	.90
8	10	2	16	16	9	18	2.1	1.8
9	14	16	20	18	10	8	1.9	1.0
10	11	10	19	19	12	12	1.0	1.2
11	10	6	18	16	6	8	2.1	1.8
12	13	10	20	25	9	13	2.6	.20
13	13	7	21	19	11	10	1.5	1.4
14	13	10	20	20	12	12	1.9	2.4
15	12	11	20	19	12	10	1.7	0.0
16	3	4	3	7	2	2	1.9	2.1
17	10	9	20	19	11	11	1.9	1.2
Low Jeal.								
Ss								
1	2	2	16	13	7	5	2.3	3.4
2	8	6	18	14	9	8	1.7	1.8
3	8	5	10	10	9	10	2.3	.10
4	0	8	3	23	3	10	1.3	2.2
5	10	8	16	19	10	11	3.4	2.5
6	2	2	8	4	11	2	2.8	2.4
7	12	9	17	10	12	18	1.4	1.6
8	9	9	20	20	8	12	1.7	1.2
9	7	8	17	18	9	8	2.7	1.7
10	14	7	19	22	8	3	2.8	1.2
11	10	6	8	17	3	10	2.0	1.9
12	11	9	15	14	7	8	2.0	2.5
13	0	0	6	6	3	2	2.5	1.5

Coping Abilities

91

	Haymes Tech.		Self- Disc. Mother	Self- Disc. Female Friend	Self- Disc. Male Friend
	Pre	Post			
High Jeal. Ss					
1	8	8	12	19	3
2	8	8	13	11	17
3	8	8	18	25	16
4	2	6	15	13	12
5	8	3	16	4	7
6	8	6	19	20	12
7	8	6	17	17	8
8	8	6	4	14	12
9	6	4	19	18	4
10	6	4	14	4	22
11	7	8	17	11	4
12	4	6	6	22	8
13	8	6	14	8	11
14	8	6	19	18	0
15	8	8	20	17	8
16	8	8	16	14	24
17	8	8	15	19	14

Low
Jeal.

Ss					
1	7	8	18	20	17
2	6	8	13	23	14
3	0	8	18	20	15
4	8	8	19	21	22
5	8	8	21	14	19
6	6	7	12	7	10
7	4	8	16	10	17
8	8	7	21	15	18
9	6	8	14	19	17
10	8	8	13	17	8
11	8	8	16	6	7
12	8	8	15	24	16
13	6	8	21	17	15

VITA

I was born in Richmond, Virginia on July 19, 1956. In 1976, I graduated Magna cum laude from Westhampton College at the University of Richmond with a B.A. in Psychology and Sociology. I worked part time at the Reception and Diagnostic Center for Children in Bon Air during 1976 and 1977. From 1976 to 1978, I attended graduate school at the University of Richmond, and received my M.A. in Psychology.