

Study of Reliability & Validity of Communicative Responses to Jealousy in Ahwaz City Women

Rashin Sabri Nazarzadeh^{1*}, Parvin Ehteshamzadeh², Ali khaleghkhah³

¹Department of psychology, Payam Noor University, Abadan, Iran

*E-mail: Rashin.Sabri@yahoo.com

²Department of Education and psychology, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran

³Department of Education and psychology, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

Received for publication: 07 March 2014.

Accepted for publication: 30 June 2014.

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to verify reliability & validation of communicative responses to jealousy & relationship among sexual satisfaction, couples intimacy and communicative responses to jealousy in Ahwaz city's women. 527 couples selected with clustering sampling method participated as a sample of this research. Research tool was communicative responses to jealousy, Enrich short form of sexual satisfaction & couple's intimacy scale. Confirmatory factor analysis, Pearson correlation coefficient & regression are used for analysis of research data. Results showed that A & B form of communicative responses to jealousy had appropriate validity (A form: RSMEA= 0.1, GFI= 0.99, AGFI=0/98 & $x^2/df= 1.39$; B form: RSMEA= 0.15, GFI= 0.94, AGFI=0/87 & $x^2/df= 1.28$).

Keywords: Communicative Responses to Jealousy, Sexual Satisfaction, Couple's Intimacy.

Introduction

Jealousy is a concept which is related to love & commitment and is a spear for communication (Buss, 1988 in Guerrero, 2008). On the other hand, romantic jealousy is also a behavioral, emotional & cognitive reaction and occurs when quality of romantic relationship is treated with an imaginary or real rival (Shrpsteen, 1997; Guerro & Andersen, 1998, in Guerrero, 2008). In this matter, Crow (1995) introduces two kinds of jealousy: 1) Natural jealousy which is introduced against actual infidelity, and 2) morbid jealousy which is not related to special matter and is hidden inside of a person.

Researches show that depression, commitment styles & low self-esteem have meaningful relationship with romantic jealousy which means mental weaknesses can increase jealousy feelings in person while mental health and high self-esteem, increase cognitive distortions considerably. (Mathes, 1991 in Cano & O'leary, 1997). Fadecki-Bushet al (1993 in Cano & O'leary, 1997) found that variables such as depression & attachment intermediate between cognitive evaluation and jealousy feeling.

Pines(1983 in Guerro, 2008) found that although seems jealousy related with negative emotions but, jealousy sometimes related to joy, love & appreciation because, it shows great affection to partner. He mentions that jealousy can have severe emotional & communicative function so that, human being has more commitment in their relations, perpetual ownership feeling to their partners or candidates. Guerro (2008) believes that there are particularly eleven communicative reactions for jealousy (negative communication, counter jealousy induction, violence, integrative communication, compensatory restoration, silence, denial/ inhibition, signs of

possession, surveillance, rival contact, and derogation of the rival), effective contact (e.g. more love & affection expression), contact avoidance (non-verbal & non-aggressive communication like remoteness from an engaged person or situation or problem which induce jealousy), and rival-base contact.

Aron Beck (2000) believes that intimacy is sub product of consideration, acceptance, sensitivity, and understanding, and it has inverse relationship with misunderstanding, criticism, blaming, and insensitivity. So, romantic jealousy can make a lot of problems in intimate relationships (Guerro, 2008).

Findings of a research show that jealousy appears more when existence of a rival is felt and there is ownership feeling in partner (Mathes, Skowran & Dick, 1982). Some people, because of their attachment style, use jealousy as a weapon to maintain their partners in relationship (Shrpsteen, 1997); Jealousy is dependent to kind of infidelity (sexual or emotional) perceived and being old or young for jealous person (Shackelford, Voracck, Schmitt, Michalski, 2003; Stieglitz, 2012). Jealousy and direct responses to jealousy, effects to secondary attributes of relationships, as couple's intimacy and also couple's conflicts have inverse relationship with direct responses to jealousy (Theissj et al, 2006). People's partners who use communicative reactions rather than others who resort effective and positive communicative reactions, have less satisfaction in their relationships (Guerro, 2008). According to Shackelford & Buss (1997) there is negative relationship among respect & intimacy with jealousy & disrespect, indeed they believe that dissatisfaction from sexual relationships caused by not managing conflicts & disability in restoration of intimate relationship (Morrise, 1999). Stieglitz et al (2012) found that jealousy is a reaction against threatening self-worth feeling which raises partner's aggression & anger that exposed to jealousy. Stieglitz et al (2012) also believe that romantic jealousy is more occurred against partner's infidelity and leads to next sexual conflict, and the cause of these conflict remains hidden.

Identification of psychological factors affecting such relationships is important to promotion of sexual relationship quality, and standard tools for measuring those effective factors are important accordingly. Existence of a standardized scale for couple's communicative reactions to jealousy measurement provides the possibility of researches in different fields of couple' psychological recognition, improvement & hygienic, and also development of psychological knowledge about sexual relationship, importance & necessity of this matter for validation of scale, which can measure couple's jealousy. So, this research attended to measure reliability & validity of communicative reaction to jealousy scale in Ahwaz city. Furthermore, it examines romantic jealousy relationship with sexual satisfaction, intimacy and predicting sexual jealousy by sexual satisfaction & couple's intimacy.

Methodology: Population, Sample & Method

Population size of this research was Ahwaz city women with 229651 people (Statistics Center of Iran, 2009). Final sample size of this research considered 527 persons with clustering sampling method, according to not responding many of items or responding more than one option in some items by some of respondents. Communicative reaction to jealousy, sexual satisfaction, couple's intimacy questionnaire distributed after enough explanations for research purposes and attracting their participation & collaboration. After two to four weeks through retesting 122 person of Ahwaz city for the evaluation of reliability and data measured by Pearson coefficient. For inner consistency from Chronbach's Alpha used for data related to 527 respondents. Pearson Regression & Multiple Regression used in order to evaluate correlation among sexual satisfaction, couple's intimacy & communicative reactions to jealousy, and also predicting communicative reactions to jealousy by sexual satisfaction and couple's intimacy.

Measurement Tool: communicative reactions to jealousy

This questionnaire is a test containing 49 questions in two forms: CRJ-S form which filled by jealous respondent and CRJ-P form which filled by him/her partner. In Guerro (2008) estimated inner consistency for all sub scales 0.80-0.89. Evaluation of validity & reliability of this scale is current research's purpose.

Validity of this questionnaire has done by content validity & convergence. In order to estimate content validity, CRJ questionnaire translated to Persian language and its content amended & revised by two Ph.D psychology specialists. Then, changes applied in order of questions and expression of some questions based on 30 MA students of psychology & consultant viewpoints.

Enrich Sexual Satisfaction Questionnaire

This questionnaire has been used as a valid tool in several researches. This questionnaire which is created by Olson & Drankman (1989) used for evaluating potential problem fields or identification of strength & productivity of sexual relationship. It is also used as tool for recognition of couples whom need consultant & relationship reinforcement (MavardiJaghargh, 2010). Questionnaire's Alpha Coefficient in Olson & Drankman (1989) research reported %93 (Asgari, 2008). Questionnaire's reliability is mentioned by two methods; Chronbach's Alpha & split up are %91 & %83 respectably (Asgari, 2008). In other research, questionnaire's reliability gained %96 by Chronbach's Alpha (Shamsaei, 2006).

Couple's Intimacy Scale

Tompson & Walker (1983) Couple's intimacy Scale has 17 questions which arranged to measure intimacy amount. This scale translated by Sanaeiin 2000 and implemented on 100 couples. Reliability coefficient of the whole couple's intimacy Scale with Chronbach's Alpha gained 0.96 (Quoted in Khandaei, 2003). Khandaei (2003) reported inner consistency with Chronbach's Alpha 0.91 to 0.97.

Results

Factor analysis applied in this research in order to measure validity of communicative reaction to jealousy. In 1, 2, 11 tables questionnaire's component lied in 4 category which Guerrero et al (1995) defined with theoretical aspects of communicative reactions to jealousy. Below of table 1 allocated a number to each component and defined with the same number in tables. According to deletion of some questions, questions also renumbered. In Table one & two factor loading and its significance has been reported.

Table 1. Factor loadings, T-value of Communicative Responses to Jealousy in Ahwaz City Women (form A)

Subscales categories	Subscales	Number of items	Number of new	item implication	Factor loading	T-values
Destructive communication	2	1	1	Flirted or talked about others	0.22	4.87
Constructive communication	11	2	2	Proving of partner (tired to prove love)	0.70	11.06
Rival-focused communication	4	3	3	Search evidence for confirming of relation partner and rival(looked through belongings for evidence)	0.72	4.20

Rival-focused communication	7	4	4	Pointed out the rival's negative qualities	0.48	4.29
Destructive communication	1	5	5	Quarreled and argued with partner	0.70	17.19
Destructive communication	1	6	6	Give "silent treatment" to partner	0.73	18.07
Destructive communication	1	7	7	Hurtful or mean comments	0.50	11.5
Constructive communication	10	8	8	Talked to the rival	0.39	8.35
Destructive communication	1	9	9	Wanted to break up	0.66	16.15
Constructive communication	10	10	10	Share jealous feeling with partner	0.52	11.56
Destructive communication	1	11	11	Yelled or cursed	0.65	15.82
Avoidant communication	8	12	12	Got quiet and didn't say much	0.26	5.20
Avoidant communication	8	13	13	Became silent	0.78	15.98
Constructive communication	11	14	14	Talking about needing him (expressed care)	0.48	10.69
Avoidant communication	9	15	15	Showing it's not important (acted like i didn't care)	0.48	10.69
Destructive communication	1	16	16	Physically pulled away partner	0.64	15.49
Destructive communication	1	17	17	Cold and dirty looks to partner	0.80	20.43
Destructive communication	1	18	18	Decreased affection	0.71	17.52
Destructive communication	3	19	19	Pushed, shoved or hit partner	0.74	10.13
Destructive communication	1	20	20	Acted rude	0.44	10.11
Constructive communication	11	21	21	Increased affection	0.59	13.41
Destructive communication	2	22	22	Acted interested in someone else	0.10	2.24
Avoidant communication	9	23	23	Denied feeling jealous	0.37	7.67
Destructive communication	3	24	24	Used physically violent	0.52	12.22
Destructive communication	1	25	25	Wore displeasure on face to him	0.42	9.58
Destructive communication	3	26	26	Threatened to harm partner	0.68	16.52

Destructive communication	3	27	27	Became physically violent with partner	0.36	8.16
Rival-focused communication	4	28	28	Kept closer tabs	0.16	2.74
Rival-focused communication	7	29	29	Said mean things about the rival	0.63	4.43
Avoidant communication	9	30	30	Pretended nothing was wrong	0.78	4.65
Constructive communication	10	31	31	Discussed about the situation	0.66	15.29
Constructive communication	10	32	32	tried to reach an understanding	0.27	5.63
Constructive communication	10	33	33	Calmly questioned	0.73	17.30
Rival-focused communication	4	34	34	Tried to determine whereabouts	0.78	4.55
Rival-focused communication	4	35	35	Repeatedly called	0.75	4.54
Rival-focused communication	4	36	36	Tried to prevent rival contact	0.64	4.47
Constructive communication	11	37	37	Tried to be the best partner possible	0.57	12.89
Constructive communication	11	38	38	Spent more time than usual with partner	0.10	2.33
Rival-focused communication	7	39	39	Made negative comments about the rival	0.75	4.48
Rival-focused communication	4	40	40	Check up more than usual	0.71	4.52
Rival-focused communication	6	41	41	Explained feelings	0.30	3.81
Constructive communication	11	42	42	Expressed feeling of needs or worry	0.58	13.23
Rival-focused communication	5	43	43	Made sure rivals knew partner is taken	0.53	3.81
Destructive communication	2	44	44	tried to make jealous too	0.14	3.17
Rival-focused communication	6	45	45	Confronted the rival	0.50	4.37
Rival-focused communication	5	46	46	Let rivals know about the relationship	0.40	4.33
Rival-focused communication	5	47	47	Showed my partner extra affection around rivals	0.35	4.14
Avoidant communication	8	48	-	Got quiet	-	-
Rival-focused communication	6	49	48	Told the rival not to see	0.21	4.02

- A. Destructive communication (1. negative communication, 2. counter jealousy 3.violence)
 B. Rival-focused communication (4. surveillance/restriction 5. signs of possession 6. rival contact 7. rival derogation)
 C. Avoidant communication (8. silence 9. denial/inhibition)
 D. Constructive communication (10. integrative communication 11. compensatory restoration)

Table 2. Factor loadings, T-value of Communicative Responses to Jealousy in Ahwaz City Women according with report of their partner (form B)

Subscales categories	Subscales	Number of items	Number of new	item implication	Factor loading	T-values
Destructive communication	2	1	1	Flirted or talked about others	0.21	4.66
Constructive communication	11	2	2	Proving of partner (tried to prove love)	0.29	6.03
Rival-focused communication	4	3	3	Search evidence for confirming of relation partner and rival(looked through belongings for evidence)	-0.27	-3.17
Rival-focused communication	7	4	4	Pointed out the rival's negative qualities	-0.35	-3.39
Destructive communication	1	5	5	Quarreled and argued with partner	0.72	18.68
Destructive communication	1	6	6	Give "silent treatment" to partner	0.71	18.68
Destructive communication	1	7	7	Hurtful or mean comments	0.83	23.11
Constructive communication	10	8	8	Talked to the rival	0.26	5.31
Destructive communication	1	9	9	Wanted to break up	0.77	20.60
Constructive communication	10	10	10	Share jealous feeling with partner	0.60	10.95
Destructive communication	1	11	11	Yelled or cursed	0.74	19.50
Avoidant communication	8	12	12	Got quiet and didn't say much	0.8	2.62
Avoidant communication	8	13	13	Became silent	0.76	14.89
Constructive communication	11	14	14	Talking about needing him (expressed care)	0.53	9.99
Avoidant communication	9	15	15	Showing it's not important (acted like I didn't care)	0.19	3.88
Destructive communication	1	16	16	Physically pulled away partner	0.63	15.61

Destructive communication	1	17	17	Cold and dirty looks to partner	0.86	24.07
Destructive communication	1	18	18	Decreased affection	0.73	19.02
Destructive communication	3	19	19	Pushed, shoved or hit partner	0.40	9/24
Destructive communication	1	20	20	Acted rude	0.57	13.91
Constructive communication	11	21	21	Increased affection	0.47	9.08
Destructive communication	2	22	22	Acted interested in someone else	0.33	7.45
Avoidant communication	9	23	23	Denied feeling jealous	0.7	2.34
Destructive communication	3	24	24	Used physically violent	0.67	17.06
Destructive communication	1	25	25	Wore displeasure on face to him	0.56	13.66
Destructive communication	3	26	26	Threatened to harm partner	0.97	10.95
Destructive communication	3	27	27	Became physically violent with partner	0.29	6.54
Rival-focused communication	4	28	28	Kept closer tabs	-0.17	-3.03
Rival-focused communication	7	29	29	Said mean things about the rival	-0.29	-5.23
Avoidant communication	9	30	30	Pretended nothing was wrong	0.97	9.74
Constructive communication	10	31	31	Discussed about the situation	0.39	7.75
Constructive communication	10	32	32	tried to reach an understanding	0.28	5.82
Constructive communication	10	33	33	Calmly questioned	0.58	10.64
Rival-focused communication	4	34	34	Tried to determine whereabouts	-0.38	-6.79
Rival-focused communication	4	35	35	Repeatedly called	-0.59	-6.78
Rival-focused communication	4	36	36	Tried to prevent rival contact	-0.5	6.43
Constructive communication	11	37	37	Tried to be the best partner possible	0.61	11.08
Constructive communication	11	38	38	Spent more time than usual with partner	0.67	11.72
Rival-focused communication	7	39	39	Made negative comments about the rival	-0.44	-6.33

Rival-focused communication	4	40	40	Check up more than usual	-0.46	-6.24
Rival-focused communication	6	41	41	Explained feelings	-0.70	-7.99
Constructive communication	11	42	42	Expressed feeling of needs or worry	0.77	12.76
Rival-focused communication	5	43	43	Made sure rivals knew partner is taken	-0.77	-7.68
Destructive communication	2	44	44	tried to make jealous too	0.30	6.67
Rival-focused communication	6	45	45	Confronted the rival	-0.40	-3.92
Rival-focused communication	5	46	46	Let rivals know about the relationship	-0.76	-7.29
Rival-focused communication	5	47	47	Showed my partner extra affection around rivals	-0.76	-7.20
Avoidant communication	8	48	-	Got quiet	-	-
Rival-focused communication	6	49	48	Told the rival not to see	-0.67	-7.61

Findings of Table 1 & 2 show that communicative reaction to jealousy after deletion of main questionnaire's 48th question in both A & B forms (because of not responding of most respondents) based on confirmatory factor analysis for A form: (RSMEA=0.1, GFI=0.99, AGFI=.098 & $\chi^2/df=1.39$) and for B form: (RSMEA=0.15, GFI=0.94, AGFI=0.87 & $\chi^2/df=1.28$) has enough validity for measurement of these reactions in couples.

Table 3. Reliability Coefficient Values of Communicative Responses to Jealousy scale

	Number	Cronbach's Alpha coefficient				CRJ scale
		Destructive communication	Rival-focused communication	Avoidant communication	Constructive communication	
Woman (form A)	527	0.88	0.85	0.67	0.82	0.89
man(form B)	527	0.90	0.87	0.51	0.87	0.92

Based on Table 3, Alpha coefficient for 527 couples (527 men & 527 women) showed suitable inner consistency for each of two A & B forms of communicative reactions' questionnaire. For measurement of communicative reactions questionnaire's reliability, this questionnaire is distributed among 130 couples after 4 to 5 weeks in order to retesting which 122 person of them completed those questionnaires. Correlation coefficient between first step of implementation & its retesting for 122 women & 122 men was 0.87 & 0.89 which shows suitable reliability.

Descriptive findings such as Mean, Standard Deviation, Min & Max for all of studied variables of this research is located in Table 4.

According to Table 4, women's understanding average of their jealousy with men's report for their partners' jealousy is the same amount, and couples' have equal perceived sexual

satisfaction but, according to Standard Deviation of men's response (21.44) there are differences between their intimacy understandings by them.

Statistical findings of correlation matrix among couple's intimacy & sexual satisfaction with communicative reactions to jealousy which is accounted for 122 couples is presented in Table 5.

Table 4. Mean, Standard deviation of research variables

Statistical Indicators	Jealousy of women	Marital Satisfaction of women	couple's intimacy of women	Jealousy of women reported by men	Marital Satisfaction of women reported by men	couple's intimacy of women reported by men
Mean	1.29	1.77	5.87	1.23	1.83	92.24
SD	2.67	2.8	2.24	2.92	2.2	21.44
min	48	104	43	48	133	45
max	191	220	119	181	220	119

Table 5 Pearson's correlations marital satisfaction, couple's intimacy and communicative reactions to jealousy among women of Ahwaz city

Statistical Indicators	communicative reactions to jealousy among women			
	Women's declarations about jealous of herself (Form A)		men's declarations about jealous of his partners (Form B)	
variables	r	n	r	n
Marital satisfaction	-0.77	122	-0.72	122
couple's intimacy	-0.67	122	-0.79	122

P<0/0001

According to Table 5, significance test of correlation coefficient show that sexual satisfaction & couple's intimacy with communicative reactions to jealousy based on women's report about their self-feeling of jealousy (-0.77 & -0.79) has negative relationship. This significant negative relationship in men's report about their partners' jealousy (-0.73 & -0.67) is also correct. Predicting communicative reactions to jealousy by sexual satisfaction & couple's intimacy is reported in Tables 6, 7, 8, 9.

Table 6. Multiple correlation between marital satisfaction, couple's intimacy and communicative reactions to jealousy and analyze of variance stepwise regressions among women of Ahwaz city (form A)

Model	steps	Predictors	R	R ²	Δ R ²	Srd. Error	F	significant
stepwise	1	Marital satisfaction	0.77	0.59	0.59	17.16	175.16	0.0001
	2	couple's intimacy	0.81	0.66	0.65	15.85	113.46	0.0001

Table 7. Results of the standard and non-standard coefficients of predicting communicative reactions to jealousy and analyze of variance stepwise marital satisfaction and couple's intimacy among women of Ahwaz city (form A)

Motel	Steps	Constant and Predictors	B	Srd. Error	β	t	Sig.
stepwise	1	Constant	260.51	10.30	-	25.98	0.0001
		Marital satisfaction	-0.74	0.06	-0.77	-13.23	0.0001
	2	Constant	239.26	10.33	-	23.16	0.0001
		Satisfaction	-0.33	0.10-	0.34	-3.17	0.002
		Couple's intimacy	-0.6	0.13	-0.5	-4.66	0.0001

Based on results presented in Tables 6 & 7 which is compatible with women's report in their relationship jealousy experience, sexual satisfaction is a good predicting for women's communicative reactions to jealousy ($\beta=-0.34$, $t=-3.17$, $p=0.002$) and couple's intimacy also is a predicting women's communicative reactions to jealousy ($\beta=-0.5$, $t=-4.66$, $p=0.001$). These tables show that couple's intimacy has more portions in predicting jealousy experience.

Table 8. Multiple correlation between marital satisfaction, couple's intimacy and communicative reactions to jealousy and analyze of variance stepwise regressions among women of Ahwaz city (form B)

Model	steps	Predictors	R	R ²	ΔR^2	Srd. Error	F	significant
stepwise	1	Marital satisfaction	0.73	0.53	0.52	19.91	143.94	0.0001
	2	couple's intimacy	0.81	0.66	0.65	19.5	79.4	0.0001

Table 9. Results of the standard and non-standard coefficients of predicting communicative reactions to jealousy and analyze of variance stepwise marital satisfaction and couple's intimacy among women of Ahwaz city (form B)

Motel	Steps	Constant and Predictors	B	Srd. Error	β	t	Sig.
stepwise	1	Constant	299.13	14.81	-	20.2	0.0001
		Marital satisfaction	-0.96	0.08	-0.73	-11.99	0.0001
	2	Constant	281.55	15.8	-	23.16	0.0001
		Satisfaction	-0.33	0.10-	0.34	-17.82	0.0001
		Couple's intimacy	-0.36	0.13	-0.26	-2.8	0.007

Table 8 & 9 Information show that sexual jealousy can also be predicted by sexual satisfaction ($\beta=-0.52$, $t=-5.4$, $p=0.001$) and couple's intimacy ($\beta=-0.26$, $t=-2.8$, $p=0.007$). As shown

in Tables, according to women's spouse report that felt jealousy in their relationship, sexual Satisfaction has more portions in predicting communicative reaction to women's jealousy.

Conclusions

Romantic jealousy is a behavioral, emotional & cognitive reaction, and when occurs that quality or existence of a romantic relationship threatened by an imaginative or real rival. (Sharpestin, 1997; Guerro& Anderson, 1998 quoted in Guerro, 2008). Communicative reactions to jealousy which defined as behavioral reactions to jealousy, has communicative value & ability to achieve communicative & personal purposes (Guerro, 2008). First finding of current research mentioned in Table 1 & 2 show enough account of this scale based on confirmatory factor analysis. Chronbach's Alpha for communicative reactions scale to jealousy for A Form was 0.89 & for B Form was 0.92 which showed high inner consistency. Retesting scale result for 122 women & 122 men was also 0.87 & 0.89 which shows suitable reliability. These findings are compatible with Guerro (2008) research. These findings showed that couple's communicative reactions scale for measuring these reactions in different periods of times for those have these reactions in feeling jealousy to their partner, present similar results. Inner consistency of scale means that communicative reactions to jealousy are relatively stable characteristic, and those who have these reactions by excluding environmental situations and different mental circumstances during time, show relatively stable communicative patterns to jealousy to their partners.

Second finding of current research is that correlation between sexual satisfaction, couple's intimacy & communicative reactions to jealousy in 122 women based on their self-reporting jealousy was -0.77 & -0.79 respectively, and based on their partners report was -0.73 & -0.67 in 0.0001 significance level respectively. These findings show that sexual satisfaction and couple's intimacy has relationship with communicative reactions in some extent. Relative equivalence or correlation between sexual satisfaction & communicative reactions to jealousy which is reported by women with amount of correlation between these variables according to their spouse report shows that men & women evaluate amount of sexual satisfaction and communicative reactions to jealousy relatively similar, which these two variables should be tested according to cause & effect. Amount of correlation of sexual intimacy & communicative reaction to jealousy reported by women, with that reported by their spouse have little difference have significant amount which probably it is because of different intimacy definition between men & women. Findings of Mathes (2006), Guerro (2006), Shakelford& Buss (1997 quoted in Morris, 1999) & Morris (1999) were compatible.

Findings of this research show that sexual satisfaction could be a good predictor for women's jealousy. These findings were compatible with Stieglitz et al (2012), Shakelford et al (2003), and Anderson et al (1995). According to previous researches a part of jealousy is related to feeling of person's commitment to relationship and an adaptive response to keep sexual relationship (Guerro et al, 2005). Another part of jealousy is lack of their sexual conflicts solving skills & communicative skills which leads increasing of their sexual tensions and non-commitment (Morris & Carte, 1999). If communicative skills instructed to couple, conflicts will be decreased and there will be better control on their negative emotions (Soudani.et al, 2011). When disorder appeared in sexual relationship, this relationship will be unstable temporarily and distance will be created. If this disorder continued (even weakly), it provides a ground shaping negative thoughts in couples which, finally they experience emotions like jealousy. Communicative reactions style to jealousy is depended to cognitive evaluations & thoughts person who is jealous.

Other findings of current research were predicting role of couple's intimacy for communicative reactions to jealousy in women. These findings were compatible with Cano & O'Leary (1997) and Pins (1983) researches, and is not compatible with Guerro (2008) and Weling et al

(2002) researches. It is possible that cultures' effect on couple's relationship & correlation between their intimacy & jealousy can play role. One of the important problems between Iranian couple is incorrect & unsuitable methods of emotion & viewpoints expression to their partners (Jarareh et al, 2009) which these incorrect methods of communication could create ambiguities in relationships. Edalati, Redzuan, Mansor & Abu Talib (2009) believe that according to current situations in Iran which men can have interim partner, jealousy is natural and one of fundamental functions of jealousy maintaining valuable relationships. So, if there are ambiguities in relationships, women will be following information that clarifies their sexual relationship. On the other hand, if their partners notice to other woman or women, it seems that man will found more attraction which experienced as jealousy, and fundamental motivation of these feelings is self-volubility (Edalaty, 2009). So, couple's intimacy could decrease ambiguity of a successful relationship, and create more commitment & closeness in relationship and couple can better understand each other. This relationship decreases misunderstanding and negative emotions.

Bevan (2006) tested how mental investment which related to communicative reactions to jealousy. He found that amount of energy investment (for example, a person how much energy spend in his/her relationship), quality of authority & replacement (for example, someone out of his/her current relationship authority has good range of choice) and satisfaction from relationship, predict communicative reactions to jealousy to some extent (Guerrero, 2008). Degrees of romantic jealousy creates a lot of problems in intimacy relationships (Ibid) because people when threatened their relationship by a rival, show negative behaviors by jealousy (such as retaliation, threatening to miff & divorce, revile, etc.) more than stabilization of intimate relationship between them and their partner, revive negative emotions in their partners. Thus, companion with such a partner associate shame, guilty & humiliation which will not have any consequences unless increasing mental space with someone who creates this feelings. As ownership feeling and jealousy are related to each other (Mathes, et al, 1982), when jealousy cause negative behaviors such as chasing, investigation, more control, etc., personal life territory of partners will be invaded, and he/she feels loss of personal freedom. In such circumstances, simultaneous with severe limitation of his/her authority by the partner, actions might be performed for achieving this authority & freedom which usually hidden or obviously cause couple's distance from each other & decreasing sexual satisfaction. So, it seems that sexual satisfaction, couple's intimacy & communicative reactions to jealousy have mutual relationships which deficiency in each of these variables could lead to disorder in function of two other variables.

Totally, it could be said that reactions measured in communicative reactions to jealousy questionnaire shows well given behavioral patterns. In other words, this questionnaire measure amount of feelings, thoughts & destructive behaviors due to jealousy to partners. Based on current research, it can be concluded which sexual satisfaction & couple's intimacy are complementary to each other & promotion of these variables can decrease couple's sensitivity, and when there are circumstances in couple's relationships which needs satisfaction (such as acceptance, being loved, etc.) mutual understanding & expressing emotions is provided, their commitment to relationship becomes more, but personality attributes such as self-esteem can interfere in feeling jealousy which a portion of this personality attributes can be affected by satisfaction of sexual life & also couple's intimacy.

Research Suggestions

Sample of current research was Ahwaz city, so, it seems this scale could be investigated in other cities in order to verification of validity & reliability. It also seems that sometimes jealousy could be caused by existence of self-coming negative thoughts as one of sexual conflicts. So, current

researchers propose that relationship of cognitive treatments in decreasing jealousy & improving sexual relationships could be investigated. It is necessary in future researches that sexual jealousy relationship with some of personality attributes such as controlling, self-confidence, etc. could be investigated. Also, researchers and family therapists could apply similar researches findings to get more obvious viewpoints related to some of couple's causes of dissatisfaction in sexual relationships & decreasing intimacy among them & measure solutions for troubleshooting.

References

- Asgari, P.; Seyede Jafari, F.; Baft, H.; Meshkipour, P. (2009). Comparison of mental health, sexual satisfaction & children parents' concern with normal children in Ahwaz city. First Regional Conference of Family Health, Azad University of Ahwaz.
- Bahrami Khondaei, F.; Fatehi Zadeh M.; Olia, N. (2006). Construction & defining validity & reliability of couple's intimacy. 8th Research of Isfahan University.
- Baven, J. L. (2006). experienceing and communicating romantic jealousy: An application of the investment model. *The southern communication journal*.
- Beck, Aron (1988). *Love is not enough*. Translated by Mehdi Gharache Daghi. Tehran: Asim.
- Cano, A.; O'Leary, K. D. (1997). Romantic jealousy and affairs: research and implications for couple therapy. *Journal of sex and marital therapy*. 23(4), 249-275.
- Crowe, M. (1995). Management of jealousy in couples. *Advances in psychiatric treatment*. 1: 71-77.
- Delahaj, R; Gaillard, A.K.; Dam, K.V. (2010). Hardiness and the response to stressful situations: Investigating mediating processes. *Personality and individual Differences*. 49, 386-390.
- Flensburg-madsen, T; Ventegodt, S; Merrick, J (2006). Sense of coherence and health. The Constuction of an Amendment to Antonovsky's Sense of Cherence Scale (SOCII). *TSW Holistic Health & medicine*. 1, 169-178.
- Guerrero, L.K, Hannawa, Annegret, Gallagher, Babin (2008). The Communicative Responses to Jealousy Scale: Revision and Empirical Validation. Paper presents at the annual meeting of the NCA 9th Annual Convention, TBA, San Diego, and CA, Nov20. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p258475_index.html
- Guerrero, L.K, Trost, M, Yoshimura, S.M (2005). Romantic Jealousy: Emotional and Communicative Responses. *Personal Relationship*. 12, 233-252.
- Guerrero, L.K., Andersen, P. A., Jorgensen, P. F., Spitzberg, B. H., Eloy, S. V. (1995). Coping with the green-eyed monster: Conceptualizing and measuring communicative responses to romantic jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication*, 59, 270-304.
- Mathes, E.W, Phillips, J.T, Skowran, J, Dick, W.E (1982). Behavioral correlations of the interpersonal Jealousy Scale. *Education and Psychological Measurement*. 42, 1227-1231.
- Maverdi Jaghargh, M. (2010). Study of effectiveness of communicative skills & sexual satisfaction, blind men communicative skills & believes & their partners. MA dissertation of Clinical Psychology, Educational Facult- Ferdowsi University.
- Meyers, S.A, landsberger, S.A (2002). Direct and indirect pathways between adult attachment style and marital satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*. 9, 159-172.
- Morris, Micheal lane; Carte, S.A. (1999). Transition to marriage: A literature review. *Journal of family and consumer Sciences education*. 17(1) 1-21.
- Murphy, S.M, vallacher.R.R, shachelford.T.K, Bjorklund, D.f, yunger,j.L (2006). Relationship experience as a pridictor of romantic jealousy. *Personal and individual Differences*. 40,761-769.
- Pines, A. M. (1992). *Romantic jealousy: Understanding and conquering the shadow of love*. New York: st. Martin's press.

- Shackelford, T.K, Voracek, M, Schmitt, D.P, Buss, D.M, Shackelford, V.A.W, Michalski, R.L (2003). Romantic Jealousy in early adulthood and in later life. *Human nature*. 15 (3) 59-76.
- Shamsaei, M. M., Nikkhah, H. R., Jadidi, M. (2007). Identification feeling role & emotional intelligence in sexual satisfaction. *Applied Psychology*, V.1, N. 2, pp. 57-67.
- Shrapsteen, D. J., Kirkpatrick, L. (1997). Romantic Jealousy and Adult Romantic Attachment. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*. 72, 627-640.
- Statistics Center of Iran (2009). Detailed results periodical pattern of population & housing census. Tehran: Mo'allef.
- Stieglitz, J.; Gurven, M.; Kaplan, H.; Winking, J. (2012). Infidelity, jealousy and wife abuse among Tsimane forager-farmers: testing evolutionary hypotheses of marital conflict. *Evolution and human behavior*. (In press).
- Theiss, J. A., Solomon, H. (2006). Coupling longitudinal data multilevel modeling to examine the Antecedents and consequences of Jealousy Experiences in Romantic Relationships: A Test of the Relational turbulence model. *Human communication Research*. vol 32, iss 4, 469.
- Tomotsune, Y; Sasahara, S; Umeda, T; Hayashi, M; Usami, K; Yoshino, S; Kageyama, T; Nakamura, H; Matsuzaki, I (2009). The Association of Sense of Coherence and Coping Profile with Stress among Research Park City Workers in Japan. *Industrial Health*. 47, 664-672.