

**GENDER DIFFERENCES IN FACE CONCERNS AND
BEHAVIORAL RESPONSES TO ROMANTIC
JEALOUSY: A STUDY IN THAILAND**

Chayapa Srivilas

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts (Language and Communication)
School of Language and Communication
National Institution of Development Administration
2015**

**GENDER DIFFERENCES IN FACE CONCERNS AND
BEHAVIORAL RESPONSES TO ROMANTIC
JEALOUSY: A STUDY IN THAILAND**

Chayapa Srivilas

School of Language and Communication

Assistant Professor



Major Advisor

(Jaray Singhakowinta, Ph.D.)

The Examining Committee Approved This Thesis Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts (Language and
Communication).

Assistant Professor



Committee Chairperson

(Rujira Rojjanaprapayon, Ph.D.)

Assistant Professor



Committee

(Jaray Singhakowinta, Ph.D.)

Assistant Professor



Committee

(Patanapong Chatiket, Ph.D.)

Assistant Professor



Dean

(Saksit Saengboon, Ph.D.)

July 2015

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis	Gender Differences in Face Concerns and Behavioral Responses to Romantic Jealousy: A Study in Thailand
Author	Miss Chayapa Srivilas
Degree	Master of Arts (Language and Communication)
Year	2015

The objectives of this quantitative study are: 1) to explore gender differences in face-saving concerns and behaviors in response to romantic jealousy as well as their associations and 2) to test the constructed model used in Thai settings.

A theoretical model was constructed and tested through statistical analysis. Subsequently, a self-administered questionnaire was distributed to 112 heterosexual Thai males and females in their native language. The questionnaires measured concerns for face-saving and communicative responses to romantic jealousy. The independent sample t-test statistics and Pearson correlation coefficients were utilized to examine gender differences in face-saving and behaviors in reaction to jealousy as well as relationships between face-saving concerns and communicative responses to romantic jealousy.

The survey questionnaires aligned with Thai contexts proved an acceptable reliability, contributing to an introductory provision of gender differences in given subjects in Thailand. The study revealed a significant gender difference in concern for saving other-face during romantic jealousy eruption. Specifically, heterosexual Thai males tended to save other-face during jealousy experience. Also, there were gender differences in negative communication, counter-jealousy induction, surveillance and derogations of a rival. The result showed that more women than men were likely to use those responses. Likewise, there were significant gender differences in associations between self-face and silence as well as mutual-face and surveillance. In particular,

heterosexual Thai women were inclined to save their face while using silence in response to romantic jealousy. Besides, the result showed that heterosexual Thai women were less concerned about saving mutual-face during the use of surveillance.

The findings suggest that gender roles have some effects on saving other-face during jealousy experience. Specifically, dealing with Thai men during romantic jealousy is to not force them to open up and express their jealousy since their primary concern is to protect their women's feelings. Furthermore, the findings demonstrate that some women are expressive and negative when feeling jealous; therefore, men should try to respond to these behaviors with understanding to prevent more conflict escalations. In particular, the study reveals that using positive behaviors such as integrative communication will be likely to ensure and increase mutual trust and respect, which sustains a relationship in the long run. More importantly, it is surprising that women are more self-defensive when they use silence. Apparently, men will gain more understanding that in times of using silence women do not trust their lovers to validate their feelings. The final suggestion of this study is that increases in using surveillance will result in decreases in saving both faces and protecting their romantic relationships.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was partially supported by Assistant Professor Jaray Singhakowinta. I would like to express my sincere appreciation for thesis committees for guidance and constructive criticism. My gratitude is to everyone who contributed to this thesis project. I am thankful to my peers for helping to distribute the questionnaires and for criticism to improve my project. Also, I am sincerely grateful to my parents for financial supports throughout the project.

I would like to show my appreciation for Thai Airways International Public Company Limited, TOT Public Company Limited, and some anonymous institutes that permitted me to do the survey. Additionally, I would like to thank 2 “anonymous” reviewers for their help in checking my questionnaires in Thai language and Mr. Howard Greene for proofreading English version of my survey questionnaires. Lastly, I would like to thank everyone who provided me with the equipment and essential materials for my thesis project.

Chayapa Srivilas

September 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	2
1.2 Purpose of the Study	4
1.3 Significance of the Study	5
1.4 Objectives of the Study	6
1.5 Primary Research Questions	6
1.6 Definition of Terms	7
1.7 Summary	9
CHAPTER 2 A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
2.1 Communicative Responses to Jealousy	11
2.2 Gender Differences in Response to Romantic Jealousy	19
2.3 Face and Face Concerns	23
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	34
3.1 Research Design	34
3.2 Participants	35
3.3 Questionnaires	37
3.4 Procedures for Data Collections	38
3.5 Measurement/Instrument	39
3.6 Analysis of Data	45

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	48
4.1 Descriptive Analysis	48
4.2 Reliability Analysis of Instruments	49
4.3 Results	50
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	60
5.1 Implications	60
5.2 Methodological Implications	65
5.3 Limitations, Recommendations for Future Research and Conclusions	66
BIBLIOGRAPHY	69
APPENDICES	84
Appendix A Frequency and Percentage for Demographic Data	85
Appendix B Means and Standard Deviations for Ages and Relationship Length	87
Appendix C Questionnaires (English)	888
Appendix D Questionnaires (Thai)	94
BIOGRAPHY	99

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
4.1 Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Concerns about Face-saving	49
4.2 Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Communicative Responses to Jealousy	50
4.3 Means and Standard Deviations for Face-Saving between Men and Women	51
4.4 Means and Standard Deviations for Communicative Responses to Jealousy	53
4.5 Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Face Concerns and Communicative Responses to Romantic Jealousy among Heterosexual Thai Men and Women	57
4.6 Z-score: Gender Difference in Relationships between Face-Saving and CRJs (The table below showed the overlapping relationships for females and males)	58

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Most couples in romantic relationships tend to face relational conflicts. Although conflicts stem from various conditions, romantic jealousy is one of the major problems provoking relational fights. Furthermore, the roles of gender even create more barriers between men and women. Consequently, these gender expectations lead couples to experience a cumulative misunderstanding, misinterpretation, and lack of integrity (Gray, 1992).

Hence, communication between couples is a core need to serve a more flourishing relationship when men and women understand each other better (Gray, 1992). Communication is a complex activity due to several contributing factors. Indeed, a significant factor may include gender prescriptions and social values such as face concerns (a consideration for self-image/self-worth or other's image) (Andersen, 2006; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Even though some scholars have explored a gender difference in communicating romantic jealousy in other nations, cultural characteristics may determine a choice a jealous person makes to some extent (Croucher et al., 2012, pp. 353-354; Guerrero & Reiter, 1998; Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989).

Therefore, this study explores gender differences in communicative responses to jealousy in relation to a concern of face in Thailand. The study elaborates an introductory problem of jealousy reactions and an implication of face roles, which seems uncorrelated, albeit significantly intriguing to determine. This chapter consists of:

- 1.1 Background of the study
- 1.2 Purpose of the study
- 1.3 Significance of the study
- 1.4 Objectives of the study
- 1.5 Primary research questions

1.6 Definition of terms

1.7 Summary

1.1 Background of the Study

In most romantic relationships, couples inevitably face an experience of jealousy when the potential threats appear in their relationship. Accordingly, this emotion triggers a particular mechanism to protect a relationship. However, Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg, and Eloy (1995) indicated that the relational threats are not necessarily actual; In other words, romantic jealousy may evoke from skewed thoughts of threats or an act of overthinking. Consequently, most jealous individuals are susceptible to disclose an expression of their jealousy in differences in degrees (Aylor & Dainton, 2001). Correspondingly, White and Mullen (1989) supported the notion that people may express jealousy differently. Markedly, their research revealed that jealousy manifestations may involve three levels: emotional, cognitive and behavioral reactions. However, to understand individuals fully, it is apparent that most people begin with observing someone's behaviors. Thus, understanding someone's behavioral patterns sheds light on how the person's thinking operates. People often fail when they mind-read someone as they believe that they know the person well. In that case, behavioral responses probably lead to an escalation of misunderstanding and intractable conflict.

Surprisingly, Croucher et al. (2012, pp. 355-356) found that jealousy expressions, including behavioral jealousy and emotional jealousy, are not desirable to most Thai people. Notably, their research demonstrated that Thai people disclosed an expression of behavioral and emotional jealousy less than other nations such as India, the United States, and Ireland. In particular, Thai culture is considered as a feminine culture, being susceptible to indirectness and avoidance of confrontation (Croucher et al., 2012, p. 355). Likewise, the assertion of Suntaree Komin (1990) ensures that being direct and expressive are socially unfavorable to most Thais as it is probably related to face loss. Nonetheless, Croucher et al. did not provide some insight into Thais' behaviors in reaction to romantic jealousy. Instead, Croucher et al. (2012, p. 357) only claimed that women in four nations were more emotionally and cognitively expressive

than men. Besides, romantic jealousy may be considered as negative emotions (Bareld & Dijkstra, 2006, as cited in Attridge, 2013, p. 2). In Thailand, expressing negative emotions is a high alarm about the face loss (Suntaree Komin, 1990).

Face is culturally related to positive image, dignity, pride and so forth; thus, face can be maintained, saved, and gained (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). It is important to realize that Thai people are also equipped with the face-saving through social interactions (Suntaree Komin, 1990). In particular, Ting-Toomey and Korogi (1998) posited that face may represent three characteristics: self-face, other-face, and mutual-face. This means that the face-saving practice may involve those three concerns of face. Significantly, Suntaree Komin (1990) asserted that Thais do care face. In addition, most Thai people in romantic relationships were less secure and more dismissing (Wongpakaran, Wongpakaran, & Wedding, 2012, p. 414). For this reason, Thai couples rarely discuss the problems and reach a mutual understanding because they attempt to avoid an argument, imposition, and criticism (Suntaree Komin, 1990). Hence, this kind of behaviors may inevitably produce distress and resentment since the couples withhold their feelings and thoughts just to protect their partners' face (Gray, 1992). In fact, considerable scholars have affirmed that couples with a more understanding of their jealousy behaviors and gender differences are more likely to have a more sustainable relationship (Dugosh, 2000; Gray, 1992; Guerrero, Hannawa, & Babin, 2011). Unfortunately, an association between face-saving practices and communicative responses to romantic jealousy among heterosexual Thai men and women has never been done before.

With respect to the benefits of knowing gender differences, several scholars claimed that a healthy relationship is a result of accepting and understanding differences between men and women (De Angelis, 2012; Gray, 1992). They additionally stated that acknowledging gender differences and the likes subsequently subside any emotional intensity and prevent a relationship closure. That is to say, identifying gender differences in communication is likely to promote respect and sensitivity between couples, resulting in helping them to be more receptive and supportive (Gray, 1992, p. 26). Besides, the role of face-saving in behavioral responses to jealousy needs to be extended on a basis of gender comparisons since Thai people in regardless of gender reflect their face-saving practice in their social interactions to some degree. Thereby,

an investigation of gender differences in jealousy reactions and face-saving practices probably contributes to handling relationship conflicts and decreasing an imposition of prejudices and stereotypical gender notions.

Extending gender studies in Thailand, the study utilizes the communicative responses to jealousy theory (Guerrero et al., 2011) and the face-saving concept. Face-saving theory is derived from theoretical notions of Suntaree Komin (1990) and three-face aspects of Oetzel, Garcia, and Ting-Toomey (2008). Chiefly, this paper serves an outlook on gender communication in jealousy responses and face-saving notions in Thailand.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The primary scope of the quantitative study is to explore gender differences in relational face-saving practices and communicative responses to romantic jealousy in Thailand. The study also demonstrates gender differences in associations between face-saving concerns and communicative responses to romantic jealousy. In addition to the secondary purpose is to test the constructed instruments used in Thailand.

Primarily, statistical tests were performed to compare two independent groups (heterosexual Thai men and women) on a given subject. Subsequently, the statistical tests were proceeded to compare gender distinctions in face-saving practices (self-face, other-face, and mutual-face) and communicative responses to jealousy (CRJs). The face-saving and CRJs were dependent variables. Then, gender differences in associations between face-saving practices and jealousy behaviors were statistically investigated.

Therefore, the study extends gender studies by shedding some light on gender distinctions in the jealousy communication and face practice in Thailand. Indeed, the contribution of the study is expected to improve interpersonal communication between Thai men and women.

1.3 Significance of the Study

First, the study encourages the audience to be more aware of their behavioral patterns and psychological components such as face concerns to promote their relationship and ameliorate jealousy-evoking situations. Given that, the contribution of the study helps to enhance cultural awareness of face-saving practices and behaviors in response to romantic jealousy. Thus, the primary intent of the research is to improve couples' psychological and interpersonal understanding. Also, the expected result of the study is to serve clinical purposes or counseling services in relationship problems.

Fundamentally, both scholars in a field of interest and people with a well-educated background might be able to make use of the salient finding. For scholars, it would be a possible implication of the future research developments. In the meantime, people could make sense of their partners' reactions to jealousy and understand themselves and their partners better when experiencing jealousy. As a result, discriminatory practices among males and females might be subsequently reduced.

In most cases, the findings would contribute to a reformation of the society in which people seem to depend on their assumptions rather than their understanding. Understanding behaviors during jealousy eruption may enable Thai individuals to have control over their jealousy emotions and behaviors. The following effect may be on a reduction of relational conflicts in intimate relationships. Misinterpretations with a vain attempt will be declined.

Likewise, face concerns are an uncanny state of individuals' psychological realms that consciously and subconsciously influences individuals' behaviors to some degree (Oetzel et al., 2008, pp. 392-397; Suntaree Komin, 1990, pp. 159-164). Therefore, a link between face and jealous behaviors may make theoretical concepts more illustrative and practical, and resonate powerfully with people's experience. Consequently, the knowledge of the study might be a practical account for how the face-saving concept in Thai culture can relate to real actions.

In conclusion, the contribution of the study is not determined to serve only the purposes of academia but also the purposes of interpersonal communication.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

This paper consists of 3 major purposes. First, the study examines how heterosexual Thai men and Thai women differ in face-saving practices (self-face, other-face, and mutual-face) in jealousy-evoking situations. Specifically, face in Thai culture refers to ego or positive image. Although Suntaree Komin (1990, pp. 159-160) proved that a face-saving notion (*rak sa na*) seems to predominate Thai society, there is no literature supporting to which extent gender affects the face-saving in romantic jealousy. Besides, the study is determined to explore gender differences in jealousy behaviors in a romantic relationship. As far as jealousy is concerned, the study solely focuses on romantic jealousy in reaction to a real threat, emotional or sexual infidelity involved. Last but not least, the research is conducted to identify whether there are significant gender differences in the associations between face-saving practices (self-face, other-face, and mutual-face) and communicative responses to romantic jealousy. Finally, the study is expected to ensure whether the tested model is applicable in future research.

1.5 Primary Research Questions

The primary intent of this quantitative study is to serve an initial groundwork for gender differences in face-saving practices and communicative responses to romantic jealousy. Also, the secondary purpose is to construct and test the instruments used in Thai settings.

There are three essential questions. The research questions were drawn from a review of the literature. With insufficient academic resources of Thailand, the first and second research questions serve primary descriptions to represent gender differences in each dependent variable (face concerns and responses). Furthermore, the third research question displays significant gender differences in relationships between two variables (face-saving practices and jealousy expressions).

RQ 1: Are there gender differences in face-saving concerns during romantic jealousy?

RQ 2: Are there gender differences in communicative responses to romantic jealousy?

RQ 3: Are there gender differences in relationships between face-saving concerns (self-face, other-face, and mutual-face) and communicative responses to jealousy?

Thus, these research questions are to provide some insight into gender differences in face-saving practices and communicative responses to romantic jealousy in Thailand. In the following section, key terms will be operationally defined to fit in this research methods and major objectives.

1.6 Definition of Terms

The provision of particular definitions signifies the extent to which each term refers to in the study so as to reduce a misunderstanding and ambiguity.

Romantic jealousy: an emotion erupts from experiencing a real potential threat – emotional and sexual infidelity involved (Guerrero et al., 1995). An imagined threat is not included. Romantic jealousy is verified by types of relationships in which individuals are.

Communicative responses to jealousy (CRJs): CRJs are a product of Gurrero et al.'s research (1995). They defined the terms as behavioral reactions to romantic jealousy. However, jealousy responses are centralized in behaviors. These responses comprise “a communicative value and the potential to fulfill individuals and relational goals” (Guerrero et al., 1995, p. 272). The responses can be positive or negative, direct or indirect, verbal or nonverbal, and partner- or rival-directed. The study does not identify which responses should be private and public. The responses must happen during a romantic jealousy eruption. There are eleven prominent behavioral expressions, indicating two classifications: general behavioral reactions (not necessarily only in front of the partner) and interactive ones (face-to-face).

Romantic relationship: the romantic relationship length is at least one month intact (Furman & Buhrmester, 2009). Romantic relationships in the study involve

romantic commitments and activities. There are five types of relationship status: dating or seeing one person casually, dating or seeing more than one person, having an exclusive boyfriend/girlfriend or having a serious relationship, engaged or living with someone else, and married. Romantic relationships must be heterosexual. The eligible romantic relationships are identified based on individuals' sexual attraction.

Face: face represents an ego or image (Suntaree Komin, 1990, pp. 159-160). The appearance of face in the study is during romantic jealousy expressions, not before or after. Face can be maintained, gained, threatened, and saved through different styles of communicative behaviors (Oetzel et al., 2008, pp. 392-397). However, the main focus is on face-saving concern during romantic jealousy between heterosexual Thai men and women.

Face-saving: face-saving concern represents the notion of *rak sa na* in Thai (Suntaree Komin, 1990, p. 160). In this study, the face-saving concept is practiced during romantic jealousy. The locus of face-saving encompasses self-face, other-face, and mutual-face. The facets of face borrowed the theoretical concepts from Oetzel et al. (2008)

Self-face: a focus on saving one own face during romantic jealousy

Other-face: other-face consideration is particularly an attempt in saving a partner's face without primarily concerning about one own face during romantic jealousy.

Mutual-face: concern for mutual-face is to save one own face and the partner's face simultaneously to maintain a relationship.

Gender: The term gender is a particular reference to "psychological and emotional characteristics of individuals" (Ivy & Backlund, 2008, p. 28). Thus, gender is socially and culturally constructed. The study employs the term by relying its core on heterosexual males and females. Particularly, gender in this research is a reference to sexual attractions. Identifying their sexual attractions to the opposite sex only are a validation of heterosexuality.

Gender differences: Granted, men and women are different on three levels: culture, biology, and their interaction (Andersen, 1998, p. 98). The experimental definition of the term is the difference between heterosexual Thai males and females in face-saving and communicative responses to jealousy.

Gender communication: Gender communication is an explanatory term that means communication about and between men and women. Gender communication is provocative, pervasive and popularized, albeit still problematic and unpredictable (Ivy & Backlund, 2008, pp. 26-27).

1.7 Summary

This exploratory study is to provide an initial description of gender differences in face-saving considerations and behaviors in response to romantic jealousy and to test a constructed model used in Thailand. The purpose of the study is derived from persisting jealousy problems in a relationship and a thorough review of prior studies of interest. In general, romantic jealousy is likely to be problematic to every romantic relationship due to gender differences in responses to jealousy and expected roles. Thus, an examination of face-saving during romantic jealousy probably contributes to a more understanding of personal differences and behavioral patterns in association with psychological states.

CHAPTER 2

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Romantic jealousy is commonly found in every romantic relationship. Unfortunately, a majority of people hold negative connotations of romantic jealousy since jealousy inevitably induces an enormous amount of pain and distress and potential destructiveness (Pines, 1992). However, jealousy experience may be aggravated due to gender differences in reactions to romantic jealousy. Without understanding the partner's behaviors and thoughts, the relationships cannot thrive, only resulting in losing mutual trust and respect. Notably, trust and respect can be gained through how couples treat each other (Gray, 1992). Likewise, how they react to romantic jealousy may reflect how much they care about face of themselves and their partners. In this study, gender differences in face-saving and communicative responses to romantic jealousy were examined. The following literature will be presented to demonstrate the effect of gender on given subjects.

2.1 Communicative Responses to Jealousy

2.1.1 The Revision of Communicative Responses to Jealousy

2.1.2 The Latest Revision of Communicative Responses to Jealousy

2.1.3 The CRJs in Association with other Relational Factors

2.2 Gender Differences in Response to Romantic Jealousy

2.2.1 The Effect of Social Expectations and Gender Differences

2.3 Face and Face Concerns

2.3.1 Face Concerns in a Close Relationship

2.3.2 Face Concerns, Genders and Behaviors

2.3.3 Face Concerns in Thai Culture

2.1 Communicative Responses to Jealousy

Jealousy manifests in numerous ways, and jealous people differently react to such an intense emotion (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2000, p. 317; McIntosh & Matthews, 1992, pp. 1037-1038). Considerable research suggested that jealousy expressions vary in romantic relationships (e.g., Afifi & Reichert, 1996; Bevan, 2008; Carson & Cupach, 2000; De Weerth & Kalma, 1993). Those variances in jealousy expressions are a result of situational factors and relationship factors (Rydell, McConnell, & Bringle, 2004, p. 457, 463). At the beginning of exploring jealousy manifestations, White and Mullen (1989) initially proposed three dimensions of the jealousy reaction. Particularly, they pointed out that jealous people are susceptible to enacting emotional, cognitive, and behavioral reactions. However, much of prior research on jealousy manifestations rather focused on psychological levels (i.e., emotional or cognitive).

Henceforth, Guerrero et al. (1995) were determined to identify jealousy behaviors specifically in terms of communicative purposes. The ensuing development of communicative responses to jealousy (CRJs) was keenly advanced to illustrate behavioral patterns as communicative strategies (Guerrero et al., 1995). In their research, Guerrero et al. recruited undergraduate students in dating relationships to discover one's behavioral patterns toward one's partner when feeling jealous (Guerrero et al., 2005).

Subsequently, Guerrero et al. (1995) introduced a CRJ model, providing eleven communicative responses to jealousy. Guerrero et al. reported that jealousy communication in reaction to romantic jealousy is an alternative term for behavioral reactions to intense emotions. In times of collecting qualitative data, they asked all participating undergraduate students how they managed to cope with jealousy in their romantic life (Guerrero et al., 1995). From then on, they notably found that responses could be sorted into four themes. Likewise, Guerrero et al. posited that all jealousy reactions might be classified into different fractions, namely direct versus indirect, positive versus negative, partner- versus rival-directed or verbal versus nonverbal. As a result, twelve prominent responses became outstanding, suggesting individuals' jealousy inclinations (Guerrero et al., 1995).

2.1.1 The Revision of Communicative Responses to Jealousy

In addition to the third CRJ revision, (Guerrero, Andersen, & Spitzberg, 2003), interactive strategies exclusively involve face-to-face communication in jealousy-evoking contexts and the directed partner. On the one hand, there were originally 6 of 11 responses identified as interactive (Guerrero et al., 1995). Interactive responses yielded negative affect expression, integrative communication, distributive communication, active distancing, avoidance/denial, and violent communication. On the other hand, the remaining five communicative responses were considered as typical behaviors (Guerrero et al., 1995). Behavioral responses do not necessarily involve direct contacts with one's partner, face-to-face interactions. In other words, Guerrero et al. (1995) suggested that these responses may appear in either an absence or a presence of one's partner. Thus, this type of responses consisted of compensatory restoration, surveillance/restriction, manipulation attempts, rival contacts and violent behaviors.

Later, three additional responses were also sorted into the third CRJ model (Guerrero & Andersen, 1998b; Guerrero et al., 2003; Yoshimura, Guerrero, & Trost, 1999). The first additional response is signs of possession: "publicly displaying the relationship to others, so they know the partner is taken" (Guerrero & Andersen, 1998b, p. 171). As far as the second additional response is concerned, derogating competitors involves criticizing or incriminating potential rivals just to devalue the rivals in the eyes of one's partner. The last one was relationship threats; this response demonstrated infidelity, cheating, or betrayal that would jeopardize a current relationship. Indeed, the theory of Guerrero et al. (1995) greatly contributed to the enlargement of research on jealous behaviors in association with other relational factors.

Notably, Guerrero et al. (2011, pp. 228-229) implied in their study that prior literature might not be claimed as the most reliable and sufficient evidence to support the phenomena on a contemporary issue, because of two possible factors. Fundamentally, the incessant change in populations may have a significant impact on either biological and psychological states. Also, they found that yielding a constant replication challenged several scholars to searched for a proper size of the population continuously. However, Guerrero et al. (2011, pp. 228-229) doubted that paradoxical findings were a sign of theoretical breakdown. Rather, they suggested that this was a

tougher and challenging task, but worth pursuing, for scholars to overcome this erroneous recurrence.

2.1.2 The Latest Revision of Communicative Responses to Jealousy

With respect to jealousy responses, there are eleven distinctive responses that are grouped into different themes according to the ‘principles of effects, manifestations, communicative approaches and targets’ (Guerrero et al., 2011).

2.1.2.1 Rival-focused responses to romantic jealousy

First, rival-focused communication, which involves protecting one’s partner and communicating with or about a rival, includes surveillance, rival contacts, derogation of rivals, and signs of possession. Significantly, surveillance draws an attention to checking one’s partner’s belongings such as cell phone, pockets, or email, watching one’s partner routine activities, spying on one’s partner to find anticipated evidence related to potential rivals, or restricting one’s partner possible contacts with rivals (Guerrero et al., 2011, p. 226).

Additionally, contacting rivals are shown in a form of discussing problems with rivals or escalating violent confrontations (Guerrero et al., 1995). Likewise, derogation of rivals is used to criticize intentionally or purportedly recount adverse events related to a potential rival. In other words, one attempts to devalue the potential rival in the eyes of one’s partner to make the partner lose interest in the potential rival (Guerrero & Andersen, 1998b; Guerrero et al., 2003).

Moreover, signs of possession are an overt expression of affections toward one’s partner in front of a perceived threat. The target might have to interpret the message because such behaviors may relatively subtle (Guerrero & Andersen, 1998b, p. 171). Also, Guerrero et al. (2011) also contended that surveillance, rival-contacts, derogations of a rival, and signs of possession were negatively associated with relational satisfactions. A more frequent use of these patterns would result in a reduction of satisfactions.

2.1.2.2 Destructive Responses to Romantic Jealousy

Second, Guerrero et al. (2011, p. 227) identified another group called destructive communication. Destructive communication embodies negative communication, violent communication and counter-jealousy induction. The apparent

indicators are aggressive and manipulative inclinations. Particularly, negative communication encompasses multiple adverse responses that are likely to cause undesirable repercussions (Guerrero et al., 2011, p. 227).

The negative communication can be in a form of verbal abuse such as yelling at, accusing of, arguing with, or quarreling with one's partner. In the same way, one may become actively distant or alienated. By doing so, one tends to give one's partner cold shoulders, enact an aggressive and discourteous behavior toward one's partner, and show negative emotions (i.e., anger, sadness, depression, or upset). Those reactions above are labeled as an act of a silent treatment or passive-aggressive behavior (Guerrero et al., 2011). Several scholars concurred with the result of Guerrero et al. that a silent treatment is unhealthy for maintaining a relationship as one shows punitive motives and disrespectful attitudes instead of having a diplomatic discussion (Parrot & Parrot, 2013; Paul, n.d.).

According to negative emotions, Guerrero et al. (1995) initially claimed in their previous research that an expression of negative emotions was a neutral strategy. However, in their recent research they confirmed that the fundamental attribute of these emotions was negative as the exploratory factor analysis grouped the items of this response into the negative communication (Guerrero et al., 2011). In terms of gender behaviors, some scholars asserted that a negative affect expression is more pervasive among women than men (Buck, Miller, & Caul, 1974; Bowen, 1978; Buck, Baron, & Barrette, 1982; Grossman & Wood, 1993).

2.1.2.3 Violent Responses to Romantic Jealousy

With violent communication, several scholars reported that Americans were inclined to enact violent and threatening acts towards either one's partner or objects (Guerrero et al., 1995; Guerrero et al., 2011, p. 226). In other words, they were likely to abuse their partners physically or throw and destroy objects on the rampage. Throwing a tantrum can be easily recognized if an individual adopts this strategy. Besides, the last response of destructive effects is counter-jealousy inductions, formerly manipulation attempts. The respective reaction involves punitive or revengeful acts that can trigger a partner's jealousy or guilt. To illustrate, one may deliberately treat one's partner as an 'option', not a top priority as usual. Guerrero et al. (2011) even asserted that individuals might do anything that can induce their partner's jealousy. For instance,

the acts would include showing an interest in someone else, flirting with others and becoming less attached to a partner. Under those circumstances, Guerrero et al. noted that some people probably assume that this response is spiteful and detrimental to establishing a loyal and long-term relationship.

Nevertheless, Fleischman, Spitzberg, Andersen and Roesch (2005, p. 67) argued that jealousy inductions would help improving relationship stability and affection. Although some jealous people were willing to initiate an affection accelerator, the outcome depended on their partners' reaction (Fleischman et al., 2005, pp. 67-68). Then again, Guerrero et al. (2011) made a critical argument that the strategy was intrinsically related to harmful behaviors and infidelity despite some positive outcomes.

Furthermore, Guerrero and Afifi (1999, p. 236) discovered that people with a higher frequency of being jealous tended to communicate their emotions negatively. However, this study employed the old version of CRJ model, indicating distributive communication often used by an extremely jealous person. The generalizing results of Guerrero and Affi would not be an account for all 'negative' types of jealousy communications in this classification.

2.1.2.4 Constructive Responses to Romantic Jealousy

Third, constructive communication places an emphasis on discussing the issue and maintaining a relationship. This category includes integrative communication and compensatory restorations (Guerrero et al., 2011). Indeed, integrative communication is approaches pertaining to constructive and straightforward manners, for instance, compromising, resolving conflicts, reaching the middle ground of understanding and receptivity, and willingly maintaining an excellent rapport (Guerrero et al., 1995; Guerrero et al., 2003; Guerrero et al., 2011).

Nevertheless, compensatory restorations are an act of the compensation for being jealous. Specifically, one is inclined to become more affectionate toward and sentimentally connected with one's partner. Namely, one is more willing to express how much one loves and cares for the partner and to maximize its effects by virtue of pertinent manners (Guerrero et al., 2011). Besides, one may be more attached to one's partner by spending time with the partner more than usual. In previous research, Guerrero and Reiter (1998) found that more American women than men reported a

higher tendency for integrative strategies and compensatory restorations. Other scholars agreed that American women were more likely to consider politeness in correspondence with a relational goal to consolidating and prolonging a relationship (Andersen, Eloy, Guerrero, & Spitzberg, 1995; Baxter, 1984).

2.1.2.5 Avoidance in Response to Romantic Jealousy

The final one is the avoidance communication, including silence and denial/inhibition (Guerrero et al., 2011). To illustrate, one stops talking and becomes silent regarding a *silence* response; however, this particular silence is different from giving a silent treatment. Silent treatment in the negative communication is subject to become silent in an attempt to manipulate and punish someone (Guerrero et al. 1995; Guerrero et al., 2003; Guerrero et al., 2011).

Notwithstanding adverse effects of the silent treatment, Guerrero et al. (2011) made a claim that one does not have an intrinsic motive for punishing one's partner in terms of the silence response. In addition to denial/inhibition, the concealment of jealousy emotion is carefully and subtly exercised. In other words, one pretends as if nothing changes and happens, still living life normally as usual (Guerrero et al., 2011). Likewise, avoidance strategies can be considered as a cut-off behavior, which is likely to relate to a preservation of self-esteem (Bowen, 1978). However, Bowen did not implement the theoretical model of CRJ as a primary instrument. An implementation of communicative responses to jealousy model might yield a significant result in gender differences and other tendencies.

2.1.3 The CRJs in Association with other Relational Factors

Given that, Guerrero et al. (2011) confirmed that the final revision of CRJ supported past work as opposed to the previous one with some errors and inconsistencies. However, Guerrero et al. assumed that it is challenging to apply the theory measuring other populations such as older people and other relationship types such as family or friends. As such, some responses might be removed to "fit" types of relationships, albeit still inappropriate (Guerrero et al., 2011). Moreover, the prior studies on CRJ showed that couples in dating relationships and serious romantic relationships were inclined to experience jealousy more frequently than fully committed relationships (Guerrero, Eloy, Jorgensen, & Andersen, 1993; Theiss &

Solomon, 2006). Nevertheless, Guerrero et al. contended that a variation in populations may help to demystify whether The CRJs replicate a result in other conditions.

In consequence, a vast number of scholars decidedly optimized the use of CRJ theory to expand scopes of psychological studies. They rigorously investigated how these multiple reactions were correlated with relational variables (e.g., Carson & Cupach, 2000; Guerrero & Afifi, 1999; Fleischman et al., 2005). The ensuing studies significantly contributed to a profound expansion into new areas of jealousy.

Correspondingly, a great number of studies revealed that each person might have a combination of various emotions in jealousy-related experiences. In particular, Guerrero, Trost, and Yoshimura (2005) found that hostile emotions were positively associated with distributive communication, active distancing, violent communication, and manipulation, but negatively associated with compensatory restorations. This result means that hostile emotions such as anger can somehow predict particular responses a jealous person is likely to use. Thus, jealous people may experience a combination of relevant emotions, such as anger, attraction, fear, and so forth. Accordingly, the results of Guerrero et al. (2005) are compatible with previous findings that not only a perceived threat but also emotions involved may determine an individual's choice in both positive and negative responses to jealousy (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989; White & Mullen, 1989).

Significantly, it should be noted that jealousy is a combination of multidimensional elements; in other words, emotions, cognitions, and behaviors are correlated, albeit distinct from individuals to individuals (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989; White & Mullen, 1989). More importantly, prior research also emphasized psychological components (e.g., attitudes, beliefs, values, emotions and vice versa) as a fundamental dimension in the extensive investigation of jealousy expressions (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989; White & Mullen, 1989).

Other researchers additionally asserted that relationship characteristics were also associated with jealousy reactions (Aylor & Dainton, 2001). Specifically, avoidance/denial, manipulation, negative affect expression, and signs of possession were found relatively low among married couples in comparison with dating couples (Aylor & Dainton, 2001). Moreover, several scholars pointed out that the distance also influence the extent to which people react to rising jealousy; to clarify, people in long-

distance relationships might express jealousy differently from people in proximal relationships (Timmerman, 2001).

Markedly, Bevan (2008, pp. 59-60) claimed that not only the distance but also the varying degree of the couples' investment in a relationship would predict reactions to perceived threats. Besides, she pointed out that if a relationship quality is relatively high, a chance of seeking for good quality alternatives outside of the current relationship is conceivably slim (Bevan, 2008, p. 60). The findings of Anderson et al. (1995) are consistent with Bevan's results that healthy relationships are correlated with relational satisfactions. For instance, happy couples tended to use more integrative strategies than other negative responses to cope with jealousy (Andersen et al., 1995). For this reason, it was due to an effort to maintain a relationship. Nonetheless, relational satisfactions might not be necessarily subject to only constructive strategies. In fact, Fleischman et al. (2005) argued that some jealous people used jealousy induction approach as a means to promote and strengthen their relationships.

Overall, eleven communicative responses to jealousy are categorized into two considerations: interactive reactions (face-to-face interaction) and behavioral reactions (Guerrero et al., 1995). Apparently, most studies employed CRJ theory were conducted in the United States; the populations, therefore, could not represent other nations' phenomena such as Thailand. Also, romantic jealousy and jealousy expressions are pervasive among couples. (Guerrero et al., 1995; Guerrero et al., 2003; Yoshimura et al., 1999) However, the major problem is that couples do not understand each other's response, leading to a conflict escalation. For this reason, investigating gender differences is significantly essential to understand better how gender may be involved partially in jealousy communications and other contributing factors.

2.2 Gender Differences in Response to Romantic Jealousy

Gender socialization may affect communicative styles in a relationship, namely expressing emotions, handling conflicts, and responding to infidelity. However, dissimilarities between men and women in terms of jealousy expressions, in general, regardless of age, status and ethnicity are paramount to investigate.

Apparently, jealousy is culturally determined. Considerable researchers held the view that an imposition of gender prescriptions determines various aspects, including gender and particular responses to jealousy (Buunk & Hupka, 1987; Hupka, 1981; Harris, Olthof, Terwogt, & Hardman, 1987; Mead, 1931). Gender is, in fact, socially and culturally constructed (Ivy & Backlund, 2008, p. 28). Namely, people are not automatically born to be female or male. Biological designations (sex attributes) are unchanging over times as those biological components have already been equipped since an individual was born. At the same time, the perception of manhood and womanhood is gendered (Ivy & Backlund, 2008, pp. 28-29). Ivy and Backlund additionally emphasized that the perceptions of gender more overtly influence individuals' choices and behaviors in different contexts. Chiefly, gender expectations are a prescription of social behaviors and roles that one should enact in a particular context. Andersen (1998, p. 98) critically stressed that the biological theories of gender were prominent in terms of understanding how men and women communicate; nevertheless, biological studies failed to suffice an explanation of some phenomena.

Explicitly, Hupka and Bank (1996) made an argument that jealousy expressions were a product of gender protocols, not of biological determinations. Unfortunately, White and Mullen (1989) rejected the observation above due to paradoxical findings of past works. For instance, some scholars claimed gender differences in jealousy experience while other scholars insisted on no gender differences (Hansen, 1982; Pines & Aronson, 1983; McIntosh, 1989; White, 1981).

Another controversy is gender differences in degrees of jealousy. Several studies revealed that men were more jealous, but others reported that women felt more jealous (Buunk, 1981; Buunk, 1982; De Weerth & Kalma, 1993; Hansen, 1985; Mathes & Severa, 1981). Regardless of an intensity of jealousy, De Weerth and Kalma (1993) drew attention to their findings that more women than men tended to abuse their

partners physically and verbally in response to infidelity and jealousy. With the contradiction in prior research, it indicates that the jealousy experience and jealousy expression are dependent on contextual variables and the extent of key terms such as gender or sex.

As a result, more scholars were eager to determine gender differences, despite the inconsistency of previous results. They initially focused on how romantic jealousy means to men as it does to women (Bringle & Buunk, 1985; Viorst, 1998; White, 1984; White & Mullen, 1989). Those scholars assumed that how gender assigns the meaning probably may have an impact on communicative approaches in response to jealousy.

Much of the literature on jealousy responses revealed that more women than men fostered a relational notion of protecting a relationship (Bryson, 1977; Buunk, 1986). In contrast, some scholars proposed that a preservation of self-esteem was more fortified by men than women (Bryson, 1977; Buunk, 1986). Many studies extensively explained that sexual infidelity could cause some damages on men's self-esteem (e.g., Casullo & Liporace, 2003; Goldenberg et al., 2003; Mathes, 2003; Sagarin, Becker, Guadagno, Nicastle, & Millevoi, 2003; Schutzwahl & Koch, 2004; Ward & Voracek, 2004). Thereby, most men tentatively used particular communicative strategies to retrieve the balance of their self-esteem. The finding of Lans, Mosek, and Yagil (2014) is consistent with previous suggestions that more women than men reported the use of productive behaviors, underpinning the integrity. To consolidate a relationship most women plausibly adopted particular ways of generating an ambiance of receptivity and concern (Lans et al., 2014). Comparatively, they also emphasized prominent findings suggesting that men were more likely to adopt distancing and denial behaviors to protect their self-esteem. The findings of what was conducted in Thailand seem to be consistent with previous research. Wongpakaran et al. (2012, p. 413) proved that Thai men were also more dismissing than women. However, the prior study solely emphasized attachment styles and self-esteem, no explanation to gender differences in behavioral patterns in response to romantic jealousy in Thai contexts.

Correspondingly, Lans et al. (2014) suggested that men showed a higher inclination of distancing and denial strategies considered as cut-off reactions to jealousy. Also, they found no sharp distinction between genders in expressing compensation or hostile behaviors associated with self-esteem preservation. In contrast,

Bowen (1978) contended that more women than men reported a higher tendency of expressing anger and blame towards their partners. The tremendous amount of past research is compatible with Bowen's claim that women are more emotionally expressive than men (Buck et al., 1974; Buck et al., 1982; Croucher et al., 2012; Grossman & Wood, 1993).

Additionally, to expand a stretch of jealousy communication studies, Guerrero and Reiter (1998) decided to carry out research on gender. Markedly, they found gender differences in jealousy expressions. That is to say, American men were prone to engage in rival contacts, surveillances, and compensatory restorations, giving a gift to their partner. Instead, American women preferably enhanced their appearance by using compensatory restorations. In contrast to the finding of Guerrero and Reiter, White (1980) revealed different findings that more women than men were prone to engage in jealousy induction (manipulative attempts).

However, those paradoxical findings imply an effect of methodological approaches and other contributing factors each study implemented. For instance, Lans et al. (2014) utilized separateness-togetherness theory proposed by Bowen (1978), which focuses on two aspects: pushing or engaging. On the contrary, Guerrero and Reiter (1998), together with White (1980) employed CRJ theory, but somehow their findings were not replicated.

Concerning an impact of social expectations on gender roles, Guerrero and Reiter (1998) held the same view as Aylor and Daintain (2001) that social expectations define gender roles. Aylor and Daintain pointed out that masculinity/instrumentality and femininity/expressiveness seemed to have a significant impact on individuals in reaction to jealousy. On the one hand, masculinity was positively associated with negative reactions such as signs of possession, rival contacts, violence, distributive communication, and manipulation attempts (Aylor & Dainton, 2001). On the other hand, femininity was positively associated with an integrative communication. Aylor and Daintain additionally suggested that femininity showed no relation with active distancing, manipulation attempts, avoidance/denial, violent communication, and relational threats. For this reason, cultural premises may play a critical role in determining communication. Indeed, Ivy and Backlund (2008, p. 57) also emphasized that the notion of masculinity and femininity is a result of social constructs.

Similarly, Croucher et al. (2012, p. 357), claimed that national characteristics influence genders on three facets of the jealousy reaction (i.e., emotional, cognitive, and behavioral levels). They found that Thais were less likely to manifest behavioral and emotional jealousy toward their partners on account of an effect of feminine identity in Thai culture (Croucher et al., 2012, p. 357). Specifically, Thais were more inclined to engage in compromising behaviors than competitive ones in comparison with Western counterparts, such as the United State and Ireland (Croucher et al., 2012). Hofstede (1998, as cited in Ivy and Backlund, 2008, p. 83) explained that feminine culture embodies less aggressive and assertive manners when engaging in social interactions and conflicts. Apparently, most individuals' behaviors are shaped and developed through a phase of social interactions. Croucher et al. (2012, p. 359) pointed out that feminine cultures such as Thailand place less value on egocentric thinking (an individualistic thought), which is pervasive in masculine cultures. Accordingly, the notion of egocentric thinking indicates that people seem to concern more about themselves than about their partners' contentment.

Another critical consideration is that most females in four nations were more disposed to manifest cognitive jealousy and emotional jealousy than males. In this case, the finding is consistent with other studies in the field of interest (e.g., Buck et al., 1974; Bowen, 1978; Buck et al., 1982; Grossman & Wood, 1993). Unfortunately, Croucher et al. (2012) did not make a separate gender comparison between four nations. Thus, their conclusion may not fully apply to the case in Thailand. Besides, behavioral patterns in reaction to jealousy among Thai men and women should be examined so as to extend the study of Croucher et al.

Thus, gender differences in jealousy expressions are tentative depending on contributing factors such as individual and cultural connotations as well as methodological operations (Buunk, 1981; De Weerth & Kalma, 1993; Hansen, 1982; Hansen, 1985; Mathes & Severa, 1981; Pines & Aronson, 1983; McIntosh, 1989; White, 1981). After a thorough review of relevant research, other values in one culture such as the concern of face in Thai culture should be extensively considered. Markedly, face concerns seem to play a critical role in psychological and behavioral practices to some degree (Mak, Chen, Lam, & Yiu, 2009; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). The

understanding of individuals' view on face may enable everyone to unveil the individual's idiosyncratic personalities and anticipated behaviors to some extent.

2.3 Face and Face Concerns

Face is not something apparently shown on someone's face, or it is not a reference to facial expressions (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Suntaree Komin, 1996; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). This study focuses on the concern for face referring to the locus of individuals' worth, pride, positive image, status, and relevant qualities.

Hu (1944) initially advocated the term of face, which represents two aspects of face in Chinese: 1) *lien* and 2) *mien-tzu*. In Chinese, *lien* refers to an internal face or a moral character of individuals whereas *mien-tzu* represents an external face or social status, goal achievements, dignity, honors, and so forth. As expected, this concept has been disseminated to western countries, and subsequently it has become prominently intriguing to several scholars.

Goffman (1967, p. 5, as cited in Canelon & Ryan, 2013, p. 111) defined face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact." Besides, face can be lost, maintained, saved, and protected. However, face cannot be presented in an absence of direct social interactions (e.g., Goffman, 1967; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

According to an alternative definition by Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 66, as cited in Canelon & Ryan, 2013, pp. 111-112), face is "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself." All the acts of negotiating face occur in social contacts, regardless of contexts. The concept of face, in most western countries, refers to self-image/self-worth, which is equivalent to the term "*mien-tzu*" in Chinese (Hu, 1944; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Later, Brown and Levinson (1987) developed the face-related theory called "politeness theory," which mainly determines a pragmatic use for positive and negative faces of self and others.

The introduction of politeness theory primarily encouraged Ting-Toomey to develop her theory called "face-negotiation theory" (Ting-Toomey, 1988). Fundamentally, the importance of face has been found in almost every culture, yet its meaning and its use differ substantially (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Ting-Toomey,

1988). According to Oetzel et al. (2008), face primarily comprises three levels: affective (e.g., feeling/emotion), behavioral (facework) and cognitive (how much face to give or receive).

For an introductory scenario of face and cultural studies, many scholars rigorously pursued such an issue to gain more understanding of another culture. Regarding face-negotiation theory, Ting-Toomey and Korogi (1998) asserted that face come into play through a medium of different conflict management styles and facework behaviors across cultures. For this reason, face-negotiation theory places a high emphasis on an utmost importance of face during conflicts (Ting-Toomey & Korogi, 1998).

The term of face is ambiguous and perplexing since it can either stand for positive self-image/self-worth or behaviors in relation to face (facework). Specifically, Ting-Toomey (1988) endeavored to distinguish face from face-related behaviors to have a better view of how people assign meanings and how they reflect the notion of face in their behaviors. In face-negotiation theory, Ting-Toomey rigorously developed the face notion by dividing the focus of face into two dimensions: self-face and other-face. This psychological realm is implicit and somehow subconsciously unrecognized, but it is significantly crucial. Additionally, Ting-Toomey and Korogi (1998) explored the concerns of face; as a result, mutual-face aspect was added to a theory as the third component of face dimensions. Specifically, self-face concern represents one's image or identity that one wants to claim for oneself while the other-face aspect is connected with a higher consideration of others' image and dignity. Also, a matter of mutual-face demonstrates a simultaneous regard for both one's face and another's face (Ting-Toomey & Korogi, 1998). For cultural characteristics, considerable studies found that individualistic cultures tend to value their self-face. In contrast, many scholars had an agreement that collectivistic cultures are more likely to underlie other-face and mutual-face levels (e.g., Gudykunst, Yoon, & Nishida, 1987; Oetzel, Ting-Toomey, Masumoto, Yokochi, Takai, & Wilcox, 2001).

However, past works mostly underlined cross-cultural comparisons done in other countries such as China, Germany, Japan, and USA and conflicts in other types of relationships (Oetzel, Ting-Toomey, Yokochi, Masumoto, & Takai, 2000; Oetzel et al., 2001; Oetzel, Ting-Toomey, Chew-Sanchez, Harris, Wilcox, & Stumpf, 2003;

Oetzel et al., 2008). As a result, previous studies have not revealed the extent to which face concerns may relate to communicative responses to jealousy between men and women (e.g., Boiger, Güngör, Karasawa, & Mesquita, 2014; Chan, 2012; Croucher et al., 2012; Canelon & Ryan, 2013; Grossman & Wood, 1993; Nitthaya Chaimanee, 2003; Oetzel et al., 2001).

2.3.1 Face Concerns in a Close Relationship

Considerable research mostly explored face concerns and facework in conflict situations across nations (Canelon & Ryan, 2013; Kim, Lee, Kim, & Hunter, 2004; Lim, 1994; Oetzel et al., 2000; Oetzel, et al., 2001; Oetzel et al., 2008). According to Ting-Toomey's study (1988), she rigorously assured that face differs depending on cultures. In terms of cultural differences, Oetzel et al. (2008) found that self-face and emotional expression was greater in China than in Germany and in the United States. Many scholars concurred with the idea that individualistic cultures tend to engage in assertive, expressive, and direct communication with a more concern of self-face (e.g., Oetzel et al., 2008; Ting-Toomey, 1988; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Thus, it is apparent that individuals in a particular culture hold different connotations of face, resulting in different behavioral patterns.

Furthermore, one party could perform some harmful actions that might yield a simultaneous impact on both one's face and others' face. An interpersonal relationship affects the way individuals relate to their face and others' face (Oetzel et al., 2000). Namely, previous research showed that rapport between individuals involved in an interaction plays a relatively big role in communication acts (Gudykunst et al., 1987; Knapp, Ellis, & Williams, 1980). Similarly, several scholars assumed that relational factors such as trust, intimacy, and social identity might predispose an individual to a certain act of face practice (Knapp et al., 1980; Suzuki, 1998; Yuki, Maddux, Brewer, & Takemura, 2005). In this case, those researchers proposed that individuals in close relationships tend to avoid acts that might trigger a loss of self-face and other-face.

As shown above, prior literature was apparently paradoxical due to cultural differences and the target populations. Generally speaking, differences in findings

imply that how an individual and a society assign the meaning to face, intimacy and vice versa may determine behaviors pertaining to face.

2.3.2 Face Concerns, Genders and Behaviors

A great number of previous studies have shown that culture greatly influences both cognitive and behavioral patterns of the people. The cultural influences give rise to different role expectations of men and women. Similarly, a value of face is also culturally defined, and thus gender roles may affect its held value in relation to particular behaviors to some degree.

Particularly, Brown and Levinson (1987) claimed that a consideration of face may be culturally related to politeness and indirectness. For instance, women are socialized to be non-aggressive, loving, caring and expressive; accordingly, they tend to consider tactful manners in response to a particular situation in their relationships (Borisoff & Merrill, 1998; Cancian, 1989). Consequently, women are prone to be more polite than men in communication because women have a higher sensitivity to others' feelings and differing views of communication (DuBrin, 1991; Gray, 1992; Kramarae, 1981; Liang & Han, 2005). Nevertheless, women can open up and express their thoughts and feelings more easily despite the likelihood of using indirect styles. Due to a large number of gender studies, most scholars asserted more gender differences than similarities. For instance, self-stereotyping (Van Vianen & Fisher, 2002) seems to govern the way men alternatively use direct and assertive approaches whereas women are inclined to adopt compliance, soft-spoken strategy, and emotional validation (Baxter, 1984; Johnson, 1976).

According to Suntaree Komin (1990, pp. 50-56), it seems that Thai men and women are equivalent in terms of placing high values for being grateful, honest-sincere, polite-humble and kind-helpful. These values are regarded as basic traits in Thai society. Suntaree Komin (1990, p. 172) insisted that there was no gender difference in placing a high value on being caring and considerate. She drew a conclusion from the findings that this cognitive notion is already embedded in Thai people's conscience. Conversely, Suntaree Komin (1990, p. 51) found gender differences in the value of family happiness-security and the ego value of self-esteem. She added that both cognitive values are stronger for Thai women. In a different fashion, the findings of

Suntaree Komin (1990, pp. 51-52) suggested that Thai men obviously value concern of power, equality and freedom. In addition, they view family happiness-security as a supplementary part of their lives. As a result, Thai men tend to entrust the power and responsibility of the family to their women as Thai women's top priority is family happiness-security. In the meantime, Thai men hold all the power outside home. However, Suntaree Komin noted that Thai men and women apparently accept and respect this division of powers.

Although Thai men and women thrive for a success in life, their rooted values are different. Thai women are more self-oriented while Thai men are more other-oriented (Suntaree Komin, 1990). Suntaree Komin pointed out that Thai women's self-orientation involves central concerns for their family happiness-security, pride and success in life. That is to say, Thai women identify their quality relationships with a success in life. In contrast, previous research revealed that the significance of interdependent, obedient-respectful, self-controlled values is higher for Thai men (Suntaree Komin, 1990, p. 54). It is evident that those values serve the hierarchical autocracy in Thailand.

2.3.3 Face Concerns in Thai Culture

Although a practice of face is so universal to every culture that an individual places a high value on, each culture still assigns different meaning to face. Indeed, how Thai people perceive face and how the concept of face considerably differs across cultures are a crucial account for understanding practices in social interactions, particularly intimate ones. The notion of face in Thai culture inevitably influences Thai people's behavior and conflict management (Suntaree Komin, 1996). The value of face might be attributed to cultural socialization.

Suntaree Komin (1990, p. 159) claimed that "the Thai are first and foremost ego oriented, characterized by the highest ego value of being independent-being oneself (*pen tua khong tua eng*) and a very high value of self-esteem." Some scholars assumed that Thai people were emotionless as they rarely expressed any feeling and emotion in social interactions (Phillips, 1965, p. 60). Nevertheless, Suntaree Komin (1990, p. 159) critically argued that Thais are not emotionless, but most Thais rather remain their poise in front of others, showing considerate and respect for others' ego or face. With that

mechanism of keeping calm, deep inside Thai people have a high susceptibility to emotional outbursts if their ego or face is threatened. Consequently, it is evident that a cognitive notion of ego (face) is deeply rooted in cultural constructs, leading to affecting and shaping Thai people's behavioral patterns.

2.3.3.1 Social Norms in Interpersonal Conflicts in Thailand

Indeed, Suntaree Komin (1990, pp. 155-156) suggested that cultural factors have an influence on cognitions and behaviors of people in Thailand. Thai people internalize the great ego value of independence, the interpersonal-moral value of being honest-sincere as well as being grateful. In addition, the competence value of being responsible and the social relation related to values of being caring and considerate and being responsive to situations and opportunities are also pervasive in Thailand. These values form Thai social smoothing values in social interactions, especially caring and considerate (a concept of *kreng jai* in Thai) as well as responsive to situations (a value of being adaptive and flexible). As shown above, it is important to remember that Thai people hold those significant values to balance their highest ego and considerate behaviors in favor of relational harmony.

Some studies revealed that avoidance and confrontation may be ascribed to Buddhism's notion of tolerance and peace (Embree, 1990; Ingle, 1983). Specifically, Buddhism places the bottom line on compassion. Additionally, Wells (1960) supported the notion above that Thais are encouraged to learn an act of forgiveness and apology so as to practice the virtue of endurance and consideration for others. As a result, Thais tend to take all the actions into account since those actions may either harm others or themselves (Wells, 1960). Carmody and Carmody (1996) delivered supportive evidence to previous research that it may be offensive for Thais to disclose negative states of mind (self-centeredness, selfishness, pride, personal willfulness) to others. In other words, those expressions do not fortify collective harmony, but they assert an individuality instead, which can reduce a sense of inclusion and mutual accommodation (Carmody & Carmody, 1996). Suntaree Komin (1990, p. 175) explained that an overt display of assertiveness and self-confidence triggers negative feelings of the audience, which disrupts a smooth interaction. Thus, Thai people exert the value of being polite-humble that enables them to maintain one another's ego or face. Indeed, practicing self-

control to some degree is required to show some respect for one another's ego and dignity (Suntaree Komin, 1990, pp. 175-176).

Regarding conflicts, Suntaree Komin (1990) reported in her study that Thais perceive conflicts as a destructive circumstance that might jeopardize harmony. Some research ensured that most Thais allegedly attribute conflicts to the ineffective interpersonal skills because conflicts impede them from promoting relationship and closeness (Embree, 1950; Nitthaya Chaimanee, 2003; Suntaree Komin, 1990). To have a smooth interaction Thai people withhold an expression of their negative feelings. Notably, tolerance can be demonstrated in considerable ways; however, it is often in a form of avoiding confrontation, refusing to disagree, face-saving of self and others and vice versa (Ingle, 1983; Suntaree Komin, 1996; Roongrenguke & Chansuthus, 1998; Wells, 1960).

Additionally, some researchers proposed that some Thais are more willing to be differential and stereotypically submissive (Klausner, 1993; Knutson, 1994). Mulder's suggestion (1992) is apparently congruent with previous studies that defiant and aggressive behaviors are discouraged as they disclose an overt expression of conflicts and hostilities. In other words, prior research demonstrated that some Thais are more inclined to hide their disagreement and to suppress their resentment or anguish (Knutson, 1994; Mulder, 1992; Suntaree Komin, 1990, p. 174). Besides, the research of Knutson (1994) revealed profound results that Thais rather perform an act of quietness in response to conflicts or frustrations, considered as moral qualities (Knutson, 1994). Other scholars implied that these behavioral patterns are perceived as an act of consideration for others (Knutson, 1994; Knutson, Vivatananukul, & Hwang, 1995).

Unfortunately, Suntaree Komin (1990) critically argued that it would be too stereotypical and simplistic to conclude that all Thais handled conflicts subtly according to the norms. Although it may be true that a majority of Thai people are more likely to exert a smooth conflict resolution, it is not a primary need in social contacts (Suntaree Komin, 1990). The exploration of Suntaree Komin revealed that a basis of individual traits may purportedly prevail over individuals' behaviors in reaction to certain situations. However, it is still a major concern for most Thai people to underline more heavily the existence of relationships than conflict-based solutions. Interestingly,

Roongrengsuke and Chansuthus (1998) found that a success in communicating is to prevent the loss of self-face and other-face for Thais, albeit considered as incompetent communicators.

Apparently, Buddhist teachings do not necessarily influence individuals to a greater degree. For instance, Suntaree Komin (1990) stressed that a lot of Thais might throw a tantrum due to small insults and contemptuous treatments toward somebody or their significant others. She even suggested in her study that the respective phenomena showed no relation to Buddhist notion of tolerance. Instead, she claimed that Thais are apparently “ego-oriented”. This suggestion should be able to explain why those destructive behaviors persist in Thai society (Suntaree Komin, 1990). Ego and self-esteem are sensitive parts to most Thais. Thus, any harsh impositions might trigger individuals’ overreactions in the events that individuals attempt to protect their face representing ego, dignity, pride and autonomy. For this reason, the implication is that most Thais have an enormous ego (Suntaree Komin, 1990, 1996). As a result, each needs to acknowledge and respect another party’s autonomy and image in social contacts, depending on social ranks and vice versa.

It is also notable to remember that avoidance seems to play a significant role in dynamic interactions for individuals to accommodate another person. Suntaree Komin (1990) added that the mechanism of avoidance behavior was not derived from Buddhist teachings in Thailand. It is true that Buddhism teaches detachment, non-self, avoidance of extreme emotions, non-aggressive behaviors in response to adverse situations, forgiveness and so forth. However, Suntaree Komin (1990) made a critical argument that it is unfair to conclude that an individual is not religious when he/she erupts in rage. Suntaree Komin assumed that there was more than one factor contributing to Thainess.

2.3.3.2 The Notion of Face-Saving in Thailand

With ego orientation, this orientation contributes to highly valuable attitudes. Specifically, the concept of “face-saving”, “a refrainment of criticism”, and the “kreng jai” (showing consideration for people) and “mai pen rai” (never mind) is an underlying concept of Thai behavioral inclinations (Suntaree Komin, 1990). Ego and face are somewhat identical with each other, and they are perceived as crucial for Thais in social interactions.

Suntaree Komin (1990) affirmed that ego and face can be used interchangeably in terms of addressing the preservation of autonomy and image. Regarding communicative styles, a great amount of previous research provided significant information that Thais tend to avoid threatening each other's face, representing indirect forms of communicating (Nitthaya Chaimanee, 2003; Knutson, 1994; Knutson et al., 1995; Suntaree Komin, 1990; Thinnapan Nakata & Likit Dhiravegin, 1989). Indirect communication explicitly includes avoiding public confrontation and face-to-face discussion, for instance. Even Thinnapan Nakata and Likit Dhiravegin (1989, p. 185, as cited in Knutson, 1994, p. 8) also found: "Thais are keen to avoid conflict ... and adverse to criticizing others in their presence." Suntaree Komin's finding (1990) is compatible with previous results that a face practice is not only for seniors and subordinates, but all relational relationships are also taken into consideration regardless of what status and position.

Accordingly, criticism is also considered as a hostile behavior that can either threaten one's face or damage social harmony and relationships. Mulder (1979, p. 171, as cited in Suntaree Komin, 1990, p. 161) suggested that "criticism of whatever type is, therefore, a social affront, and insult of a person." Mulder (1979) indicated that a criticism in response to seniors or *phu yai* – the elder is socially disrespectful and unacceptable. In contrast, Suntaree Komin (1990) argued that this attitude may apply to all relationship types, including equals and inferiors as well. Suntaree Komin even suggested that to keep their face and save others' Thais often make a subtle utterance when they have to criticize somebody about something. It is quite rare to see a harsh and the inconsiderate criticism and a direct comment from Thai people (Suntaree Komin, 1990).

Often, Thais do not take sides; they, therefore, end up making a vague statement that can be interpreted either differently or wrongly since that utterance does not raise only one meaning. Thinnapan Nakata and Likit Dhiravegin (1989) proposed intriguing findings that an ambiguous utterance or a given opposite answer such as saying yes as a reference to "no" frequently invokes more confusion. Apparently, Thinnapan Nagata and Likit Dhiravegin's finding (1989) is consistent with some past works in other nations (Knapp et al., 1980; Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). Thinnapan Nagata and Likit Dhiravegin (1989) indicated that Thai people were more likely to feel

“kreng jai” to the close relations. This means that the closer the relationships, the more difficult for Thais is to be straightforward, particularly in times of refusing to do something or rejecting someone and/or something (Thinnapan Nakata & Likit Dhiravegin, 1989). However, the finding is apparently paradoxical to what Lim (1990) concluded. Specifically, Lim believed that the acts of embarrassing close friends can be tolerant to some degree depending on in-group rules.

If face and ego cannot be detached from social interactions in Thai culture, the attitude of kreng jai should be underlined. Kreng jai and face are interwoven. As mentioned above, Kreng jai can be translated into English as a consideration for others’ feelings. In this sense, Klausner (1981) posited that it might be very difficult for foreigners or people outside Thai culture to fully grasp its essence since this concept has been internalized through socialization for a long time. Nevertheless, Suntaree Komin (1990, p. 161) explained that kreng jai is demonstrated in a form of being considerate, unwilling to cause someone’s discomfort and a loss of face, together with someone’s autonomy. Kreng jai attitude can apply to all types of relationships such as relationships between superiors, inferiors, and equals. However, Suntaree Komin made an explicit suggestion that each relationship (e.g. close friends, intimate relationships) may ensure the discrepancy in the presence of kreng jai with differences in degree, depending on acceptable rules among members. Markedly, the mentioned result of Suntaree Komin is consistent with past work that close friends may be able to embarrass each other’s face to a given degree (Lim, 1990, 1994; Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). For in-group members among friends, potential behaviors are not apparently labeled as face-threatening acts. Similarly, the degree of kreng jai is most likely congruent with a degree of familiarity, contexts, and other relational variables (Suntaree Komin, 1990).

In conclusion, face-saving in Thai culture cannot be dissociated from Buddhism (Embree, 1950; Suntaree Komin, 1990). Some attitudes, such as kreng jai and mai pen rai, are cultivated in times. Face and ego are so sensitive that wrong treatments may lead to demoralizing another party’s face (and ego) (Suntaree Komin, 1990, 1996). However, there is no concrete evidence to claim that there is a discrepancy in concern for face in relation to jealousy expression among Thai males and females. Most prior literature on face orientation in Thai culture has predominantly concentrated

on the prevailing conflicts in business settings and behaviors in everyday lives (e.g., Klausner, 1993; Knutson, 1994; Suntaree Komin, 1996). Also, previous research has not yet classified the extent to which three aspects of face may function in association with other factors (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

Thus, research is needed to further a significant exploration of how the embedded values of face in Thai culture might be a contributing predisposition toward a particular response to romantic jealousy among genders in Thailand. Henceforth, the following chapter will identify and justify the research methodology and relevant criteria regarding a scope of the study.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was to explore gender differences in a relationship between face concerns and romantic jealousy reactions in terms of communicative styles, leading to identifying gender difference in concern for face and jealousy responses. Since salient findings reflected the issue at large, a proper method was crucial. Significantly, the process was considered as a theoretical framework that helped to maintain a conceptual equivalence and a consistent direction throughout the research. An appropriate method implementation was likely to yield an optimum result. For this reason, this section signified the methodical concepts and criteria of the research, which included the following headings:

- 3.1 Research Design
- 3.2 Participant
- 3.3 Questionnaires
- 3.4 Procedures for Data Collections
- 3.5 Measurement/Instrument
- 3.6 Analysis of Data

3.1 Research Design

The intrinsic aim of the study was to determine whether there were gender differences in three facets of face-saving in associations with communicative responses to jealousy in a heterosexual romantic relationship. This quantitative study was considered as exploratory research, yet the study also incorporated descriptive statistics to draw inferable data. Its main purpose was to demonstrate attitudes and behaviors embraced by a group of people on a given subject. Basically, there were a few studies shedding some light on face-saving in Thai contexts; nevertheless, those studies did not

identify gender differences in associations between face-saving notions and communicative responses to romantic jealousy (Klausner, 1993; Knutson, 1994; Suntaree Komin, 1996). Thus, the research method was primarily designed as an exploratory survey based upon a comparative gender examination. This exploratory study was also expected to provide an instrument used in Thai contexts. Indeed, the preliminary findings were an initial groundwork for future research that was intended to demonstrate the effect of gender on face-saving practices and communicative responses to romantic jealousy in Thailand. In addition to survey questionnaires, 112 Thai respondents were asked to report their attitudes about face-saving concern during romantic jealousy and their behaviors in reaction to jealousy.

3.2 Participants

The survey study approximately consisted of 130 Thai respondents. However, there were 112 individuals who were eligible for the analyzes. The selection of participants was based on convenience samplings. The study surveyed Thai people's behavioral patterns in response to romantic jealousy and notions of face-saving through self-administered questionnaires. Subsequently, the eligibility criteria were operated to determine respondents' qualification for participating. Those, who failed to meet criteria, were excluded from the study.

First, the study fundamentally focused on the phenomena in Thai culture; the respondents were measured by choosing whether they were Thai or another nationality based on a critical criterion of their official nationality identification.

Furthermore, the expected respondents' age was more than 18 years old. According to previous research, participants were mostly undergraduate students (20-23 years old) since some findings revealed that young adults tend to experience romantic jealousy with a low commitment and unconfirmed sexual exclusivity (Guerrero et al., 1993; Hansen, 1983, Pines & Aronson, 1983; Salovey & Rodin, 1985; Theiss & Solomon, 2006). However, previous research did not signify the evidence that older individuals would not feel jealous at all. Thus, age might not be ascribed to predicting an experience of romantic jealousy. In recent research, Guerrero et al. (2011) suggested that future studies should not mainly focus on undergraduate students. In

other words, the researchers may involve more grown-up individuals to promote an equation of sampling and assert a replication in multiple groups of populations.

Since the research was primarily quantitative, a variation in the populations was underlying – including all available populations based upon age criterion (more than 18) and other criteria. Regarding gender differences, eligible respondents were fundamentally heterosexual Thai males and females. Heterosexual males and females were operationally defined based on sexual attraction to the opposite sex. The respondents were asked to identify their sexual attraction as means of verifying their gender identity. This conclusion was drawn from Savin-Williams (2006, p. 41) Hudepohl, Parrot, and Zeichner (2010). Specifically, they proposed that asking respondents to evaluate their sexual behaviors and gender identification can be relatively difficult since gender identification and sexual behaviors have been regulated by immense effects of social contexts and cultural premises. As a result, in order to prevent self-report biases and a susceptibility to several variable meanings, the term of sexual attraction as a reference to heterosexual identification provides a more confirmed accuracy (Hudepohl et al., 2010). Indeed, respondents verifying their sexual attraction to only the opposite sex were endorsed to be heterosexual whereas those with either a sexual attraction to both males and females or being uncertain about their sexual interest were regarded as homosexual and unidentified – underqualified.

Moreover, the romantic relationship was at least one month intact (Furman & Buhrmester, 2009). Couples are more insecure and jealous in early romantic relationships due to uncertainty (Kennedy-Lightsey & Booth-Butterfield, 2011). Considerable scholars have identified one month or two months as a minimum eligible length of a romantic relationship (Fleischman et al, 2005; Guerrero et al., 2011). In this study, romantic relationships were defined as a stage when heterosexual individuals showed romantic involvement and commitment with differences in degrees (Furman & Winkles, 2010). Romantic relationships among heterosexual men and women included: dating or seeing one person casually, dating or seeing more than one person, having an exclusive boyfriend/girlfriend or having a serious relationship, engaged or living with someone else, and married. Therefore, the term lover used in this study referred to the categories above. The study did not identify the degree to which couples engaged in sexual activities.

This study did not offer financial incentives for participating and recruit respondents from a particular place such as colleges or organizations due to a constraint of financial cost. For this reason, the study used convenience sampling within an age range, and all respondents ensured anonymity and consent willingness.

3.3 Questionnaires

According to the underlying scope of the study, a relationship between face concerns and jealousy communication in terms of responses in a romantic relationship among heterosexual Thai men and women were explored. The study utilized a survey method by means of distributing questionnaires to respondents through a self-administered questionnaire.

For rationales for this data collection approach, most studies on face concerns and jealousy expressions have employed a questionnaire survey (e.g., Oetzel et al., 2003; Oetzel et al., 2008; Sabini & Green, 2004). Since this study was exploratory and determined to investigate a given phenomenon at large, questionnaires were able to collect a vast amount of data. Also, the utility of a questionnaire survey ensured respondents' privacy and autonomy. Psychological states such as emotions and attitudes were sensitive and personal to express overtly, especially in a face-to-face interaction such as an interview. For this reason, questionnaires did not require as much trust as an interview does. Therefore, self-report questionnaires were a more suitable method for this study. Particularly, the study was initially constructed to test the instruments and to provide the preliminary findings suggesting the effect of gender on face-saving and communicative responses to romantic jealousy to some extent. An introductory instruction attached to the questionnaires affirmed a consent agreement and personal anonymity. Expectedly, respondents could be more honest in answering the questions.

Due to a large number of participants, self-administered questionnaire format was utilized to serve the purpose of the exploratory study. Survey questionnaires help to measure a given subject at large. The questionnaires comprised close-ended questions with rating scales ranging from 5-1 or 7-1 regarding the sections of jealousy responses and face concerns, apart from demographic data collections and a measurement of eligible participation. All items and contents on questionnaires were

written in English, then translated into Thai and back-translated into English in an attempt of maintaining a conceptual equivalence. However, some items or words were possibly be modified to align with the Thai cultural settings and concepts since behaviors and perceptions may be different across cultures. Original models may not apply to Thai contexts. The term modification was thus clarified in a measurement section.

However, before collecting data from the respondents, the author asked some peers to review and complete the questionnaires in Thai language to check if there was a consistency within variables. As a result, the questionnaires met acceptable levels of reliability.

To sum up, the survey questionnaires consisted of three sections, namely, demographic information, three face aspects and jealousy responses. Subsequently, the expected salient findings provided an insightful representation of romantic jealousy communication associated with face-saving between two genders (male/female) in Thailand.

3.4 Procedures for Data Collections

First, respondents were informed the purpose of the study. They were subsequently asked to read introductory instructions before completing the survey. According to the instructions, the respondents were informed consent agreement on privacy and the future use of their data. An agreement confirmed their willingness and anonymity to do the survey.

Regarding self-administered questionnaires, respondents were alone to complete the survey. According to self-report questionnaires, respondents were more comfortable to be honest in their answers because they were asked to recall their past behaviors that would be embarrassing to them. All the respondents were then invited to complete the first section (demographic data). This section was crucial to data analyzes since respondents' background was a part of analyzes.

On the process of categorizing qualified respondents, respondents failing to meet criteria for participating were removed from data analyzes. For the second section (face concerns), the respondents reported the concerns of saving self-face, other-face,

and mutual face. The following section was communicative responses to jealousy measurement. Respondents were asked to think or recall their experience when they felt jealous and to evaluate their frequency of enacting such behavioral responses to jealousy. Instructions in a second section prompted respondents what situations they have to recall when their relationships were threatened by a real threat such as a third person or a rival.

Each respondent took approximately 10 minutes to complete three sections. Once completing the survey, respondents returned it to the author. Finally, an appreciation for their time and participation was shown to thank them briefly.

3.5 Measurement/Instrument

The utmost gist of the study was to identify whether there were gender (heterosexual male vs. heterosexual female) differences in relationships between face concerns and jealousy reactions in a romantic relationship. Specifically, the fundamental factor was gender (i.e., male and female). Face concerns (i.e., self-face, other-face, and mutual-face) and communicative responses to romantic jealousy were dependent variables depending. A questionnaire format was utilized to examine the purpose. Henceforth, the questionnaires were divided into three sections that respondents were asked to fill out.

The first section gathered demographic information (e.g. age, sex/gender, nationality, relationship status and length) . Due to an anonymous approach, respondents were not asked to put their name. Demographic questions included eight items altogether. There were five items (items number 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8) which were essential for participating. In item number 1, respondents were expected to hold Thai nationality. Operationally, this criterion was designed based on their nationality on their official identification. Those checking Thai nationality were endorsed as Thai people who were eligible for analyzes. Simply stated, respondents identifying themselves as non-Thai nationality were dropped from analyzes. Regarding item number 3, eligible respondents were expected to be heterosexual Thai males and females. Heterosexual males and females were operationally defined based upon sexual attraction to the opposite sex. It was a validation of their gender identity. This theoretical concept was

particularly derived from Savin-Williams (2006) Hudepohl et al. (2010). Notably, they postulated that self-report biases may be inevitably a result of asking respondents to evaluate their sexual behaviors and gender identification. Additionally, culture impositions may determine their choices of answer. To prevent self-report biases and several variable meanings the term of sexual attraction as a reference to heterosexual identification provides a more confirmed accuracy (Hudepohl et al., 2010). Indeed, only the respondents with a sexual attraction to the opposite sex were approved to be heterosexual, and the rest was discarded from the analyzes. Sex orientations in item number 2 were not for a measurement. The item was to classify their sexes regarding biological divisions.

The age of respondents was measured with a single question (e.g. how old are you?). The respondents' age was expected to be equal to or more than 18 years old as Thai society has widely discouraged dating scenes among teenagers due to numerous reasons such as an unwanted pregnancy, a sexually transmitted disease and a loss of future known as *sai ah na kod* (Apichat Chamratrithirong, Sirinan Kittisuksathit, Chai Podhisita, Pimonpan Isarabhakdi, & Malee Sabaiying, 2007; Sinnott, 2004). In other words, dating scenes among youths has been put down and perceived as a transition of puberty instead of a real relationship (Sinnott, 2004). Thus, in this study the expected respondents' age was equal to or more than 18 years old. According to previous research, romantic jealousy is likely to be found in a romantic relationship with a low commitment and unconfirmed sexual exclusivity (Guerrero et al., 1993; Hansen, 1983, Pines & Aronson, 1983; Salovey & Rodin, 1985; Theiss & Solomon, 2006). For their studies, participants were mostly undergraduate students (20-23 years old) who were in dating and serious relationships rather than fully committed relationships. However, their research did not suggest that older couples could never experience romantic jealousy despite being in a committed relationship. For this reason, age might not assumedly be the only key factor that determines an experience of romantic jealousy.

Moreover, the last three items (6, 7, 8) were created to identify respondents' relationship length. Operationally stated, being in a romantic relationship was endorsed if the respondents' relationship was at least one month intact (Furman & Buhrmester, 2009). Kennedy-Lightsey and Booth-Butterfield (2011) proposed that couples are more insecure and jealous in early romantic relationships due to uncertainty. Indeed,

considerable scholars identified one month or two months as a minimum eligible length of a romantic relationship (Fleischman et al., 2005; Guerrero et al., 2011).

In this study, a validation of romantic relationships implemented the notion of Furman and Winkles (2010), namely, romantic involvement and commitment that may be different in degrees. Romantic relationships among heterosexual men and women include: dating or seeing one person casually, dating or seeing more than one person, having an exclusive boyfriend/girlfriend or having a serious relationship, engaged or living with someone else, and married. Through self-report questionnaires, anyone indicating a relationship status within the continuum of five types and at least one-month duration was taken into analyzes. This conclusion was derived from theoretical concepts regarding romantic involvement and commitment (Furman & Winkles, 2010; Dush & Amato, 2005). Thus, these eligibility criteria determined whether respondents were qualified for participating. Those, who failed to meet criteria above, were dropped from analyzes.

In the second section, face concerns (self, other, and mutual) were identified as dependent variables according to the research questions. In addition to the conceptual definition, this study referred to face as an ego or image projection of individuals in a heterosexual romantic relationship. Face concerns for most Thais are based primarily on a high emphasis of *kreng jai* (consideration for others) and *rak sa na* (face-saving) (Suntaree Komin, 1990). For the terms of *kreng jai* and *rak sa na*, these perceptions do not refer to fear as several scholars suggested. Regardless of superior-inferior and familiar-unfamiliar relationships, face-saving may be displayed in different ways in degrees. The key is not to impose someone, cause inconvenience, and intrude someone's ego. In a romantic relationship, the study focused on the extent to which heterosexual individuals placed their emphasis on "rak sa na" in terms of concern for self-face, other-face, and mutual-face during jealousy experiences and expressions.

Operationally, respondents were asked to recall their experience when they felt jealous. The study employed key terms of face concerns proposed by Oetzel et al. (2008), namely, a concern for self-face, other-face, and mutual-face. However, the modification was performed to align with Thai contexts. In other wordss, the study optimized the theoretical concepts of Oetzel et al., but minimizing ambiguity and aligning sentences with Thai contexts of *rak sa na* (Suktaree Komin, 1990) were carried

out. To measure a concern for self-face, a high concern for saving self-face demonstrated a priority for protecting one own face under the circumstances during jealousy experience. Indeed, the given statements on the survey did not involve consideration for respondents' partner. On the other hand, a concern for saving other-face emphasized only an avoidance of enacting some behaviors that would hurt the lover's feeling and damage his/her face. It was an exclusive consideration for others. Finally, the extent of concern for saving mutual-face was operated by pinpointing a notion of maintaining a relationship and a reduction of the face loss effect on both parties in a romantic relationship. This aspect did not focus exclusively on either one own face or the lover's face, but relational harmony. The concern for face regardless of self-face, other-face, and mutual-face was primarily conditioned by the context of romantic relationship and romantic jealousy. In addition to the manifestation of face concerns, this study only reflected face-saving in times of behavioral jealousy expressions. Therefore, a concern for face, when jealousy does not erupt, was not included in this study.

On self-report questionnaires, the respondents were asked to consider the given statements related to a concern for self-face, other-face, and mutual-face in relational situations when romantic jealousy erupted. Additionally, the instructions mainly guided the respondents to ponder their attitudes towards the given statements on the basis of their concern for self and their partner, excluding other parties. Face concerns were initially assessed with 34 items developed by Ting-Toomey and Oetzel (2001).

However, in this study, nine items were optimized to survey face concerns of Thai men and Thai women in a conflict with their partner. The study did not employ all elements from the original model; In other words, only some items were selected and modified to make an alignment with the phenomena in Thai culture. Specifically, the concept of face-saving (face-saving) was employed to reflect Thai practices. The scale was designed to measure three distinct features of the face related to romantic jealousy among heterosexual Thai men and women. The items were appraised with a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). 9 items were constructed by maintaining the original key concepts of self-face, other-face, and mutual-face, but the contents in each item were modified according to theories proposed by (Klausner, 1993; Knutson et al., 1995; Nitthaya Chaimanee, 2003; Suntaree Komin,

1990). The scale was exclusively implemented to examine Thai individuals in a heterosexual romantic relationship. Some items under the subscales were modified by changing words to make the sentence align more with the context of romantic relationships (e.g. changing the term “other people” to “my partner”).

According to the subscales, each subscale, regarding a concern for self-face, other-face, and mutual-face, included three items to measure face-saving. With respect to the distribution of elements on the questionnaires, other-face measurement consisted of items number: 2, 3, 7 while self-face implemented statements number: 4, 5, 9. Last, items number 1, 6, 8 were marked to identify mutual-face.

The following section was communicative responses to jealousy. According to the conceptual definition employed in this study, communicative responses to jealousy referred to behaviors in reaction to romantic jealousy according to an existence of the real threat, not an imagined threat. Also, those behavioral expressions had to display in the respondents' current relationship. Behavioral responses were either direct or indirect. It could be expressed in either public or private. Showing either partner-directed or rival-directed approach was also considered since the subscale already classified types of the response. The study eliminated emotional and cognitive factors. The study did not concentrate on both instant and late responses. It solely lied its utmost focus on behaviors when the respondents felt jealous in reaction to the real threat. Therefore, the study was proceeded to investigate overall behavioral inclinations toward jealousy associated with a concern for keeping face in Thai society among heterosexual males and females.

Guerrero et al. (2011) provided a thorough revision of the CRJ scale. The CRJ scales were revised several times due to the length of items and inconsistent factor structures. The newest version of the CRJ scale successfully affirmed the consistency with the past work, a more validity and reliability of measurement.

Therefore, this study optimized the use of the revised CRJ scale (Guerrero et al., 2011). Nevertheless, an alignment with the potential behaviors in contemporary Thai phenomena and a reduction of redundancy were carried out, resulting in twenty-five items altogether. The statements were rewritten to suit Thai society and eliminate cultural ambiguity. The constructed measurement was to examine the frequencies of

behavioral jealousy expressions in reaction to the intense jealousy the respondents enacted in their current relationship, not in their past relationships.

Regarding subscales, twenty-five items were divided into 11 subscales. For the first subscale, negative communication employed four items, for example, made hurtful or mean comments to my partner. Two items were proceeded to assess the violence communication (e.g., used physical forces with my partner). Two items were used to measure counter-jealousy induction (e.g., flirted or talked about others to make my partner jealous). Those responses above were identified as destructive communication. There were two subscales (i.e., integrative communication and compensatory restorations) fallen under constructive communication. Two items were deemed to determine integrative communication, for instance, calmly question my partner. Then, the measurement of compensatory restorations was based on two items, namely becoming more affectionate to my partner.

Additionally, denial and silence were two distinct subscales with respect to the avoidance communication. Denial subscale consisted of two items (e.g., denied feeling jealous) in total. A single item was implemented to address the extent of silence responses such as becoming quiet. In terms of rival-focused communication, this response was a rival-directed. Importantly, the rival focus could be displayed in both a partner's presence and his/her absence. Three unique subscales (i.e., rival contacts, derogation of rivals, and signs of possession) were theoretically considered as responses toward potential rivals. Likewise, two items were assigned to average an inclination in the matter of rival contacts, such as confronting the rival and discussing the situation with him/her. Three questions were applied to measure derogation of rivals (e.g., made negative comments about the rival). Finally, surveillance response consisted of item number 3, 16, and 23. This response referred to monitoring behaviors such as checking up on jealous person's partner. Two items were brought into play in an attempt to underline signs of possessions, such as making sure rivals knew my partner is taken.

The original statements, served as principal components, were not radically altered as the meaning of the discourses is somehow conventional and straightforward. However, some words written in Thai were slightly modified to be as much commensurate as possible with Thai perceptions in terms of discourse interpretations. Importantly, all items were carefully examined to simplify the meanings and yield an

optimum and comprehensive output. A 7-point Likert-type was employed to specify a continuum of (7) always and (1) never responses. Accordingly, the full implementation of the respective elements ensured a reliable data collection.

3.6 Analysis of Data

Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 20 was optimized to analyze all the numerical and relevant data. Descriptive Statistics technique was used to display demographic information of respondents in percentage, means and standard deviation. In times of data analyzes, a composite score were performed for each subscale regarding three facets of face and jealousy reactions, yielding separate three subscales and eleven subscales, respectively. The answers to those items related to each subscale were averaged to make a subscale score, and subsequently those subscale scores were counted as variables for the analyzes. Also, gender regarding sexual attractions was coded with a value as a matter of statistical analyzes on SPSS, 1 for heterosexual male and 2 for a heterosexual female. An unknown connection between face concerns and CRJ in previous research leads to an extensive exploration rather than a hypothetical test (e.g., Guerrero et al., 1995, 2011; Oetzel et al., 2003; Oetzel et al., 2008; Ting-Toomey & Korogi, 1998). For this reason, research questions were drawn from the respectable knowledge gaps to discover gender differences in associations between three aspects of face-saving and communicative responses to romantic jealousy. A procedure of data analyzes was described below.

RQ 1: Are there gender differences in face-saving concerns (self-face, other-face, and mutual-face) during romantic jealousy?

This question focused on differences in concerns for the face between males and females. Therefore, gender (heterosexual male/female) was manipulated as independent variables or factors whereas face concerns divided into three variables were dependent variables. An independent sample t-test was implemented to investigate a difference in means. Beneficially, the independent sample t-test enables more than one dependent variables. Gender (2 levels: heterosexual male/female) was placed in a factor box. Face concerns, self-face, other-face, and mutual-face, were entered into a dependent variable box at once. Accordingly, if an independent samplet-

test revealed a significant difference in means ($p < .05$) between males' and females' concerns for three faces, means and standard deviations of both groups would be drawn to locate a difference. If not ($p > .05$), the result probably yielded no significant gender difference in face concerns, which was relatively equal to each other.

RQ 2: Are there gender differences in communicative responses to romantic jealousy?

First, independent variables and dependent variables were identified. Specifically, gender was employed as independent variables while dependent variables were communicative responses to jealousy, including 11 variables. An independent sample t-test was utilized to yield a significant result. As a rationale above, the independent sample t-test statistical technique determined significant differences between two groups on dependent variables in comparison with chi-square and ANOVA. Briefly, chi-square is used to compare frequencies of non-parametric data, for instance, gender and ethnicity. On the other hand, ANOVA is statistically used to test a significance of group differences, but it does not indicate in which a difference lies (Waller & Johnson, 2013). The data of CRJ is parametric/continuous, In other words, interval/ratio, which is normally distributed. Therefore, neither chi-square is suitable for parametric data nor ANOVA is in terms of being unable to identify a significant difference on variables of interest. In times of analyzing data, a gender variable was added to a factor or an independent variable box. Accordingly, since communicative responses to jealousy comprised 11 subscales, each subscale was counted as a single variable for this study. Specifically, 11 variables were placed in a dependent variable box at once, and all variables were analyzed simultaneously. If the independent sample t-test indicated that there was a significant difference among variables, identifying which variable or/ response was significantly different would be performed by finding $p\text{-value} < .05$. A gender comparison was subsequently performed by means of identifying means of both groups.

RQ 3: Are there gender differences in relationships between face-saving concerns (self-face, other-face and mutual-face) and communicative responses to jealousy?

Concerning examine a relationship between concerns about face-saving and CRJs in the current study, the Pearson correlation was deployed to determine the

relationship between face concerns and jealousy behaviors. First, respondents were split into two groups based on gender categories. Henceforth, the correlation analysis was performed by means of inputting all variables, both three subscales of face-saving and those of communicative responses to jealousy. The output yielded separate boxes according to genders. By looking at p-value in each correlation box, if the p-value was less than .05, it would indicate a significant correlation between variables. More importantly, to identify a gender difference in correlation coefficients, Fisher's r-to-z transformation was performed (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). The test yielded a z-score of the two groups and compared both. A z-score was significant at level .01 and .05.

Overall, the study was quantitatively exploratory in an intrinsic effort to look at associations between face-saving and behavioral jealousy expressions in terms of gender differences – a study in Thailand. 130 respondents were asked to complete a questionnaire with respect to respondents' affirmative willingness and anonymity. Only 112 respondents were eligible, however. Self-administered questionnaires were distributed to respondents, based upon random sampling. Then, all the eligible data were taken into analyzes, except for those failing to meet criteria. Since the study fundamentally utilized a quantitative method, the author employed inferential statistics to analyze the data based on research questions in SPSS program version 20. Accordingly, an independent sample t-test statistics was applied to analyze data for RQ1 and RQ2, and Pearson correlation coefficient analysis was exclusively utilized to answer RQ3. Importantly, the ultimate goal of the study was to aim for eliciting a salient finding that probably contributed to a more understanding of Thai people's behaviors in both genders regarding an interpersonal intimacy.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

After following methodological approaches, this study yielded some salient findings. Specifically, this chapter reports the results according to research questions and a selection of populations. First, descriptive information of the samples was presented, and the following sections displayed a result of the independent sample t-test. Lastly, results of the Pearson correlation statistics demonstrated a relationship between concerns about face-saving and jealousy behaviors. Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the variables were reported to ensure reliability and validity of the data.

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

The sample consisted of 130 Thai respondents. There were 75 male respondents (57.7%) and 55 female respondents (42.3%). However, only 63 males respondents (56.3%) and 49 females respondents (43.8%) were eligible for the analyzes. The age range was from 18 to 57 years old, with an average of 34.9 years old ($SD=11.45$). According to the survey, the respondents were asked to identify their current romantic relationship status. An average showed 17 respondents (13.1%) in dating or seeing one person casually, 3 respondents (2.3%) in dating or seeing more than one person, 44 respondents (33.8%) in a serious relationship, 2 respondents (1.5%) in an engaged or cohabiting relationship, and 47 respondents (36.2%) in marriage. Also, the length of their relationship ranged from 1 month to 38 years was 9.3 in means ($SD=9.4$). Finally, the eligible respondents' occupations varied, with an average of 39 respondents (30%) as a student, 60 respondents (46.2%) as a state enterprise officer, 21 respondents (16.2%) as a company employee, 2 respondents (1.5%) as a business owner, 5 respondents (3.8%) as a self-employment, and 3 respondents (2.3%) as other status.

The number did not include 18 unqualified respondents who failed to meet eligibility criteria. Ten respondents (7.7%) indicated their sexual attractions to both males and females. Only four respondents (3.1%) reported “not sure.” Those identifying their sexual attractions to both sexes and the same sex were considered as homosexual individuals in this study. Besides, there were 17 respondents (13.1%) who were not in a romantic relationship.

4.2 Reliability Analysis of Instruments

All variables were checked to ensure internal consistency. The items of each subscale were analyzed by performing Cronbach’s alpha statistical analysis.

For a concern for self-face consisting of item number 4, 5 and 9, Cronbach’s alpha was .75. A concern for other-face (2, 3, and 7) yielded .81. Also, the reliability coefficient for a concern for mutual-face was .74. (See Table 4.1)

According to communicative responses to romantic jealousy, Cronbach’s alpha analysis for negative communication was .71 while that of violence communication was .75. The reliability coefficient of counter-jealousy induction was .71, for integrative communication was .83, for compensatory restoration was .78. Cronbach’s alpha also yielded .81 for denial, .73 for surveillance, .74 for rival contacts, .71 for derogations of a rival, and .87 for signs of possession. However, item number 10, silence response, was not analyzed to produce Cronbach’s alpha reliability since Cronbach’s alpha solely measures the internal consistency among items. According to Wells and Wollack (2003), it is acceptable to have a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher. (See Table 4.2)

Table 4.1 Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients for Concerns about Face-saving

Face concerns	Cronbach’s alpha
Self-face	.75
Other-face	.81
Mutual-face	.74

Table 4.2 Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Communicative Responses to Jealousy

Communicative responses to jealousy	Cronbach's alpha
Negative communication	.71
Violence communication	.75
Counter-jealousy induction	.71
Integrative communication	.83
Compensatory restoration	.78
Denial	.81
Silence	N/A
Surveillance	.73
Rival contacts	.74
Derogations of rival	.70
Signs of possession	.87

Note: N/A in silence means that Cronbach's alpha did not yield scores for silence because silence response was measured with one item. Cronbach's alpha is to identify consistency in multiple variables.

4.3 Results

4.3.1 RQ 1: Are there Gender Differences in Face-Saving Concerns during Romantic Jealousy?

An independent sample t-test was performed to compare heterosexual males and females in saving self-face, other-face, and mutual-face when feeling jealous. There was no significant difference in saving self-face for heterosexual males ($M=3.39$, $SD=.89$) and heterosexual females ($M=3.21$, $SD=.83$); $t(110)=1.13$, $p>.05$. These results suggested that males and females were not different in terms of having a high concern for their face when they experienced jealousy in their romantic relationships.

On the other hand, an independent sample t-test yielded a significant difference in saving other-face for heterosexual males ($M=3.69$, $SD=.76$) and heterosexual females ($M=3.37$, $SD=.86$); $t(110)=2.06$ $p=.042$. These results indicated that more males than females had a high concern for their partner's face.

Regarding to mutual-face concern, an independent sample t-test produced no significant difference in saving mutual-face for heterosexual males ($M=4.01$, $SD=.71$) and heterosexual females ($M=3.85$, $SD=.65$); $t(110)=1.23$, $p>.05$. The results implied that neither males nor females cared mutual-face more than one another in a when feeling jealous in a romantic relationship. (See Table 4.3)

Table 4.3 Means and Standard Deviations for Face-Saving between Men and Women

Face-saving concerns	Male (N=63)		Female (N=49)	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Self-face	3.39	.89	3.21	.83
Other-face	3.69**	.76	3.37**	.86
Mutual-face	4.01	.71	3.85	.65

Note: ** Significant gender difference at .05 level

Table 4.3 shows that there is a significant gender difference in other-face-saving between heterosexual males and females in the study. Specifically, other-face-saving was stronger and more prominent for men than for women when jealousy arose in a romantic relationship.

4.3.2 RQ 2: Are there Gender Differences in Communicative Responses to Romantic Jealousy?

For the research question, an independent variable was heterosexual males and females coded as 1 for men and 2 for women. The independent variable was placed into a separate sample t-test analysis as a grounded variable. All items according to communication responses to romantic jealousy were entered into a dependent variable box at once.

An independent sample t-test was performed to compare means between males ($N=63$) and females ($N=49$) regarding jealousy behaviors in a heterosexual romantic relationship. There was a significant difference in negative communication for males ($M=2.51$, $SD=.84$) and females ($M=3.51$, $SD=1.10$); $t(110)=-5.494$, $p<.05$. The results presented that females in a heterosexual romantic relationship were inclined to express jealousy through negative communication more than male counterparts.

However, the independent t-test yielded no significant difference in violence communication for men ($M=1.49$, $SD=.85$) and women ($M=1.76$, $SD=1.11$); $t(110)=-1.46$, $p>.05$. The results showed that there was no gender difference in using violence communication to convey their romantic jealousy; In other words, Thai men and women in this study had the equivalent degree of violence communication.

For counter-jealousy induction, the findings suggested a significant difference that females ($M=2.87$, $SD=1.48$) in this study reported a greater frequency of counter-jealousy induction as a jealousy expression than that of male counterparts ($M=2.08$, $SD=.90$); $t(110)=-3.48$, $p<.05$.

The independent sample t-test produced a result output that there was no significant gender difference in integrative communication ($t(110)=-.56$, $p>.05$) and compensatory restoration ($t(110)=-1.23$, $p>.05$). Particularly, the respective results concluded that Thai males ($M=4.09$, $SD=1.31$) and females ($M=4.23$, $SD=1.15$) did not significantly differ in expressing jealousy through integrative communication. Also, Thai males ($M=4.67$, $SD=1.23$) and females ($M=4.97$, $SD=1.32$) in the study equally used compensatory restoration in an average frequency.

In addition, the results of an independent sample t-test yielded no significant gender difference in denial ($t(110)=-.64$, $p>.05$) and silence ($t(110)=-1.54$, $p>.05$). The overall mean scores of males ($M=3.67$, $SD=1.29$) and females ($M=3.82$, $SD=1.18$) were

not significantly different in denial. Notably, heterosexual males and females in this study equally enacted denial as a response to jealousy. By the same token, the average score showed that males ($M=3.81$, $SD=1.58$) and females ($M=4.27$, $SD=1.54$) were not significantly different regarding an inclination of silence.

Additionally, the results of t-test revealed that surveillance, $t(110)=-3.98$; $p<.05$, and derogations of rival, $t(110)=-2.69$; $p<.05$, significantly differed between males and females. Thai females ($M=3.14$, $SD=1.27$) were more inclined to use surveillance to express their jealousy than Thai males ($M=2.28$, $SD=1.01$) in this study.

However, the t-test did not yield a significant gender difference in rival contacts, $t(110)=-1.62$; $p>.05$, and signs of possession, $t(110)=-.86$; $p>.05$. Specifically, males and females equally expressed romantic jealousy through rival contacts and signs of possession. (See Table 4.4)

Table 4.4 Means and Standard Deviations for Communicative Responses to Jealousy

CRJs	Male (N=63)		Female (N=49)	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Negative communication	2.51**	.84	3.51**	1.10
Violence communication	1.49	.85	1.76	1.11
Counter-jealousy induction	2.08**	.90	2.87**	1.48
Integrative communication	4.09	1.31	4.23	1.15
Compensatory restoration	4.67	1.23	4.97	1.32
Denial	3.67	1.29	3.82	1.18
Silence	3.81	1.58	4.27	1.54
Surveillance	2.28**	1.01	3.14**	1.27
Rival contacts	1.45	.79	1.73	1.04
Derogations of rival	1.83**	.91	2.37**	1.21
Signs of possession	2.82	1.31	3.07	1.74

Note: ** Significant gender difference at .05 level

Table 4.4 presents an inclination of jealousy expression between heterosexual males and females. As shown, females were more likely to use negative communication than male counterparts. Moreover, the table also shows a gender difference in counter-jealousy induction between males and females. Namely, more females than males were prone to make their partner jealous as a counter-response. Additionally, the findings suggested that females tended to enact surveillance more than males did. Besides, the results prominently indicated that discrediting the potential rival was a response more females than males were subject to do. There was no significant gender difference in other responses between males and females. Markedly, they were equivalent in response to jealousy through violence communication, integrative communication, compensatory restoration, denial, silence, rival contacts, and signs of possession.

4.3.3 RQ 3: Are there Gender Differences in Relationships between Face-Saving Concerns (Self-Face, Other-Face and Mutual-Face) and Communicative Responses to Jealousy?

A Pearson correlation coefficient was conducted to examine whether face concerns would be correlated with communicative responses to jealousy between heterosexual Thai males and females.

Negative communication was not correlated with self-face [$r(49)=.149, p>.05$], other-face [$r(49)=-.045, p>.05$], and mutual-face [$r(49)=-.204, p>.05$] for females, and for males, $r(63)=-.234, r(63)=-.152, r(63)=.75$, respectively.

Violence communication was negatively correlated with mutual-face concern for females, $r(49)=-.323, p<.05$, but not for males, $r(63)=-.178$., Fisher's r -to- z transformation was employed to compare coefficients using formula 2.8.5 from Cohen and Cohen (1983). The respective test was designed particularly to test whether the obtained correlation coefficients of the two samples were equal. The difference between these correlations was not statistically significant, $Z=0.791, p>.05$. However, a Pearson correlation coefficient for violence communication did not yield a significant correlation with self-face and other-face in both females [$r(49)=.140; r(49)=-.107$] and males [$r(63)=.086; r(63)=-.058$].

Counter-jealousy induction was negatively correlated with mutual-face concern for females, $r(49)=-.326, p<.05$, but not for males, $r(63)=-.157$. The difference between

these correlations was not statistically significant, $Z=0.919$, $p>.05$. The results revealed that counter-jealousy induction was not correlated with self-face and other-face for both females [$r(49)=.122$; $r(49)=.062$] and males [$r(63)=-.035$; $r(63)=-.085$].

According to the integrative communication, the statistical analysis showed that integrative communication was positively correlated with other-face and mutual-face for both females, [$r(49)=.374$, $p<.01$; $r(49)=.469$, $p<.01$], and males, [$r(63)=.348$, $p<.01$; $r(63)=.496$, $p<.01$]. The difference between the correlations was not statistically significant, $Z=-.0153$, $p>.01$ for other-face, $Z=.18$, $p>.01$ for mutual-face.

The compensatory restoration was positively correlated with other-face and mutual-face for males, [$r(63)=.336$, $p<.01$; $r(63)=.372$, $p<.01$], but not for females [$r(49)=-.128$, $p>.01$; $r(49)=.055$, $p>.01$], respectively. The difference between these correlations was not statistically significant for other-face, $Z=2.441$, $p>.01$, and for mutual-face, $Z=1.713$, $p>.01$. There was no correlation between compensatory restoration and self-face for both males, $r(63)=.149$, $p>.01$ and females, $r(49)=-.177$, $p>.01$.

For denial, the test revealed that denial was positively correlated with self-face, $r(49)=.579$, $p<.01$, other-face, $r(49)=.468$, $p<.01$, and mutual-face, $r(49)=.412$, $p<.01$, for females, but only other-face, $r(63)=.295$, $p<.05$, and mutual-face, $r(63)=.325$, $p<.01$, for males. Only denial and self-face for males were not significantly correlated; $r(63)=.245$, $p>.05$. Fisher's transformation was performed. Namely, there was no significant gender difference between the respective correlations for self-face, $Z=-2.097$, $p>.01$, for other-face, $Z=-1.038$, $p>.01$, and for mutual-face, $Z=-.0514$, $p>.01$. The correlations between face concerns and denial for females and males were not significantly different.

The model of Pearson correlation coefficient produced a significant result that silence was positively correlated with three facets of face for females; $r(49)=.388$, $p<.01$ for self-face; $r(49)=.371$, $p<.01$ for other-face; $r(49)=.333$, $p<.05$ for mutual-face, but not for males, $r(63)=-.098$; $r(63)=-.028$; $r(63)=.137$, respectively. The gender difference between correlations was statistically significant for silence and self-face, $Z=-2.591$, $p<.01$. However, there was no significant gender difference in correlations for silence and other-face, $Z=-2.131$, $p>.01$, and for silence and mutual-face, $Z=-1.063$,

$p > .01$. The results suggest that increases in the use of silence in correlation with increases in saving self-face were more important for Thai females in this study.

Also, the results of Pearson correlation coefficient revealed that surveillance was negatively correlated with mutual-face for females, $r(49) = -.324$, $p < .05$, but not for males, $r(63) = .061$, $p > .05$. The gender difference between these correlations was statistically significant, $Z = 2.027$, $p < .05$. The results suggest that females were inclined to engage in increases in using surveillance as a response to jealousy in correlation with decreases in saving mutual-face in a romantic relationship. However, surveillance was not correlated with self-face and other-face for both females [$r(49) = -.012$; $r(49) = -.129$] and males [$r(63) = -.128$; $r(63) = -.139$].

A Pearson correlation coefficient revealed that rival contacts were negatively correlated with mutual-face for both females, $r(49) = -.285$, and males, $r(63) = -.287$. However, there was no significant correlation between rival contacts and self-face for both females; $r(49) = -.016$, $p > .05$, and males; $r(63) = .001$, $p > .05$, along with no correlation between rival contacts and other-face, for females; $r(49) = .001$, $p > .05$, for males; $r(63) = -.156$, $p > .05$. The findings suggested that more frequent use of rival contacts would result in the decreasing inclination of saving mutual-face for both females and males. According to the gender difference between correlations, Fisher's test revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between female correlation and male correlation, $Z = -.011$, $p > .05$. There was no great gender difference in a relationship between rival contacts and mutual-face.

Regarding derogations of a rival, the model of Pearson correlation coefficient yielded no correlation between derogations of rival and three facets of face for females; $r(49) = .176$, $p > .05$ for self-face; $r(49) = .030$, $p > .05$ for other-face; $r(49) = -.180$, $p > .05$ for mutual-face, and for males; $r(63) = .039$, $p > .05$ for self-face; $r(63) = -.100$, $p > .05$ for other-face; $r(63) = -.132$, $p > .05$ for mutual-face. That is, both genders did not engage a notion of saving self-face, other-face, and mutual-face with the use of derogations of a rival.

Lastly, signs of possession were not significantly correlated with all face concerns for both females and males. For females, the statistical test yielded no correlation for self-face, $r(49) = .006$, $p > .05$; for other-face, $r(49) = .019$, $p > .05$; for mutual-face, $r(49) = -.012$, $p > .05$. In addition, there was no correlation for male

counterparts either; for self-face, $r(63)=-.116, p>.05$; for other-face, $r(63)=.191, p>.05$; for mutual-face, $r(63)=.097, p>.05$.

Table 4.5 Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Face Concerns and Communicative Responses to Romantic Jealousy among Heterosexual Thai Men and Women

CRJs	Male			Female		
	Self-face	Other-face	Mutual-face	Self-face	Other-face	Mutual-face
Negative communication	-.234	-.152	.75	.149	-.045	-.204
Violence communication	.086	-.058	-.178	.140	-.107	-.323*
Counter-jealousy induction	-.035	-.085	-.157	.122	.062	-.326*
Integrative communication	.116	.348**	.496**	.163	.374**	.469**
Compensatory restoration	.149	.336**	.372**	-.117	-.128	.055
Denial	.245	.295*	.325**	.579**	.468**	.412**
Silence	-.098	-.028	.137	.388**	.371**	.333*
Surveillance	-.128	-.139	.061	-.012	-.129	-.324*
Rival contacts	.001	-.156	-.287*	-.016	.001	-.285*
Derogations of rival	.039	-.100	-.132	.176	.030	-.180
Signs of possession	-.116	.191	.097	.006	.019	-.012

Note: ** Correlation is significant at .01 level

* Correlation is significant at .05 level

Table 4.6 Z-score: Gender Difference in Relationships between Face-Saving and CRJs (The table below showed the overlapping relationships for females and males)

	Self-face <i>Z-score</i>	Other-face <i>Z-score</i>	Mutual-face <i>Z-score</i>
Negative communication	-	-	-
Violence communication	-	-	.791
Counter-jealousy induction	-	-	.919
Integrative communication	-	-.153	.18
Compensatory restoration	-	2.441	1.713
Denial	-2.097	-1.038	-.514
Silence	-2.591**	-2.131	-1.063
Surveillance	-	-	2.027*
Rival contacts	-	-	-.011
Derogations of rival	-	-	-
Signs of possession	-	-	-

Note: ** Z-score is significant at .01 level

* Z-score is significant at .05 level

As shown above, Table 4.5 presents significant relationships between face-saving and jealousy responses among heterosexual Thai men and women. In Table 4.6, the overlapping relationships between variables for men and women were identified, and gender differences in a relationship between face-saving and jealousy behaviors were tested by optimizing Fisher's *r*-to-*z* transformation. The test enabled correlation coefficients to be converted into a z-score, and the comparison between z-scores were carried out (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). The difference between two samples were identified at .01 level ($Z > 2.58$) and .05 level ($Z > 1.96$).

The z-tests revealed two prominent findings. First, there was a significant gender difference in a relationship between silence and self-face, which means more females than males in the study were inclined to engage in the use of silence in response

to romantic jealousy and saving self-face at the same time. Second, an association between surveillance and mutual-face in a negative fashion was stronger for females, but not for males. On the other hand, z-tests did not present any gender differences in other associations. Specifically, there was no gender difference in a relationship between face concerns and other reactions to jealousy.

Overall, the findings were prominent in terms of shedding some light on behaviors in response to jealousy and face-saving in Thai culture. The study was an initial step for future research, serving a reflection of the phenomena to some extent and a survey questionnaire used in Thai contexts. Although most Thai individuals hold a perception of face-saving, the study illuminated that gender expectations still determine jealousy mechanism and a concern about face-saving.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This quantitative study has three significant contributions. First, the primary contribution is that it is the first exploratory study on gender differences in face-saving and communicative responses to romantic jealousy in Thailand. Second, it is original to check a reliability of the constructed questionnaires used in Thai contexts. In addition to the third contribution, this paper demonstrates the difference between Thai men and women in the given subjects above on a surface level. Significantly, previous studies have been conducted to prove that understanding gender differences in behaviors and mindsets contributes to a substantial reduction of misinterpretations and judgmental biases (De Angelis, 2012; Gray, 1992).

5.1 Implications

5.1.1 Gender Differences in Face-Saving during Romantic Jealousy

The results of this study provide the overview of prone behaviors in response to romantic jealousy and face-saving in Thai culture. The findings suggest that there is a gender difference in face-saving for others. Specifically, Thai men in this study report a higher concern for their partner than women in times of being jealous. The findings demonstrate an avoidance of face threat to their partners that Thai men in this study are concerned. In fact, the findings partially support past work of Suntaree Komin (1990, pp. 48-56) that Thai men are more other-oriented than women counterparts. Suntaree Komin even found that more Thai men than women are likely to place high values on being interdependent (mutually helpful), obedient-respectful and self-controlled (tolerant-restrained). Suntaree Komin (1990, p. 54) additionally stressed that a high value of interdependence among Thai men reinforces the hierarchical function of autocracy and patriarchy in Thai society. The differences between past research and

this study are that this study specifically focuses on jealousy in romantic relationships whereas Suntaree Komin (1990) concentrated on the instrumental values.

Furthermore, the current findings also yield underlying notions that Thai men still practice detachment attitude to secure themselves from displaying their jealousy. The study of Suntaree Komin (1990, p. 179) supports the current findings that more Thai men than women avoid expressing their negative emotions towards others on account of a person of strength. In other words, a majority of Thais believe that a person of strength can withhold their emotions. In addition, De Angelis (2012) even emphasized that male characters are traditionally portrayed as strong, unemotional, and central. Therefore, some men need to have total control over their partners by not showing their insecurity and dependency on women (De Angelis, 2012, p. 40). Explicitly, De Angelis (2012, p. 109) even concurred with the statements made by many experts that “a man is uncomfortable when he sees a woman becoming emotional because he is uncomfortable with his vulnerable feelings.” Inasmuch as the respective observation, it is possible that Thai men in this study believe that despite feeling jealous they do not succumb to expressing their negativity in order to uphold their strength and to save their women’s face. Notably, this study also demonstrates the socially expected patterns of face practice among men. More importantly, men claim that they comply with the social norms of protecting women. Despite the increasing gender equality, Thai men and women are still different in terms of face-saving.

Also, the findings reveal that there is no gender difference in saving self-face and mutual-face. Interestingly, the findings are not consistent with the results of Suntaree Komin (1990). She remarkably argued that Thai women are more self-oriented. Nevertheless, no gender difference in saving self-face may be due to how this study basically assigned the meanings to self-face in romantic jealousy experience. Suntaree Komin solely concentrated on the holistic view of primary life goal values and supportive values between Thai men and women. Her study did not provide some insight into how caring for face and ego regarding three aspects of face would be associated with a given response to romantic jealousy. Even though Thai men and women are culturally oriented to collectivism, the findings show that they still exert an ego value of independence due to a significant consideration of self-face.

5.1.2 Gender Differences in Relationships between Communicative Responses to Romantic Jealousy and Face-Saving

According to communicative responses to romantic jealousy (CRJs), it is surprising that negative communication patterns, such as blaming their partner, enacting some punitive acts, devaluing the potential rival, and monitoring their partner, are common among women in this study. The findings replicate past works that women are more expressive than men and they tend to express their anger and blame (Bowen, 1978; Croucher et al., 2012; De Weerth & Kalma, 1993). Furthermore, the findings also suggest that Thai women do not mull over face-saving concern when they particularly use negative jealousy expressions. The current findings are compatible with the assertion of Suntaree Komin (1990, p. 55) that a majority of Thai women possess personality traits of expressing feelings and emotions more freely.

Additionally, White (1980) underlined the fact that women are more likely to use counter-jealousy induction as a punitive act, which is consistent with the current results. Although it is socially expected that women should be less aggressive than men, De Angelis (2012) argued in her book that it is acceptable for women to express emotions whereas men are expected to suppress theirs. Hence, the findings demonstrate some profound implications that in romantic relationships men find it difficult for them to enact potentially destructive behaviors as such behaviors may lead them to become more emotional and thus losing control over themselves and their partners. Moreover, previous study even proved that Thai men value self-control more than women (Suntaree Komin, 1990, p. 54). This may be a reason why Thai men reported negative associations between compensatory restoration and face-saving for other-face as well as mutual-face. As a result, using this behavior in reaction to romantic jealousy ensures patriarchal patterns that men are responsible for women, both physically and emotionally. Similarly, the current findings support the past work of Guerrero and Afifi (1999, pp. 235-236) that the use of compensatory restorations was motivated by an effort to maintain a relationship. Specifically, the results elaborate upon an implication that Thai men are more concerned about saving their partner's face or ego, and thus they enact this behavioral pattern of jealousy than women, who showing no correlation.

Another interesting finding is that the negative associations between mutual-face and surveillance were stronger for Thai women. Previous research revealed that a

jealous individual who used surveillance would be too preoccupied with reducing an uncertainty about the rival or protecting their self-esteem (Guerrero & Afifi, 1999). As a negative result, Guerrero and Afifi (1999, p. 237) posited that this behavior may bring an embarrassment to the jealous person since the partner may assume that the jealous person is overly paranoid and controlling. Thus, it is tentative that the repercussion Thai women in this study experience is a loss of their face, and indeed their action is a threat to their partner's face or ego, resulting in damaging relational trust and harmony (Suntaree Komin, 1990, pp. 159-162). The results suggest that identifying the primitive motive of Thais' behaviors in response to romantic jealousy may provide a more understanding of how a particular jealousy manifestation functions in romantic relationships.

Furthermore, there is no gender difference in integrative communication. Nevertheless, the current findings are not compatible with prior research that more women than men tended to use integrating styles to express their jealousy. Unexpectedly, the present study provides contrasting results that Thai men and women do not display a sharp distinction. Particularly, Aylor and Dainton (2001, p. 380) claimed that integrative communication was positively associated with femininity. Considering to this, jealousy expressions among Thai men and women are equivalent in terms of using soft and constructive strategies. More importantly, the findings also demonstrate face-saving for other-face and mutual-face in times of enacting integrative styles. Accordingly, it is tentative that expressing emotions in a polite manner is still pervasive in Thai culture regardless of genders.

Regarding positive associations between silence and face-saving for self-face, the findings indicate stronger associations for women. Specifically, Thai women in this study care more about their self-image in jealousy experience. They claim that they are not willing to display their vulnerability and insecurity to their partners through an overt expression of jealousy. As a result, Thai women rather shut down in an attempt to protect themselves. Guerrero's suggestion (1998) supports the findings above that an avoidance of disclosing emotions is a result of fear of judgment. She even added that jealous individuals with negative thoughts of others used avoidance strategies (e.g., silence) more frequently than those with positive views of others. Additionally, the findings imply that Thai women become more self-oriented when they adopt silence in

response to romantic jealousy. On the contrary, there is no such positive association for Thai men. This lack of correlation for men may be due to different social expectations. Considering to this, previous researchers argued that Thai men were more likely to use dismissing behaviors to protect and regain their self-esteem (Bryson, 1977; Buunk, 1986; Mathes, 2003; Wongpakaran et al., 2012). As a consequence, it is probable that Thai men care more about their self-esteem than their face during jealousy expression.

Another interesting finding is that the negative associations between mutual-face and surveillance was stronger for Thai women, but not for Thai men. Previous research revealed that a jealous individual who used surveillance would be too preoccupied with reducing an uncertainty about the rival or protecting their self-esteem (Guerrero, 1998, p. 286; Guerrero & Afifi, 1999, p. 237). Furthermore, there is a theoretical support from Guerrero (1998) that using surveillance behaviors demonstrates fearful avoidants in attachment styles. As a negative result, Guerrero and Afifi (1999, p. 237) posited that using this behavior while trying to avoid expressing jealousy is counterproductive. Accordingly, surveillance may bring an embarrassment to the jealous person since the partner may assume that the jealous person is overly paranoid and controlling (Guerrero & Afifi, 1999, p. 237). Presumably, this behavioral pattern may be harmful to relationship maintenance. Thus, it is tentative that the repercussion Thai women in this study experience is a loss of their face, and indeed their action is a threat to their partner's face or ego, resulting in damaging relational trust and harmony (Suntaree Komin, 1990, pp. 159-162). The results suggest that identifying the primitive motive of Thais' behaviors in response to romantic jealousy may provide a more understanding of how a particular jealousy manifestation functions in romantic relationships. With respect to gender communication, the findings also suggest that taking the effect of the response on the partner into account may enhance an awareness of how the targeted partner (both Thai men and women) cognitively, emotionally, and behaviorally respond to a certain jealousy expression.

Overall, it is apparent that there are still gender differences in face-saving and communicative responses to romantic jealousy among Thai people. However, some similarities among Thai men and women may be a result of cultural influences. Unsurprisingly, Thai men still dominate women that they need to exert their masculinity by protecting women's feelings. With these differences, communicative responses to

romantic jealousy and face-saving need to be further investigated to avoid gender misunderstanding. In conclusion, the findings reveal that there is an inevitable influence of globalization that introduce Thai people to cultural transitions and different perspectives of gender identity.

5.2 Methodological Implications

This study was designed to construct the model to measure jealousy behaviors and face concerns among Thai men and women. The findings suggest that the model is sufficiently reliable that it shows some relationships between face concerns and behavioral jealousy expressions. This model is primarily considered as initial evidence to examine communicative responses to jealousy and face-saving in Thai culture. However, the sole utilization of survey model identifies some deficits in an evaluation of behavioral jealousy expressions and face-saving. For instance, the model cannot offer an account of how respondents choose a particular choice and why it matters to data interpretations.

Moreover, methodological definitions of various terms produce different outcomes. First, the ambiguity of the terms such as silence should be defined with caution due to its extensive meanings. For this reason, the qualitative examination should be conducted with respect to an inclusive set of possible meanings.

Regarding an involvement of multidimensional jealousy, a sole study on behavioral expressions may not be able to include all possible aspects of the participants. Cognition and jealousy-related emotions may yield influence the respondent's personal choice of behaviors. Nevertheless, the current model was primarily constructed to investigate the jealousy responses at the behavioral level. The study did not focus on a complexity of human behaviors. In particular, future research may extend the areas of interest by determining personal differences and the effect of individuals' prone behaviors and ways of thinking. The findings also suggest that the model cannot provide the profound meanings of participants' behaviors and perceptions of face-saving at the expense of situational explanations. Quantitative data might not provide adequate explanations to the distinction of individuals' personality and intelligence. Regardless of quantitative data, the results of the qualitative study would

only represent personal conditions. Thus, qualitative and quantitative approaches should be incorporated to validate the reliability and objectivity. Presumably, individual observations may fortify the generalizing results with empirical facts.

Last but not least, a time of behavior occurrence should be identified as some responses such as compensatory restorations, and surveillance may be also considered as post-response to romantic jealousy with different relational goals. The findings suggest that a determination of actual motivations might contribute to explaining how motivations govern individuals' behaviors in reaction to romantic jealousy. With the benefits of discovering real motives, individuals may be able to handle their jealousy experience and jealousy expressions more.

More importantly, the previous studies suggested that young adults (20-23) tended to experience romantic jealousy more than older couples (Guerrero et al., 2011). Instead, these findings reveal that ages do not influence the way people experience and express jealousy. In contrast, it is tentative that gender is a contributing factor to differences in face-saving and communicative responses to romantic jealousy. However, the greater number of samples may produce a sharp distinction, and thus generations may be another crucial factor if the size is ample.

Thus, the overall model was constructed to test whether the model produced some significant findings as an initial measurement for future research. The survey shows that gender is a crucial factor in experience and expression of romantic jealousy. Concerning enriching explanations to jealousy behaviors and face-saving, an incorporation of qualitative and quantitative methods need to be carried out. Consequently, differences in gender communication in romantic relationships will probably decline, and personal experiences during jealousy will become better.

5.3 Limitations, Recommendations for Future Research and Conclusions

Since the study is the quantitative-based approach, there are several limitations that need to be addressed in future research. Although the strength of the study is to provide the instrument applied in Thai contexts, the study does not provide an in-depth explanation to the likelihood of different behaviors in romantic jealousy. This is due to

the fact that quantitative survey cannot suffice information on contextual factors that helps explaining variations in behaviors and perceptions.

5.3.1 Target Populations and Methodological Approaches

The sample size is also a limitation as 112 respondents cannot represent the whole Thai society. Since the research is constructed to test the instrument, the number of respondents above are limited and based on convenience samplings that cannot be used to make a significant claim. Future research should be able to include more samples if the scholars would like to make a representative of the phenomenon in Thai society. Moreover, a majority of populations in this study are middle class. Therefore, the findings do not provide a generalizing result that can represent a majority of Thais. Further studies should consider sampling distribution that includes the variance of a sample.

Although the questionnaires showed the acceptable reliability of the collected data, the obvious limitation is that it is challenging to make the respondents understand how they should complete the questionnaires. In other words, the survey questionnaires do not contain an experimental case for the respondents. The provision of the case study is important as it draws respondents to the same understanding. How they do the survey will ensure a standard. Therefore, future research should construct a case study for respondents so that it confirms the increased accuracy. An accuracy is intended to ensure an evaluation of respondents' prone behaviors in times of romantic jealousy experience.

5.3.2 Methodological Terms

The current study did not examine face concerns in great details that may reflect personal differences. Face is not normative that every individual holds the same value. Cultural and personal perceptions are complicated; thus, future studies may utilize a qualitative approach to examine concern for face. Future narratives may also help to enhance understandings and dimensions of face-saving (*rak sa na*) in romantic relationships. What is more, face concern theory used in the study does not include the scope of acquisition of face and restoration of face. Future studies may consider the aspects above of face in behavioral jealousy expressions. Last but not least, since face

concerns are not exercised all the time, the concern for face may be before, during, and after jealousy expressions. It will be more meaningful if future research can take this perspective into account.

Overall, the research provides a model for further studies to explore behaviors in reaction to romantic jealousy and face-saving. The study is an initial step in demonstrating gender difference in concern for face during jealousy expressions. It reflects how gender affects face-saving and jealousy behaviors as well as their relationships. An incorporation of personal narratives should be taken into account to produce insightful explanations in great details. It is beneficial to Thai people to evaluate their jealousy reactions and face-saving practices. With such benefits, it is apparent that Thai individuals can also improve and sustain their relationships in times of jealousy explosion. As a result, the importance of this study is to reduce relational conflicts and gender misunderstandings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Afifi, W. A., & Reichert, T. (1996). Understanding the role of uncertainty in jealousy experience and expression. *Communication Reports*, 9(2), 93-103.
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Allison, P. D. (1999). *Multiple regression: A primer*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Andersen, P. A. (1998). Researching sex differences within sex similarities: The evolutionary consequences of reproductive differences. In D. J. Canary & K. Dindia (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication: Critical essays and empirical investigations of sex and gender in interaction* (pp. 83-100). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Andersen, P. A. (2006). The evolution of biological sex differences in communication. In D. J. Canary & K. Dindia (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication* (2nd ed., pp. 117-136). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Andersen, P. A., Eloy, S. V., Guerrero, L. K., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1995). Romantic jealousy and relational satisfaction: A look at the impact of jealousy experience and expression. *Communication Reports*, 8(2), 77-85.
doi:10.1080/08934219509367613
- Apichat Chamrathirong, Sirinan Kittisuksathit, Chai Podhisita, Pimonpan Isarabhakdi, & Malee Sabaiying. (2007). *National sexual behavior survey of Thailand 2006* (IPSR Publication No. 338). Nakhon Pathom: Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University.
- Apter, T. (1990). *Altered loves: Mothers and daughters during adolescence*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Archer, J. (1996). Sex differences in social behavior: Are the social role and evolutionary explanations compatible? *American Psychologist*, 51(9), 909-917. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.51.9.909

- Argyle, M. and Henderson, M. (1984). The rules of friendship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 1(2), 211-237. doi:10.1177/0265407584012005
- Attridge, M. (2013). Jealousy and relationship closeness: Exploring the good (reactive) and bad (suspicious) sides of romantic jealousy. *SAGE Open*, 3(1), 1-16. doi:10.1177/2158244013476054
- Aylor, B., & Dainton, M. (2001). Antecedents in romantic jealousy experience, expression, and goals. *Western Journal of Communication*, 65(4), 370-391. doi:10.1080/10570310109374717
- Baxter, L. A. (1984). An investigation of compliance-gaining politeness. *Human Communication Research*, 10(3), 427-456. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.1984.tb00026.x
- Bevan, J. L. (2008). Experiencing and communicating romantic jealousy: Questioning the investment model. *Southern Communication Journal*, 73(1), 42-67. doi:10.1080/10417940701815626
- Bevan, J. L., & Stetzenbach, K. A. (2007). Jealousy expression and communication satisfaction in adult sibling relationships. *Communication Research Reports*, 24(1), 71-77. doi:10.1080/08824090601128224
- Boiger, M., Güngör, D., Karasawa, M., & Mesquita, B. (2014). Defending honour, keeping face: Interpersonal affordances of anger and shame in Turkey and Japan. *Cognition and Emotion*, 28(7), 1255-1269. doi:10.1080/02699931.2014.881324
- Borisoff, D., & Marrill, L. (1998). *The power to communicate: Gender differences as barriers* (3rd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Bowen, M. (1978). *Family therapy and clinical practice*. New York: Aronson.
- Brainerd, E., Jr., Hunter, P. A., Moore, D., & Thompson, T. R. (1996). Jealousy induction as a predictor of power and the use of other control methods in heterosexual relationships. *Psychological Reports*, 79(3f), 1319-1325. doi:10.2466/pr0.1996.79.3f.1319
- Bringle, R. G., & Buunk, B. P. (1985). Jealousy and social behavior. In P. Shaver (Ed.), *Self, situations, and social behavior: Vol. 6 Review of personality and social psychology* (pp. 241-264). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryson, J. B. (1977, August). *Situational determinants of the expression of jealousy*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Bryson, J. B. (1991). Modes of response to jealousy evoking situations. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 178-210). New York: Guilford Press.
- Buck, R., Baron, R., & Barrette, D. (1982). Temporal organization of spontaneous emotional expression: A segmentation analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(3), 506-517. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.42.3.506
- Buck, R., Miller, R. E., & Caul, W. F. (1974). Sex, personality and physiological variables in the communication of affect via facial expression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30(4), 587-596. doi:10.1037/h0037041
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science*, 3(4), 251-255. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.1992.tb00038.x
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(2), 193-221.
- Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Kirkpatrick, L. A., Choe, J. C., Lim, H. K., Hasegawa, M., ... Bennett, K. (1999). Jealousy and the nature of beliefs about infidelity: Tests of competing hypotheses about sex differences in the United States, Korea, and Japan. *Personal Relationships*, 6(1), 125-150. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.1999.tb00215.x
- Buunk, B. P. (1981). Jealousy in sexually open marriages. *Alternative Lifestyles*, 4(3), 357-372. doi:10.1007/bf01257944
- Buunk, B. P. (1982). Strategies of jealousy: Styles of coping with extra marital involvement of the spouse. *Family Relations*, 31(1), 13-18. doi:10.2307/584196
- Buunk, B. P. (1986). Husbands. In R. A. Lewis & R. E. Salt (Eds.), *Men in families* (pp. 97-114). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Buunk, B. P., & Dijkstra, P. (2000). Extradysadic relationships and jealousy. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A sourcebook* (pp. 317-329). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Buunk, B. P., & Hupka, R. B. (1987). Cross-cultural differences in the elicitation of sexual jealousy. *Journal of Sex Research*, 23(1), 12-22.
doi:10.1080/00224498709551338
- Cancian, F. (1989) Love and the rise of capitalism. In B. J. Risman & P. Schwartz (Eds.), *Gender in intimate relationships: A microstructural approach* (pp. 12-25). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Canelon, J., & Ryan, T. (2013). Facework, gender, and online discussion: A negotiation perspective. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 110-124.
- Carmody, D. L., & Carmody, J. T. (1996). *Serene compassion: A Christian appreciation of Buddhist holiness*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Carson, C. L., & Cupach, W. R. (2000). Fueling the flames of the green-eyed monster: The role of ruminative thought in reaction to romantic jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication*, 64(3), 308-329.
doi:10.1080/10570310009374678
- Casullo, M. M., & Liporace, F. M. (2003). Los sentimientos de celos en las relaciones sexuales de adultos argentinos [Jealousy in sexual relationships among Argentine adults]. *Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnostico Y Evaluacion Psicologica*. 15(1), 43-55.
- Chan, K. L. (2006). The Chinese concept of face and violence against women. *International Social Network*, 49(1), 65-73. doi:10.1177/0020872806059402
- Chan, K. L. (2012). The Role of Chinese face in the perpetration of dating partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(4), 793-811.
doi:10.1177/0886260511423242
- Cloven, D. H., & Roloff, M. E. (1991). Sense-making activities and interpersonal conflict: Communicative cures for the mulling blues. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 55(2), 134-158. doi:10.1080/10570319109374376
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Croucher, S. M., Homsey, D., Guarino, L., Bohlin, B., Trumpetto, J., Izzo, A., ... Sykes, T. (2012). Jealousy in four nations: A cross-cultural analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, 29(4), 353-360.
doi:10.1080/08824096.2012.723273
- De Angelis, B. (2012). *Secrets about men: Every woman should know*. London: HarperCollins.
- De Weerth, C., & Kalma, A. P. (1993). Female aggression as a response to sexual jealousy: A sex role reversal? *Aggressive Behavior*, 19(4), 265-279.
doi:10.1002/1098-2337(1993)19:4<265::AID-AB2480190403>3.0.CO;2-P
- DuBrin, A. J. (1991). Sex and gender differences in tactics and influence. *Psychological Reports*, 68(2), 635-646. doi:10.2466/pr0.68.2.635-646
- Dugosh, J. W. (2000). On predicting relationship satisfaction from jealousy: The moderating effects of love. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 5(17), 254-263.
- Dush, C. M. K., & Amato, P. R. (2005). Consequences of relationship status and quality for subjective well-being. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22(5), 607-627. doi:10.1177/0265407505056438
- Edlund, J. E., & Sagarin, B. J. (2009). Sex differences in jealousy: Misinterpretation of nonsignificant results as refuting the theory. *Personal Relationships*, 16(1), 67-78. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2009.01210.x
- Ellestad, J., & Stets, J. E. (1998). Jealousy and parenting: Predicting and emotions from identity theory. *Sociological Perspectives*, 41(3), 639-668.
doi:10.2307/1389567
- Embree, J. F. (1950). Thailand—A loosely structured social system. *American Anthropologist*, 55(2), 181-193. doi:10.1525/aa.1950.52.2.02a00030
- Fleischman, A. A., Spitzberg, B. H., Andersen, P. A., & Roesch, S. C. (2005). Tickling the monster: Jealousy induction in relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22(1), 49-73. doi:10.1177/0265407505049321

- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (2009). Methods and measures: The network of relationships inventory: Behavioral systems version. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 33(5), 470–478.
doi.org/10.1177/0165025409342634
- Furman, W., & Winkles, J. K. (2010). Predicting romantic involvement, relationship cognitions, and relationship qualities from physical appearance, perceived norms, and relational styles regarding friends and parents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 33(6), 827–836. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2010.07.004
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Goldenberg, J. L., Landau, M. J., Pyszczynski, T., Cox, C. R., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Dunnam, H. (2003). Gender-typical responses to sexual and emotional infidelity as a function of morality salience induced self-esteem striving. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(12), 1585-1595.
doi:10.1177/0146167203256880
- Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from mars, women are from venus: A practical guide for improving communication and getting what you want in your relationships*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Grossman, M., & Wood, W. (1993). Sex differences in intensity of emotional experience: A social role interpretation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(5), 1010-1022. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.5.1010
- Gudykunst, W. B., Yoon, Y.-C., & Nishida, T. (1987). The influence of individualism-collectivism on perceptions of communication in ingroup and outgroup relationships. *Communication Monographs*, 54(3), 295-306.
doi:10.1080/03637758709390234
- Guerrero, L. K. (1998). Attachment-style differences in the experience and expression of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships*, 5(3), 273-291.
doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.1998.tb00172.x
- Guerrero, L. K., & Afifi, W. A. (1998). Communicative responses to jealousy as a function of self-esteem and relationship maintenance goals: A test of Bryson's dual motivation model. *Communication Reports*, 11(2), 111-122.
doi:10.1080/08934219809367693

- Guerrero, L. K., & Afifi, W. A. (1999). Toward a goal-oriented approach for understanding communicative responses to jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication*, 63(2), 216-248. doi:10.1080/10570319909374637
- Guerrero, L. K., & Andersen, P. A. (1998a). The dark side of jealousy and envy: Desire, delusion, desperation, and destructive communication. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 33-70). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guerrero, L. K., & Andersen, P. A. (1998b). Jealousy experience and expression in romantic relationships. In P. A. Andersen & L. K. Guerrero (Eds.), *The handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications, and contexts* (pp. 155-188). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., Jorgensen, P. F., Spitzberg, B. H., & Eloy, S. V. (1995). Coping with the green-eyed monster: Conceptualizing and measuring communicative responses to romantic jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication*, 59(4), 270-304. doi:10.1080/10570319509374523
- Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2003, July). *Communicative responses to jealousy*. Featured research presentation at the annual conference of the International Association for Relationship Research, Madison, WI.
- Guerrero, L. K., Eloy, S. V., Jorgensen, P. F., & Andersen, P. A. (1993). Hers or his? The experience and communication of jealousy in close relationships. In P. J. Kalbfleisch (Ed.), *Interpersonal communication: Evolving interpersonal relationships* (pp. 109-132). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guerrero, L. K., Hannawa, A. F., & Babin, E. A. (2011). The communicative responses to jealousy scale: Revision, empirical validation, and associations with relational satisfaction. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 5(3): 223-249. doi:10.1080/19312458.2011.596993
- Guerrero, L. K., & Reiter, R. L. (1998). Expressing emotion: Sex differences in social skills and communicative responses to anger, sadness, and jealousy. In D. J. Canary & K. Dindia, (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication: Critical essays and empirical investigations of sex and gender in interaction* (pp. 321-350). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Guerrero, L. K., Trost, M. L., & Yoshimura, S. M. (2005). Romantic jealousy: Emotions and communicative responses. *Personal Relationships*, 12(2), 233-252. doi:10.1111/j.1350-4126.2005.00113.x
- Hansen, G. L. (1982). Reactions to hypothetical jealousy producing events. *Family Relations*, 31(4), 513-518. doi:10.2307/583926
- Hansen, G. L. (1983). Marital satisfaction and jealousy among men. *Psychological Reports*, 52(2), 363-366. doi:10.2466/pr0.1983.52.2.363
- Hansen, G. L. (1985). Perceived threats and marital jealousy. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 48(3), 262-268. doi:10.2307/3033686
- Hansen, G. L. (1991). Jealousy: Its conceptualization, measurement, and integration with family stress theory. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 211-230). New York: Guilford Press.
- Harris, P. L., Olthof, T., Terwogt, M. M., & Hardman, C. E. (1987). Children's knowledge of the situations that provoke emotion. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 10(3), 319-343. doi:10.1177/016502548701000304
- Ho, D. Y.-F. (1976). On the concept of face. *American Journal of Sociology*, 81(4), 867-884.
- Ho, D. Y.-F. (1994). Face dynamics: From conceptualization to measurement. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The challenge of facework: Cross-cultural and interpersonal issues* (pp. 269-286). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hofstede, G. H. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. H. (1998). Masculinity/Femininity as a dimension of culture. In G. H. Hofstede (Ed.), *Masculinity and femininity: The taboo dimension of National cultures* (pp. 3-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hu, H. C. (1944). The Chinese concept of "face". *American Anthropology*, 46(1), 45-64.
- Hudepohl, A. D., Parrott, D. J., & Zeichner, A. (2010). Heterosexual men's anger in response to male homosexuality: effects of erotic and non-erotic depictions of male-male intimacy and sexual prejudice. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57(8), 1022-1038. doi:10.1080/00918369.2010.503511

- Hupka, R. B. (1981). Cultural determinants of jealousy. *Alternative Lifestyles*, 4(3), 310-356. doi:10.1007/bf01257943
- Hupka, R. B., & Bank, A. L. (1996). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution or social construction? *Cross-Cultural Research*, 30(1), 24–59.
doi:10.1177/106939719603000102
- Ingle, M. (1983). Local governance and rural development in Thailand. In N. T. Uphoff (Ed.), *Rural development & local organization in Asia* (pp. 62-201). Delhi: Macmillan.
- Ivy, D. K., & Backlund, P. (Eds.). (2008). *Genderspeak: Personal effectiveness in gender communication* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson/Ilyn and Bacon.
- Johnson, P. (1976). Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. *Journal of Social Issues*, 32(3), 99-110. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1976.tb02599.x
- Kennedy-Lightsey, C., & Booth-Butterfield, M. (2011). Responses to jealousy situations that evoke uncertainty in married and dating relationships. *Communication Quarterly*, 59(2), 255-275.
doi:10.1080/01463373.2011.563443
- Kim, M.-S., Lee, H.-R., Kim, I. D., & Hunter, J. E. (2004). A test of a cultural model of conflict styles. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 14(2), 197-222.
doi:10.1075/japc.14.2.02kim
- Klausner, W. J. (1981). *Reflections on Thai culture: Collected writings*. Bangkok: Suksit Siam.
- Klausner, W. J. (1993). *Reflections on Thai culture* (4th ed.). Bangkok: Siam Society.
- Knapp, M. L., Ellis, D. G., & Williams, B. A. (1980). Perceptions of communication behavior associated with relationship terms. *Communication Monographs*, 47(4), 262-278. doi:10.1080/03637758009376036
- Knutson, T. J. (1994). Comparison of Thai and US American cultural values: 'Mai Pen Rai' versus 'just do it'. *ABAC Journal*, 14(3), 1-38.
- Knutson, T. J., Vivatananukul, M., & Hwang, J. C. (1995). A comparison of communication apprehension between Thai and USA samples: The identification of different cultural norms governing interpersonal communication. *Journal of the National Research Council of Thailand*, 27(1), 21-46.

- Kramarae, C. (1981). *Women and men speaking: Frameworks for analysis*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Lans, O., Mosek, A., & Yagil, Y. (2014). Romantic jealousy from the perspectives of Bowen's concept of differentiation and gender differences. *The Family Journal*, 22(3), 321-331. doi:10.1177/1066480714530835
- Liang, G. & Han, J. (2005). A contrastive study on disagreement strategies for politeness between American English and Mandarin Chinese. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(1), 155-166.
- Lim, T. (1990). Politeness behavior in social influence situations. In J. P. Dillard (Ed.), *Seeking compliance: The production of interpersonal influence messages* (pp. 75-86). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Lim, T. (1994). Facework and interpersonal relationship. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The challenge of facework cross-cultural and interpersonal issues* (pp. 209-230). Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Mak, W. W. S., Chen, S. X., Lam, A. G., & Yiu, V. F. L. (2009). Understanding distress: The role of face concern among Chinese Americans, European Americans, Hong Kong Chinese, and Mainland Chinese. *The Counselling Psychologist*, 37(2), 219-248. doi:10.1177/0011000008316378
- Mathes, E. W. (2003). Are sex differences in sexual vs. emotional jealousy explained better by differences in sexual strategies or uncertainty of paternity? *Psychological Reports*, 93(3), 895-906. doi:10.2466/pr0.2003.93.3.895
- Mathes, E. W., & Severa, N. (1981). Jealousy, romantic love, and liking: Theoretical considerations and preliminary scale development. *Psychological Reports*, 49(1), 23-31. doi:10.2466/pr0.1981.49.1.23
- McIntosh, E. G. (1989). An investigation of romantic jealousy among black undergraduates. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 17(2), 135-141. doi:10.2224/sbp.1989.17.2.135
- McIntosh, E. G., & Matthews, C. O. (1992). Use of direct coping resources in dealing with jealousy. *Psychological Reports*, 70(3c), 1037-1038. doi:10.2466/pr0.1992.70.3c.1037
- Mead, M. (1931). Jealousy: Primitive and civilized. In S. D. Schmalhausen & V. F. Calverton (Eds.), *Women coming of age* (pp. 35-48). New York: Liveright.

- Melamed, T. (1991). Individual differences in romantic jealousy: The moderating effect of relationship characteristics. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 21(5), 455-461. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420210508
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Morisaki, S., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1994). Face in Japan and the United States. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The challenge of facework: Cross-cultural and interpersonal issues* (pp. 47-94). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mulder, N. (1979). *Inside Thai society: An interpretation of everyday life*. Bangkok, Thailand: Duang Kamol.
- Mulder, N. (1992). *Inside Thai society: An interpretation of everyday life* (3rd ed.). Bangkok, Thailand: Duang Kamol.
- Nitthaya Chaimanee. (2003). "Mai pen rai" on communicative phenomena in Thai culture. *MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities*, 6(1), 35-46.
- Oetzel, J., Garcia, A. J., & Ting-Toomey, S. (2008). The analysis of the relationships among face concerns and facework behaviors in perceived conflict situations: A four-culture investigation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 19(4), 382-403. doi:10.1108/10444060810909310
- Oetzel, J., & Ting-Toomey, S. (2003). Face concerns in interpersonal conflict: A cross-cultural empirical test of the face negotiation theory. *Communication Research*, 30(6), 599-624. doi:10.1177/0093650203257841
- Oetzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Chew-Sanchez, M. I., Harris, R., Wilcox, R., & Stumpf, S. (2003). Face and facework in conflicts with parents and siblings: A cross-cultural comparison of Germans, Japanese, Mexicans, and U.S. Americans. *Journal of Family Communication*, 3(2), 67-93. doi:10.1207/s15327698jfc0302_01
- Oetzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Masumoto, T., Yokochi, Y., Takai, J., & Wilcox, R. (2001). Face and facework in conflicts: A cross-cultural comparison of China, Germany, Japan, and The United States. *Communication Monographs*, 68(3), 235-258. doi:10.1080/03637750128061

- Oetzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Yokochi, Y., Masumoto, T., & Takai, J. (2000). A typology of facework behaviors in conflicts with best friends and relative strangers. *Communication Quarterly*, 48(4), 397-419.
doi:10.1080/01463370009385606
- Parrott, L., & Parrott, L. (2013). *The good fight: How conflict can bring you closer*. New York, NY: Worthy Publishing.
- Paul, M. (n.d.). *Yes, the silent treatment is emotional abuse – and you can stop it*. Retrieved January 15, 2015 from http://www.yourtango.com/experts/dr-margaret-paul/silent-treatment#.VLc_4nsuuXd
- Pfeiffer, S. M., & Wong, P. T. P. (1989). Multidimensional jealousy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 6(2), 181-196.
doi:10.1177/026540758900600203
- Phillips, H. P. (1965). *Thai peasant personality: The patterning of interpersonal behavior in the village of Bang Chan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pines, A. (1992). *Romantic jealousy: Understanding and conquering the shadow of love*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Pines, A., & Aronson, E. (1983). Antecedents, correlates and consequences of sexual jealousy. *Journal of Personality*, 51(1), 108-136. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1983.tb00857.x
- Pines, A., & Friedman, A. (1998). Gender differences in romantic jealousy. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138(1), 54-71.
doi:10.1080/00224549809600353
- Preacher, K. J. (2002). *Calculation for the test of the difference between two independent correlation coefficients* [Computer Software]. Retrieved from <http://quantpsy.org>
- Roongrenguke S., & Chansuthus D. (1998). Conflict management in Thailand. In K. Leung & D. Tjosvold (Eds.). *Conflict management in the Asia Pacific: Assumptions and approaches in diverse cultures* (pp. 167-221). Singapore: Wiley.

- Rydell, R. J., McConnell, A. R., & Bringle, R. G. (2004). Jealousy and commitment: perceived threat and the effect of relationship alternatives. *Personal Relationships, 11*(4), 451–468. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00092.x
- Sabini, J., & Green, M. C. (2004). Emotional responses to sexual and emotional infidelity: Constants and differences across genders, samples, and methods. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(11), 1375-1388. doi:10.1177/0146167204264012
- Sagarin, B. J., Becker, D. V., Guadagno, R. E., Nicastle, L. D., & Millevoi, A. (2003). Sex differences (and similarities) in jealousy: The moderating influence of infidelity experience and sexual orientation of the infidelity. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 24*(1), 17–23. doi:10.1016/s1090-5138(02)00106-x
- Salovey, P., & Rodin, J. (1985). The heart of jealousy. *Psychology Today, 19*(9), 22-29.
- Savin-Williams, R. C. (2006). Who's gay? Does it matter? *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15*(1), 40-44. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2006.00403.x
- Schutzwahl, A., & Koch, S. (2004). Sex differences in jealousy: The recall of cues to sexual and emotional infidelity in personally more and less threatening context conditions. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 25*(4), 249-257. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.03.006
- Sinnott, M. (2004). *Toms and dees: Transgender identity and female same-sex relationships in Thailand*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Suntaree Komin. (1990). *Psychology of the Thai people: Values and behavioral patterns*. Bangkok, Thailand: Research Center, National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA).
- Suntaree Komin. (1996). *Psychology of the Thai people: Values and behavioral patterns*. Bangkok, Thailand: Research Center, National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA).
- Suzuki, Shinobu. (1998). In-group and out-group communication patterns in international organizations: Implications for social identity theory. *Communication Research, 25*(2), 154-182. doi:10.1177/009365098025002002

- Theiss, J. A., & Solomon, D. H. (2006). Coupling longitudinal data and multilevel modeling to examine the antecedents and consequences of jealousy experiences in romantic relationships: A test of a relational turbulence model. *Human Communication Research*, 32(4), 469-503. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2006.00284.x
- Thinnapan Nakata, & Likit Dhiravegin. (1989). Social and cultural aspects of Thai policy. In Suchart Prasith-rathsint (Ed.), *Thailand's National Development: Social and economic background*. Bangkok, Thailand: Thai University Research Association.
- Timmerman, L. M. (2001). *Jealousy expression in long distance romantic relationships* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and database. (UMI No. 304718688)
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face negotiation theory. In Yong Yun Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 213-235). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). The matrix of face: An updated face-negotiation theory. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about Intercultural Communication* (pp. 71-92). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict: An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22(2), 187-225. doi:10.1016/s0147-1767(98)00004-2
- Ting-Toomey, S., & Oetzel, J. G. (2001). *Managing intercultural conflict effectively*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Vianen, A. E. M., & Fisher, A. H. (2002). Illuminating the glass ceiling: The role of organizational culture preference. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75(3), 315-337. doi:10.1348/096317902320369730
- Viorst, J. (1998). Confessions of a jealous wife. In G. Clanton & L. G. Smith (Eds.), *Jealousy* (3rd ed., pp. 17-24). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

- Waller, J. L., & Johnson, M. H. (2013). Chi-square and t-tests using SAS®: Performance and interpretation. *SAS Global Forum 2013* (pp. 430-2013). Augusta, Georgia. Retrieved September 25, 2014, from <https://support.sas.com/resources/papers/proceedings13/430-2013.pdf>
- Ward, J., & Voracek, M. (2004). Evolutionary and social cognitive explanations of sex differences in romantic jealousy. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 56(3), 165-171. doi:10.1080/00049530412331283381
- Wells, C. S., & Wollack, J. A. (2003). *An instructor's guide to understanding test reliability*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin. Retrieved January, 4, 2015 from <https://testing.wisc.edu/Reliability.pdf>
- Wells, K. E. (1960). *Thai buddhism, its rites and activities*. New York: AMS Press.
- White, B. T. (2009). Saving Face: The benefits of not saying I'm sorry. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 72(2), 261-270.
- White, G. L. (1980). Inducing jealousy: A power perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6(2), 222-227. doi:10.1177/014616728062006
- White, G. L. (1981). A model of romantic jealousy. *Motivation and Emotion*, 5(4), 295-310. doi:10.1007/BF00992549
- White, G. L. (1984). Comparison of four jealousy scales. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 18(2), 115-130. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(84)90024-2
- White, G. L., & Mullen, P. E. (1989). *Jealousy: Theory, research, and clinical strategies*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Wongpakaran, T., Wongpakaran, N., & Wedding, D. (2012). Gender differences, attachment Sstyles, self-esteem and romantic relationships in Thailand. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(3), 409-417. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.12.001
- Yoshimura, S. M., Guerrero, L. K., & Trost, M. R. (1999, November). *Toward a model of jealousy experience and expression: Association between treat, emotion, cognition, goals, and relational consequences*. Paper Presented at the National Communication Association Annual Convention, Chicago, IL.
- Yuki, M., Maddux, W. W., Brewer, M. B., & Takemura, K. (2005). Cross-cultural differences in relationship-and group-based trust. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(1), 48-62. doi:10.1177/0146167204271305

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Frequency and Percentage for Demographic Data

	Frequency	Percent
Participant	130	100
Sex		
Male	75	57.7
Female	55	42.3
Sexual Attraction		
Male	52	40
Female	64	49.2
Both males and females	10	7.7
Not sure	4	3.1
Occupation		
Student	39	30
State Enterprise officer	60	46.2
Company employee	21	16.2
Business owner	2	1.5
Self-employment	5	3.8
Others	3	2.3
Lover		
Yes	113	86.9
No	17	13.1

	Frequency	Percent
Relationship Status		
Dating or seeing one person casually	17	13.1
Dating or seeing more than one person	3	2.3
Having a serious relationship	44	33.8
Engaged or cohabiting	2	1.5
Married	47	36.2
Unidentified*	17	13.1

Note: Unidentified relationship status showed percent for the respondents who were not in a romantic relationship.

Appendix B

Means and Standard Deviations for Ages and Relationship Length

	Means	SD
Age (years)	34.89	11.45
Relationship length (month-years)	9.25	9.44

Appendix C

Questionnaires (English)

This questionnaire is a part of the study on gender and face concerns in communicative responses to romantic jealousy: A study in Thailand. I am conducting this study to gain more understanding of Thai heterosexual men's and women's behaviors in response to romantic jealousy. You might not receive a direct benefit from this study, but I believe that your response and participation will help me shed some more light on human behaviors regarding genders and interpersonal relationships. Therefore, your contribution to the study is truly appreciated. Although you will be asked about your attitudes, I reassure that your anonymity will be maintained. Only the data provided will be taken into analyses. Your completion of a questionnaire is expected to be about 10 minutes. Please feel free to ask if you have any question.

The survey consists of three sections

- Part 1: Demographic questions – 8 items
- Part 2: Face concerns in a romantic relationship – 9 items
- Part 3: Communicative responses to romantic jealousy – 25 items

Survey Part 1 (Demographic Questions)

Instruction: the following questions ask you general questions about “yourself”. However, you do not have to put your name or any identification on this survey. Therefore, you can be assured that the survey is anonymous. Please be as much honest as possible when answering the questions.

1. What is your nationality?
☐ 1. Thai ☐ 2. Other:.....
2. What sex were you assigned at birth, on your original birth certificate?
☐ 1. Male ☐ 2. Female
3. For your sexual attraction, I feel sexually attracted to... (Please check one)
☐ 1. Male ☐ 2. Female
☐ 3. Both sexes – male and female ☐ 4. I am not sure
4. What is your age? years old.
5. What is your current employment status?

- ☐ 1. Student
 ☐ 2. Government officer/state enterprise employee
☐ 3. Private/Company employee
 ☐ 4. Business owner
☐ 5. Self-Employment
 ☐ 6. Other.....

6. Are you in a relationship? (Please note: if you tick “No”, skip questions number 7 and 8)

- ☐ 1. Yes
 ☐ 2. No

7. If you are in a relationship, how do you describe your relationship status? (Please check one)

- ☐ 1. Dating or seeing one person casually
☐ 2. Dating or seeing more than one person
☐ 3. Having an exclusive boyfriend/girlfriend or having a serious relationship
☐ 4. Engaged or cohabiting with someone
☐ 5. Married

8. How long have you been in a current romantic relationship?year(s)
month(s)

Survey Part 2 (Face concerns in a romantic relationship)

Instruction:

Please think about the times when you felt jealous. **In times of jealousy, you found that your partner was interested in someone else or when someone was interested in your boyfriend/girlfriend.** Thus, your jealousy must originate only from an involvement of the opposite sex party whom you perceive to be a potential threat to your relationship.

The following statements ask you to indicate how much each item reflects what you would think and feel about yourself and your partner when jealousy arose. **Please note that the study asked you to think about how much you were concerned about yourself and your partner only, no involvement of others.** Please be as honest as possible.

➤ **Circle (O) the number you want to choose. One answer for each item.**

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided/don't know, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

When you feel jealous, have you ever...?	1	2	3	4	5
1. In times of jealousy, you did not directly express your jealousy because you did not want to lose face to your partner and threaten your partner's face.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Whenever you felt jealous, criticizing and blaming my partner should not do since it might have a negative effect on your partner's ego (face).	1	2	3	4	5
3. Maintaining your humbleness and composure during jealousy should do in order to save your partner's face.	1	2	3	4	5
4. When you felt jealous, you believed that letting your partner know how you felt should not do since you did not want to look bad in the eyes of your partner.	1	2	3	4	5
5. You felt embarrassed when you expressed your jealousy. You believed that you should remain clam in order to save your self-face.	1	2	3	4	5
6. In times of jealousy, you approached a peaceful resolution rather than hostile one because relationship harmony was important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
7. In order to keep face of your partner, you thought that indirect expressions should be performed.	1	2	3	4	5
8. You tried to control your romantic jealousy so that you were able to save both your face and your partners'.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Overt expressions made you feel embarrassed.	1	2	3	4	5

Survey Part 3 (Communicative responses to jealousy)

Instruction:

Please think about the times when you felt jealous. **In times of jealousy, you found that your partner was interested in someone else or when someone was interested in your boyfriend/girlfriend.** Thus, your jealousy must originate only from an involvement of the opposite sex party whom you perceive to be a potential threat to your relationship.

Before completing this section, please recall your jealous behaviors and jealousy experience in your current relationship. The following statements ask you to indicate the frequency you have ever expressed your jealousy in a particular way.

Please note that the question asks you whether you have ever used such an expression before in your current relationship. If you have never done that, please **“circle”** the appropriate choice such as never or rarely. Please be as much honest as possible when answering the questions below.

➤ **Circle (O) the number you want to choose. One answer for each item.**

1 = never, 2 = rarely (almost never), 3 = seldom (not often), 4 = occasionally, 5 = often, 6 = very often, 7 = always

When you are jealous, have you ever done...?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. You flirted with someone else in order to make your partner jealous too (both on social media and in face-to-face interactions).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. You showed or told your partner how much you loved him/her and how important he/she was to you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. You secretly looked through your partner's belongings such as computer and cell phone for evidence of cheating or contacting the potential rival.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. You pointed out the rival's bad qualities to convince your partner that that particular person was not good enough.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. You started to quarrel with, yelling at, and blaming your partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. You gave my partner the “silent treatment” or cold shoulder, and physically pulled away acting like he/she was invisible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

When you are jealous, have you ever done...?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. You became very sarcastic and made hurtful or mean comments on Facebook, Instagram, or other media to let your partner know that you was very upset but not directly tell him/her what made you upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. You directly told your partner how you felt and thought about the situation in a nice manner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. You became very emotional and moody in order to let my partner know that I was mad and upset	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. You became quiet but you did not show any negative emotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. You acted like you wasn't jealous pretending that nothing was wrong.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. You aggressively expressed your romantic jealousy through physical violence.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. You spent more time with your partner and showed more affection than usual.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. You acted like you were interested in someone else with no concern for your partner's feeling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. You avoided admitting to both yourself and your partner that you felt jealous by saying "no" when your partner asked you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. You became more suspicious and repeatedly called your partner or checked what your partner was doing, where he/she was, and with whom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. You tried to find the right time and calmly talk to and ask your partner about the situation in private.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

When you are jealous, have you ever done...?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. You talked about the potential rival with your friends in a negative way without the presence of your partner (both on social media and face-to-face conversations).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. You tried to contact the rival via social media, phone call, or meeting in person in order to discuss with the rival about the situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. You showed off your relationship with your partner on social media so that everyone would know we were together.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. You confronted the rival and likely ended up with physical violence.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. You showed your partner extra affection in public when you spotted the rivals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. You constantly spied on your partner's social media to see if he/she was talking to someone else.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. You called the rival names with/without your partner's and the target rival's presence.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. You hit or threw objects. I just vented my anger and jealousy on everything around me whether or not my partner was around.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Suggestion

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank you for your attention and participation

Appendix D

Questionnaires (Thai)

แบบสอบถามฉบับนี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาในหัวข้อเรื่อง เพศสภาพ (Gender) และการให้ความสำคัญกับการรักษาหน้าหรือภาพลักษณ์ (Self-image/ego/pride) ต่อพฤติกรรมการแสดงออกต่อความหึงหวง ผู้วิจัยศึกษาหัวข้อนี้เพื่อหวังว่าจะสามารถเพิ่มพูนความเข้าใจต่อพฤติกรรมของผู้ชายไทยและผู้หญิงไทยในการแสดงออกต่อความหึงหวง ท่านอาจไม่ได้ประโยชน์จากการศึกษานี้โดยตรง แต่ผู้วิจัยเชื่อว่าท่านจะช่วยให้การศึกษานี้ประสบความสำเร็จและเกิดความเข้าใจมากขึ้นในพฤติกรรมของมนุษย์ในแง่ของเพศสภาพและความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างบุคคล นอกจากนี้ แม้ว่าเนื้อหาในแบบสอบถามอาจถามถึงทัศนคติหรือความรู้สึกของท่าน ท่านก็สามารถมั่นใจได้ว่าตัวตนของท่านจะไม่ถูกเปิดเผย เนื่องจากแบบสอบถามไม่ต้องการให้ท่านระบุชื่อแบบสอบถามเป็นเพียงการสุ่มประชากรโดยรวม ข้อมูลที่ท่านให้มาเท่านั้นที่จะถูกนำไปวิเคราะห์ สุดท้ายนี้ แบบสอบถามนี้อาจใช้เวลาโดยประมาณ 10 นาที หากมีข้อสงสัยเพิ่มเติม กรุณาติดต่อผู้จัดทำได้ที่ ขอบขอบคุณค่ะ

แบบสอบถามมีทั้งหมด 3 ส่วน

- ส่วนที่ 1: ข้อมูลทั่วไป – 8 ข้อ
- ส่วนที่ 2: การให้ความสำคัญกับหน้าและภาพลักษณ์ในความสัมพันธ์ – 9 ข้อ
- ส่วนที่ 3: พฤติกรรมในการแสดงออกต่อความหึงหวง – 25 ข้อ

แบบสอบถามส่วนที่ 1 (ข้อมูลทั่วไป)

คำแนะนำ: คำถามต่อไปนี้เป็นคำถามเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลทั่วไปของคุณ แต่คุณไม่ต้องระบุชื่อลงไปแบบสอบถามนี้ ดังนั้นคุณจึงมั่นใจได้ว่าข้อมูลของคุณจะเป็นความลับ ดังนั้นกรุณาตอบแบบสอบถามตามความเป็นจริงที่สุด

1. คุณเป็นคนสัญชาติอะไร

- ☐ 1. ไทย ☐ 2. อื่นๆ:.....

2. เพศของคุณคือ (เพศที่ระบุบนใบแจ้งเกิด)

- ☐ 1. ผู้ชาย ☐ 2. ผู้หญิง

3. คุณมีความรู้สึกดังคุณทางเพศกับ... (โปรดเลือกเพียงข้อเดียว)

- ☐ 1. ผู้ชาย ☐ 2. ผู้หญิง
☐ 3. ทั้งชายและหญิง ☐ 4. ไม่แน่ใจ

4. คุณอายุเท่าไร ปี

5. อาชีพของคุณคือ?

- ☐ 1. นักเรียน/นักศึกษา ☐ 2. ข้าราชการ/พนักงานรัฐวิสาหกิจ
- ☐ 3. พนักงานเอกชน ☐ 4. เจ้าของธุรกิจส่วนตัว
- ☐ 5. รับจ้างทั่วไป ☐ 6. อื่นๆ:.....

6. ตอนนี้คุณมีคนรักหรือไม่? (ถ้าคุณเลือก “ไม่” ให้ข้ามคำถามข้อที่ 7 และ 8)

- ☐ 1. มี ☐ 2. ไม่มี

7. คุณคิดว่าสถานะความสัมพันธ์ของคุณกับคนรักเป็นแบบไหน? (โปรดเลือกเพียงข้อเดียว)

- ☐ 1. คบหากันธรรมดา ยังไม่คิดจริงจัง หรือลองคบ ๆ กันไปที่ละคน
- ☐ 2. คบหาหลายคนไปเรื่อย ๆ ยังไม่คิดจริงจังอะไร
- ☐ 3. มีแฟนเป็นตัวเป็นตน จริงจังกับการคบกัน ไม่คิดจะมองหาคนอื่นอีก
- ☐ 4. หมั่นแล้วหรืออยู่ร่วมกันก่อนแต่ยังไม่ได้แต่งงาน
- ☐ 5. แต่งงานแล้ว

8. คุณคบหาอยู่กับคนรักคนปัจจุบันมานานเท่าไรแล้วเดือน.....ปี

แบบสอบถามส่วนที่ 2 (การให้ความสำคัญกับหน้าและภาพลักษณ์ในความสัมพันธ์)

คำแนะนำ:

กรุณานึกถึงช่วงเวลาที่คุณรู้สึกหึงหวงคนรักของคุณ โดยความหึงหวงในงานวิจัยนี้เป็นความหึงหวงที่เกิดจากการที่คุณพบว่าคนรักของคุณสนใจคนอื่น (เช่น พูดคุยกับคนอื่นในทางสุภาพหรือมีความสัมพันธ์ที่เกินกว่าคำว่าคนรู้จักหรือเพื่อน เป็นต้น) หรือคนอื่นมาสนใจคนรักของคุณ ดังนั้นประสบการณ์เกี่ยวกับความหึงหวงของคุณจะต้องมาจากการที่มีบุคคลที่สามเข้ามาเกี่ยวข้อง โดยที่คุณรู้สึกว่าความสัมพันธ์ของคุณกับคนรักเริ่มไม่มั่นคง

คำถามที่จะถามคุณต่อไปนี้ต้องการให้คุณระบุว่าในแต่ละข้อนั้นคุณเห็นด้วยมากน้อยเพียงใดหรือไม่เห็นด้วยเลย โดยยึดเอาจากสิ่งที่คุณ “คิด” หรือ “รู้สึก” ในยามที่คุณรู้สึกหึงหวงคนรักของคุณ โดยให้ความสำคัญแก่คุณกับคนรัก ไม่เกี่ยวข้องกับบุคคลอื่น กรุณาตอบแบบสอบถามตามความเป็นจริงด้วยค่ะ

➤ ให้วงกลม (O) ตัวเลขที่คุณต้องการเลือก เลือกข้อละหนึ่งคำตอบเท่านั้น

1 = ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง, 2 = ไม่เห็นด้วย, 3 = ไม่แน่ใจ, 4 = เห็นด้วย, 5 = เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

เวลาที่คุณหึงหวง คุณเคยคิดหรือรู้สึก...	1	2	3	4	5
10. ในเวลาที่คุณหึงหวง คุณจะไม่แสดงอาการหึงหวงออกไปตรง ๆ เพราะคุณไม่ต้องการให้คนรักรู้สึกเสียหน้า พร้อม ๆ กับที่คุณไม่ต้องการเสียหน้าเช่นกัน	1	2	3	4	5

เวลาที่คุณหึงหวง คุณเคยคิดหรือรู้สึก...	1	2	3	4	5
11. ในยามที่คุณหึงหวง คุณคิดว่าคำหึงหวงคนเดียวคนรักเป็นสิ่งที่ไม่ควรทำ เพราะจะมีผลกระทบต่อภาพลักษณ์/หรือความรู้สึกของคนรักได้	1	2	3	4	5
12. เวลาที่คุณหึงหวง การไม่แสดงออกและเก็บอารมณ์หึงหวงเอาไว้ เป็นสิ่งที่ควรทำ เพราะคุณไม่ต้องการทำให้คนรักเสียหน้า	1	2	3	4	5
13. คุณคิดว่าการแสดงให้คนรักเห็นว่าความรู้สึกไม่ดีและไม่พอใจในสิ่งที่เขา/เธอทำเป็นสิ่งที่ไม่ควร เพราะมันทำให้คุณดูแย่ในสายตาของคนรัก	1	2	3	4	5
14. คุณรู้สึกขายหน้าหากคุณแสดงอาการหึงหวง คุณคิดว่าสิ่งที่ควรทำคือทำตัวเป็นปกติ เพื่อรักษาหน้าตนเอง	1	2	3	4	5
15. ในยามหึงหวง คุณเลือกที่จะแก้ปัญหาโดยการพูดคุยกันด้วยเหตุและผลเพื่อรักษาความสัมพันธ์และความรู้สึกของทั้งสองฝ่ายให้ดียิ่งขึ้น	1	2	3	4	5
16. เพื่อเป็นการรักษาหน้าและรักษาน้ำใจของคนรัก คุณคิดว่าควรแสดงพฤติกรรมหึงหวงแบบอ้อม ๆ	1	2	3	4	5
17. คุณพยายามควบคุมความหึงหวงของคุณเพื่อรักษาหน้าของตัวเองและคนรัก	1	2	3	4	5
18. คุณคิดว่าการแสดงความรู้สึกหึงหวงอย่างเปิดเผย ทำให้คุณรู้สึกอับอาย	1	2	3	4	5

แบบสอบถามส่วนที่ 3 (พฤติกรรมการแสดงออกต่อความหึงหวง)

คำแนะนำ:

กรุณานึกถึงช่วงเวลาที่คุณรู้สึกหึงหวงคนรักของคุณ โดยความหึงหวงในงานวิจัยนี้เป็นความหึงหวงที่เกิดจากการที่คุณพบว่าคนรักของคุณสนใจคนอื่น (เช่น พุดคุยกับคนอื่นในทางผู้สาวหรือมีความสัมพันธ์ที่เกินกว่าคำว่าคนรู้จักหรือเพื่อน เป็นต้น) หรือคนอื่นมาสนใจคนรักของคุณในทางผู้สาวเช่นเดียวกัน ดังนั้นประสบการณ์เกี่ยวกับความหึงหวงของคุณจะต้องมาจากการที่มีบุคคลที่สามเข้ามาเกี่ยวข้อง โดยที่คุณรู้สึกว่าคนรักของคุณอาจจะเปลี่ยนใจไปชอบคนอื่นนอกจากคุณ

ก่อนเริ่มทำแบบสอบถามในส่วนถัดไป กรุณานึกถึงพฤติกรรมการแสดงออกความหึงหวงของคุณที่เคยประสบมาในช่วงระยะเวลาที่คบกันกับคนรักคนปัจจุบันเท่านั้น โดยคำถามในแต่ละข้อจะให้คุณระบุความบ่อยของการแสดงออกความหึงหวงในรูปแบบต่าง ๆ ตามเป็นจริงที่คุณได้กระทำมา

ข้อควรจำ หากคำถามในข้อใดไม่ตรงตามประสบการณ์ของคุณหรือไม่ได้บ่งบอกถึงความเป็นคุณให้เลือก “ไม่เคยเลย” หรือ “แทบจะ ไม่เคย” โปรดตอบคำถามตามความเป็นจริงที่สุดเพื่อประโยชน์ในการวิจัยค่ะ ขอบขอบคุณค่ะ

➤ ให้วงกลม (O) ตัวเลขที่คุณต้องการเลือก เลือกข้อละหนึ่งคำตอบเท่านั้น

1 = ไม่เคยเลย, 2 = แทบจะไม่เคย, 3 = ไม่บ่อยนัก, 4 = เป็นบางครั้งบางคราว, 5 = บ่อย, 6 = บ่อยมาก, 7 = ตลอด

เวลาที่คุณหึง คุณมักจะ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. คุณประหลาดประชันคนรักโดยการไปคุยกับเพศตรงข้ามหรือพูดถึงใครอีกคน เพื่อให้คนรักหึงหวง (ทั้งบนโลกออนไลน์และอื่น ๆ)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. คุณแสดงออกให้คนรักรู้ว่าคุณรักเขา/เธอมากแค่ไหน โดยการบอกรักหรือบอกว่าเขา/เธอสำคัญกับคุณมากแค่ไหน	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. คุณแอบตรวจสอบดูข่าวของเครื่องใช้ของคนรักเช่นคอมพิวเตอร์ส่วนตัวหรือโทรศัพท์มือถือเพื่อที่จะหาว่ามีการนอกใจหรือการติดต่อกับเพศตรงข้ามที่คุณสงสัยหรือไม่	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. คุณพูดถึงข้อเสียต่าง ๆ ของผู้ชายหรือผู้หญิงอื่นที่คุณสงสัยว่าแอบกิ๊กกับคนรัก เพื่อที่จะทำให้คนรักรู้สึกไม่ดีกับบุคคลเหล่านั้น	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. คุณโวยวาย กล่าวหา ต่อว่าหรือทะเลาะกันทันทีที่รู้สึกว่าคนรักคุยกับคนอื่นหรือคนอื่นมาชอบคนรัก	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. คุณทำเฉยชาหรือห่างเหินใส่คนรัก โดยการไม่ยอมคุยด้วยราวกับคนรักไม่มีตัวตน	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. คุณมักพูดจาเสียดสี เขียนข้อความเชิงเสียดสี ไม่พอใจ แบบไม่ระบุชื่อใครลงบนโซเชียลมีเดีย เพื่อแสดงให้คนรักรู้แบบอ้อม ๆ ว่า你不พอใจบางอย่าง	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. คุณพูดตรงๆ กับคนรักว่าคุณรู้สึกและคิดอย่างไร โดยไม่ได้ใช้อารมณ์	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. คุณจะแสดงความไม่สบายอารมณ์ เพื่อให้คนรักรับรู้ว่าคุณไม่พอใจบางอย่าง	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. เมื่อคุณไม่พอใจหรือหึงหวงคนรัก คุณมักจะแสดงออกโดยการเงียบ ไม่พูด ไม่จาเหมือนปกติ โดยไม่ได้แสดงออกว่ารู้สึกแย่	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. คุณมักแสดงอาการเป็นปกติ ไม่หึงหวง ในขณะที่คุณรู้สึกแย่	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. เวลาที่คุณไม่พอใจคนรัก คุณจะแสดงความก้าวร้าวต่อคนรัก ด้วยการทำร้ายร่างกาย	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. คุณแสดงความรักต่อคนรักมากขึ้น โดยใช้เวลาร่วมกับคนรักบ่อยขึ้น เช่น กินข้าว ไปเที่ยว และอื่น ๆ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. คุณให้ความสำคัญต่อบุคคลอื่นที่เป็นเพศตรงข้าม โดยไม่คิดถึงความรู้สึกของคนรัก เช่น ชื่นชมให้คนรักฟัง เป็นต้น	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. คุณระแวงคนรักโดยการถามโทรเช็คบ่อยครั้ง เพื่อดูว่าเขา/เธอทำอะไรที่ไหนกับใคร	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. เมื่ออยู่กันสองคนกับคนรัก คุณมักหาเวลาเคลียร์ปัญหาข้อข้องใจต่าง ๆ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. คุณมักพูดกับเพื่อนของคุณถึงมือที่สามในทางที่ไม่ดี ทั้งบนสื่อออนไลน์หรือนั่งคุยกันส่วนตัว โดยไม่มีคนรักร่วมอยู่ด้วย	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

1 = ไม่เคยเลย, 2 = แทบจะไม่เคย, 3 = ไม่บ่อยนัก, 4 = เป็นบางครั้งบางคราว, 5 = บ่อย, 6 = บ่อยมาก, 7 = ตลอด

เวลาที่คุณหึง คุณมักจะ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. คุณพยายามติดต่อกับมือที่สาม เพื่อถามถึงความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างคุณกับคนรักของคุณ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. คุณมักเผยแพร่ภาพของคุณกับคนรักบนสื่อออนไลน์ต่าง ๆ เพื่อให้ทุกคนรู้ว่าเราเป็นแฟนกัน	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. คุณเผชิญหน้ากับมือที่สามโดยใช้กำลังด้วยความรุนแรง	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. คุณมักจะแสดงความรักมากเป็นพิเศษกับคนรัก เมื่อคุณเห็นว่ามิบุคคลที่สามอยู่บริเวณนั้น เพื่อให้เขา/เธอเห็นว่าคุณคือคนพิเศษ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. คุณคอยติดตามสื่อออนไลน์ที่คนรักใช้เพื่อสอดส่องและดูความเคลื่อนไหวของคนรัก	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. คุณมักต่อว่ามือที่สามอย่างรุนแรง โดยไม่สนใจว่าคนรักจะอยู่ตรงนั้น	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. เมื่อเกิดความหึงหวง คุณมักชอบปาข้าวของเพื่อระบายอารมณ์ ทั้งต่อหน้าและลับหลังคนรัก	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

คำแนะนำและติชม

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

ขอขอบคุณสำหรับความร่วมมือค่ะ

BIOGRAPHY

NAME

Chayapa Srivilas

ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

Bachelor's Degree with a major in
Religious Studies from Mahidol
University, Nakhonpathom Province,
Thailand in 2012

CONTACTS

Address: 71/73 Banfahpiyalom M.4
Lumlukka Rd. Bungkrumpoi Lumlukka
Pathum Thaini 12150
Phone Number: 083-091-3203
Email: praew.maloving@gmail.com