

Gender Differences in Face Concerns and Behavioral Responses to Romantic Jealousy

Chayapa Srivilas and Jaray Singhakowinta

Abstract

While jealousy is pervasive in every romantic relationship, it is undeniable that couples' jealous responses are culturally shaped by social influence. Analogous to other high-context cultures, Thais' responses to jealousy are presumably sanctioned by the cultural notion of face saving. Having a profound influence on Thai people's behaviors, this face practice is employed as a way to lessen or avoid possible conflicts in social interactions. The different views of individual men and women on jealous responses and face saving are thus the results not only of personal differences but also social expectations of gender performances. Consequently, gender differences can be said to engender relational conflicts and misunderstandings among romantic couples. Although the roles of men and women are often believed to complement each other in romantic relationships, these gender role distinctions are often found to cause resentment among disagreeing couples. Hence, the focus on behavioral responses in romantic jealousy may lack sufficient insight into the vital role of gender in romantic communication. This study therefore investigates a plausible impact of gender on face saving and communicative responses to jealousy in romantic relationships. In addition, it highlights the different practices of men and women in face saving strategies and their jealous responses.

Keywords: gender differences, face saving, communicative responses to jealousy, romantic jealousy

บทคัดย่อ

ความทึ่งหวงเกิดขึ้นได้เสมอในทุกๆ ความสัมพันธ์แบบคู่รัก อิทธิพลของวัฒนธรรมส่งผลกระทบต่อการแสดงออกต่อความทึ่งหวงของบุคคล ในแต่ละวัฒนธรรมไทย แนวคิดเรื่องการรักษาหน้าเป็นสิ่งที่คนไทยส่วนใหญ่ยึดถือและปฏิบัติมาช้านาน เป็นที่ชัดเจนว่าแนวความคิดเรื่องของการรักษาหน้าในสังคมไทยส่งผลกระทบต่อพฤติกรรมของคนไทย ทั้งนี้ความสำคัญอาจแตกต่างกันไปขึ้นอยู่กับบุคคล นอกจากนี้การที่บุคคลมีแนวความคิดหรือทัศนคติที่แตกต่างกันในเรื่องของการแสดงออกต่อความทึ่งหวงและ การรักษาหน้าเป็นผลลัพธ์มาจากการความแตกต่างทางด้านบุคคลและความคาดหวังทางสังคมที่มีต่อคนในสังคมด้วย ผลที่ตามมาก็คือ การกระทำที่ห่างกันและความไม่เข้าใจกันระหว่างชายหญิงในความสัมพันธ์แบบคู่รัก ซึ่งเป็นสิ่งที่เกิดขึ้นอย่างหลีกเลี่ยงไม่ได้ แม้ว่า บทบาทของผู้ชายและผู้หญิงจะเติมเต็มซึ่งกันและกันในความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างเพศ แต่ด้วยความต่างของบทบาททางเพศนั้นที่อาจ นำมาซึ่งความขุนเคืองใจ ดังนั้นเป็นที่ชัดเจนแล้วว่า การศึกษาการแสดงออกทางความทึ่งหวงในมิติด้านพฤติกรรมเพียงอย่างเดียว อาจไม่เพียงพอที่จะทำความเข้าใจต่อการสื่อสารระหว่างชายหญิงได้ งานวิจัยขึ้นนี้ต้องการที่จะแสดงให้เห็นถึงผลกระทบของเพศ สภาพต่อการรักษาหน้าและการแสดงออกต่อความทึ่งหวงที่เกิดขึ้นในความสัมพันธ์แบบคู่รัก ทั้งยังแสดงให้เห็นถึงความแตกต่าง ระหว่างชายหญิงในความเชื่อมโยงกันระหว่างการรักษาหน้าและพฤติกรรมความทึ่งหวง

คำสำคัญ : ความแตกต่างทางเพศสภาพ, การรักษาหน้า, การแสดงออกต่อความทึ่งหวงในมิติด้านพฤติกรรม, ความทึ่งหวงแบบคู่รัก

Introduction

In most romantic relationships, couples inevitably face an experience of jealousy when potential threats appear in their relationships. Differences in jealous expressions may vary among individuals (Aylor & Dainton, 2001). Behavioral responses to romantic jealousy probably lead to escalating misunderstanding and intractable conflicts among couples. However, a display of negative emotions is rarely overt in Thailand due to an avoidance of face loss (Komin, 1991). Romantic couples may adopt different practices of face saving and communicative responses to jealousy based on their different gender characteristics, resulting in the success or failure of their relationships. Thus, identifying

gender differences may enable individuals to maintain the well-being of their relationships and enhance cooperation and mutual trust among couples (Gray, 1992, p. 4).

Research on communicative responses to romantic jealousy and face saving are not uncommon (e.g., Croucher, et al., 2012; Guerrero, Hannawa, & Babin, 2011; Komin, 1996; Qetzel, Garcia, & Ting-Toomey, 2007); however, they were conducted in non-Thai contexts. Not only did they fail to investigate the connection between face saving and behavioral responses to romantic jealousy, but also the effect of gender on romantic relationships. Aiming to provide a quantitative research model for Thai contexts, this study therefore examines gender differences in the plausible relationship between cultural concern over face saving and romantic responses to jealousy. This research then utilizes communicative responses to romantic jealousy and face concerns as analytical frameworks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: Are there gender differences in face saving within romantic jealousy?

RQ2: Are there gender differences in communicative responses to romantic jealousy?

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

This research considers gender as a contributing factor to face saving and communicative responses to romantic jealousy. The findings derived from this study also provide insights into gender communication in regard to face saving and behavioral responses to jealousy in Thailand.

Literature Review

Communicative responses to romantic jealousy

Jealousy manifests itself in numerous ways, and jealous people express such an intense emotion differently (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2000; McIntosh & Matthews, 1992).

Researchers of jealous expressions mostly focused their investigation on psychological levels (i.e., emotional or cognitive). Additionally, Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg, and Eloy (1995) identified jealous behaviors specifically in terms of communication responses. The development of research on communicative responses to jealousy (CRJ) was aimed at illustrating behavioral patterns as communicative strategies (Guerrero L. K., Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg, & Eloy, 1995). Guerrero et al. (1995) posited that all jealous reactions might be classified into different fractions, namely direct versus indirect, positive versus negative, partner- versus rival-directed or verbal versus nonverbal. After several renditions of the model, the final revision includes 52 items, representing 11 subscales (Guerrero, Hannawa, & Babin, 2011).

Specifically, a negative communication pattern can be found in the form of verbal abuse such as yelling at, accusing, arguing with, or quarreling with one's partner. Similarly, one may become actively distant or alienated (Guerrero, Hannawa, & Babin, 2011). De Weerth and Kalma (1993) also suggested that more women than men were likely to abuse their partners physically and verbally in response to infidelity and jealousy. Regarding violence communication, one is inclined to enact violent and threatening acts towards either one's partner or objects. In other words, one might physically abuse one's partner or one violently throws and destroys objects on a rampage. Another destructive response is a counter-jealousy induction. This reaction involves punitive or revengeful acts that can trigger a partner's jealousy or guilt. Nevertheless, Fleischman et al. (2005) revealed that jealousy inductions may help improve a relationship's stability and affection (Fleischman, Spitzberg, Andersen, & Roesch, 2005).

Integrative communication refers to constructive and straight-forward manners; for instance, compromising, resolving conflicts, reaching the middle ground of understanding and receptivity, and willingly maintaining an excellent rapport (Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg, & Eloy, 1995; Guerrero, Hannawa, & Babin, 2011; Guerrero, Andersen, & Spitzberg, 2003). Additionally, compensatory restorations are an act of compensation for being jealous. Particularly, one is both physically and emotionally

connected to one's partner. Several scholars posited that more women than men reported a higher tendency for integrative strategies and compensatory restorations (Guerrero & Reiter, Expressing emotion: Sex differences in social skills and communicative responses to anger, sadness, and jealousy, 1998; Lans, Mosek, & Yagil, 2014).

The avoidance of communication includes silence and denial/inhibition (Guerrero, Hannawa, & Babin, 2011). To illustrate, one stops talking and becomes silent in regard to a silent response. It is a response at the behavioral level. In addition to denial/inhibition, one does not disclose their jealousy and pretend as if nothing has changed or happened (Guerrero, Hannawa, & Babin, 2011).

With respect to other rival-focused strategies, contacting rivals are shown in the forms of discussing problems with rivals or escalating violent confrontations (Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg, & Eloy, 1995). Likewise, derogation of rivals is used to criticize intentionally or purportedly recount adverse events related to a potential rival. The last response is signs of possession, which are manifestations of overt expressions of affection towards one's partner in front of a perceived threat.

Face saving

Face is not something necessarily shown on someone's face, nor is it a reference to facial expressions (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Komin, 1996; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). The current study focuses on the concerns of face that pertain to the locus of individuals' worth, pride, positive image, status, and relevant qualities. In 1967, Goffman defined that the term of face aligned with western culture. Face is "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (Goffman, 1967, p. 5, as cited in Canelon & Ryan, 2013, p. 111). Face can be lost, maintained, saved, and protected. 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). The notion of face in Thai

culture has inevitably influenced Thai people's behavior and conflict management (Komin, 1996).

Carmody and Carmody (1996) delivered supportive evidence to previous research when they argued that it may be offensive for Thais to disclose negative states of mind (self-centeredness, selfishness, pride, personal willfulness, etc.) to others. Tolerance for Thais is a means to handle and ameliorate the effects of conflict (Ingle, 1983; Komin, 1996; Wells, 1960). Such tolerance can be demonstrated in considerable ways; however, it is often in the form of avoiding confrontation, refusing to disagree, saving the face of self and others and vice versa (Ingle, 1983; Komin, 1996; Wells, 1960). Thais are more inclined to hide their disagreement and to suppress their resentment or anguish (Knutson, 1994; Mulder, 1992a). Besides, the research of Knutson (1994) reveals the profound result that Thais would rather opt for an act of quietness in response to conflicts or frustrations, and considered this as a moral quality.

With regard to an ego orientation, this contributes to highly valuable attitudes. Specifically, the concepts of "face-saving" and "refrainment from criticism," as well as "kreng jai" (showing consideration for people) and "mai pen rai" (never mind) are underlying concepts of Thai behavioral inclinations (Komin, 1990). Ego and face are somewhat identical and they are perceived as crucial for Thais in social interactions. However, the notion of face saving in Thai culture does not focus on three aspects of face. Its concepts rely on the overall consideration of others. Therefore, it is possible to look at face saving in three dimensions based on face negotiation theory (Qetzel, Garcia, & Ting-Toomey, 2007).

Face negotiation theory provides three outlooks on face concerns: self-face, other-face, and mutual-face (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Specifically, self-face concern represents one's image or the identity that one wants to claim for oneself while the other-face aspect is connected with a higher consideration of an other's image and dignity. Mutual-face demonstrates a simultaneous regard for both one's face and another's face

(Ting-Toomey & Korogi, 1998). It is apparent that face negotiation theory does not particularly concentrate on face saving. Therefore, an association of the three facets of face and face saving in Thai culture can be extended. More importantly, gender aspects may play an important role in shaping face saving in accordance with jealousy expressions. Such a study in a Thai context has not been previously undertaken.

Research Method

Respondents and procedures

This study surveyed approximately 130 Thai respondents. However, there were 112 individuals who were eligible for the analysis. The study survey was based on convenient samplings. However, the potential respondents were required to meet eligibility criteria through self-administered questionnaires. There were 75 male respondents (57.7%) and 55 female respondents (42.3%). However, only 63 male respondents (56.3%) and 49 female respondents (43.8%) were eligible for the analysis. The respondents' 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%) as dating or seeing one person casually, 3 respondents (2.3%) as 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 a marriage relationship. Finally, there were 17 respondents (13.1%) who indicated they were not in a romantic relationship.

Additionally, the respondents who specified being in relationships included different relationship duration ranges from 1 month to 38 years, a 9.3 mean ($SD=9.4$). In addition, the eligible respondents' occupations varied, with an average of 39 respondents (30%) being students, 60 respondents (46.2%) as state enterprise officers, 21 respondents

(16.2%) as company employees, 2 respondents (1.5%) as business owners, 5 respondents (3.8%) self-employment, and 3 respondents (2.3%) indicated “other status.”

These statistics do not include the 18 unqualified respondents who failed to meet the eligibility criteria. Ten respondents (7.7%) indicated their sexual attraction towards both males and females. Only four respondents (3.1%) reported “not sure.” Those identifying that their sexual attraction is towards either both sexes or the same sex were considered as homosexual individuals in this study.

Instrumentations

Face saving. Apart from demographic questions, the second section of the questionnair asked the respondents to think about their practice of face saving during jealousy experiences in their current relationships. The study employed the key terms of face concerns proposed by Qetzel, Garcia, and Ting-Toomey (2007); namely, a concern for self-face, other-face, and mutual-face. Even though this study optimized the theoretical concepts of these researchers, it needed to minimize ambiguity and employ the notion of rak sa na in Thai contexts (Komin, 1991). Nine items were optimized to survey face saving among Thai men and women in times of romantic jealousy. The scale was designed to measure three distinct features of 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). For item distribution and Cronbach’s alpha reliability, face saving for self-face (item numbers 4, 5, and 9) was .75. Other-face saving (item numbers 2, 3, and 7) yielded .81. Also, the reliability coefficient for mutual-face saving (item numbers 1, 6, and 8) was .74.

Communicative responses to romantic jealousy. The respondents were asked to recall their past experiences of romantic jealousy expressions. However, the display of these jealousy expressions had to appear in their current relationship. This study optimized the use of the revised CRJ scale (Guerrero et al., 2011). Nevertheless, a reduction of redundancy was carried out to align with Thai society, resulting in 25 items

for 11 subscales altogether. The statements were rewritten to suit Thai society and eliminate cultural ambiguity. The items were measured with a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 7 (always) to 1 (never).

For the first subscale, negative communication detailed four items; for example, made hurtful or mean comments to my partner. Cronbach's alpha analysis for negative communication was .71. Two further items were adopted to assess violence communication (e.g., used physical force with my partner), producing $\alpha = .75$. Two more items were used to measure counter-jealousy induction (e.g., flirted with or talked about others to make my partner jealous), $\alpha = .71$. The above responses were identified as destructive communication. Furthermore, two subscales (i.e., integrative communication and compensatory restorations) fall under constructive communication. Two items were deemed to determine integrative communication; for instance, calmly question my partner, $\alpha = .83$. Then, the measurement of compensatory restorations was based on two items, namely becoming more affectionate towards my partner, $\alpha = .78$. Contrarily, denial and silence are two distinct subscales considered as avoidance communication. The denial subscale consisted of two items (e.g., denied feeling jealous); in total, $\alpha = .81$. A single item was implemented to address the extent of silence responses such as becoming quiet. Thus, being a single item, there was no Cronbach's alpha for silence. In terms of rival-focused communication, this response was 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. Cronbach's alpha for rival contacts was .74. Additionally, three questions were applied to measure the derogation of rivals (e.g., made negative comments about the rival), $\alpha = .71$. Further, a surveillance response consisted of item numbers 3, 16, and 23. This response referred to monitoring behaviors such as checking up on jealous person's partner. The Cronbach's alpha was .73. Finally,

two items were brought into play in an attempt to underline signs of possessions, such as making sure rivals knew my partner is taken, $\alpha = .87$.

Results

Gender differences in face saving

Research Question 1, which was intended to answer whether there was a significant gender difference in face saving for three aspects of face, namely self-face, other-face, and mutual-face, was measured with an independent sample t-test. The p-value was identified to confirm differences when statistical results produced a p-value of less than .05. Gender was, therefore, assigned as a contributing factor to differences in face saving.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Face Concerns between Males and Females

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

** Significant gender difference at .05 level

The independent sample t-test yielded no significant difference in face saving for self-face between heterosexual Thai men ($M=3.39$, $SD=.89$) and women ($M=3.21$, $SD=.83$); $t(110)=1.13$, $p>.05$. Also, there was no statistical significance in mutual-face saving for heterosexual Thai men ($M=4.01$, $SD=.71$), and women ($M=3.85$, $SD=.65$);

$t(110)=1.23, p>.05$. On the contrary, the independent sample t-test revealed that there was a significant difference between Thai men ($M=3.69, SD=.76$) and women ($M=3.37, SD=.86$) in other-face saving, $t(110)=2.06 p=.042$. The practice of other-face saving was stronger for heterosexual Thai men.

Gender differences in communicative responses to romantic jealousy

Research Question 2 was determined to investigate gender differences in communicative responses to romantic jealousy. This question was explored by utilizing the independent sample t-test. Genders were considered as having a key effect on the analysis, and thus all communicative responses to romantic jealousy were dependent variables.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for Communicative Responses to Jealousy

CRJs	Male (N=63)		Female (N=49)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
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

** Significant gender difference at .05 level

The test revealed a significant effect on negative communication between heterosexual Thai men ($M=2.51, SD=.84$) and women ($M=3.51, SD=1.10$); $t(110)=-5.494, p<.05$. In addition, there was a gender difference in counter-jealousy induction where the responses were stronger for Thai women ($M=2.87, SD=1.48$) than men ($M=2.08, SD=.90$); $t(110)=-3.48, p<.05$. Furthermore, the statistical test produced a result output that showed Thai women ($M=3.14, SD=1.27$) were more inclined to use surveillance than men ($M=2.28, SD=1.01$), $t(110)=-3.98; p<.05$. More importantly, the results also demonstrated gender differences in derogations of a rival where more Thai women ($M=2.37, SD=1.21$) than men ($M=1.83, SD=.91$) tended to talk about a potential rival in a negative way, $t(110)=-2.69; p<.05$.

However, the independent sample t-test showed a nonsignificant gender difference in violence communication ($t(110)=-1.46, p>.05$), integrative communication ($t(110)=-.56, p>.05$), compensatory restoration ($t(110)=-1.23, p>.05$), denial ($t(110)=-.64, p>.05$), silence ($t(110)=-1.54, p>.05$), rival contacts ($t(110)=-1.62; p>.05$), and signs of posession ($t(110)=-.86; p>.05$). These responses were not statistically significant, at a .05 level.

Gender differences in relationships between face saving and communicative responses to jealousy

Research Question 3 addressed gender differences in association with the three facets of face saving and communicative responses to romantic jealousy. To determine the relationships amongst the variables, the Pearson correlation coefficient was utilized. In addition to differences in correlations, Fisher's r to z transformation was employed to compare coefficients (Cohen and Cohen, 1983). From the beginning of the analysis, both genders were observed separately. However, even though the statistical test for both was performed simultaneously, multiple outputs for each response were produced.

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Face Concerns and Communicative Responses to Romantic Jealousy among Heterosexual Males and Females

CRJs	Male			Female		
	Self-face	Other-face	Mutua l-face	Self-face	Other-face	Mutua l-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

** Correlation is significant at .01 level

* Correlation is significant at .05 level

Table 4. Z-score: Gender Difference in a Relationship between Face Concerns and CRJs

(The table below showed the overlapping relationships for females and males)

	Self-face	Other-face	Mutual-face
	Z-score	Z-score	Z-score
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	-	-	-

** Z-score is significant at .01 level

* Z-score is significant at .05 level

Specifically, the Pearson correlation coefficient revealed significant associations between silence and the three facets of face, self-face ($r(49)=.388, p<.01$), other-face ($r(49)=.371, p<.01$), and mutual-face ($r(49)=.333, p<.05$), for women, but not for men. However, Z-score demonstrated that only saving self-face in positive association with silence was stronger for Thai women, $Z=-2.591, p<.01$. The Z-score did not yield

significant gender differences between silence and other-face, as well as mutual-face. Likewise, the results of the 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, $Z=2.027, p<.05$. Namely, a negative association between surveillance and mutual-face was stronger for Thai women.

For negative communication, the Pearson correlation coefficient revealed no significant association with self-face [$r(49)=.149, p>.05$], other-face [$r(49)=-.045, p>.05$], and mutual-face [$r(49)=-.204, p>.05$] for both Thai men and women. Even though the test produced some associations between violence communication and mutual-face in a negative fashion for Thai women, $r(49)=-.323, p<.05$, there was no great gender difference in such associations, $Z=0.791, p>.05$. 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, $Z=0.919, p>.05$.

Furthermore, 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, and $Z=.18, p>.01$ for mutual-face.

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, $r(49)=-.177, p>.01$.

Regarding denial, the test results 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; $r(63)=.245, p>.05$. There was no significant gender difference between these correlations for self-face, $Z=-2.097, p>.01$, for other-face, $Z=-1.038, p>.01$, and for mutual-face, $Z=-.0514, p>.01$.

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 Fisher test revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between female and male correlation, $Z=-.011, p>.05$.

The Pearson correlation coefficient yielded no correlation between derogation of rivals and three facets of face for females; $r(49)=.176, p>.05$ for self-face; $r(49)=.030, p>.05$ for other-face; and $r(49)=-.180, p>.05$ for mutual-face; while for males; $r(63)=.039, p>.05$ for self-face; $r(63)=-.100, p>.05$ for other-face; and $r(63)=-.132, p>.05$ for mutual-face.

Also, 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, $r(49)=.019, p>.05$; or 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, $r(63)=.191, p>.05$; and for mutual-face, $r(63)=.097, p>.05$.

Discussion

Gender differences in face saving during romantic jealousy

The results of this study provide an overview of behavior which is conducted in response to romantic jealousy and face saving in Thai culture. The study identifies a specific gender difference in other-face saving. Specifically, Thai men in this study report a higher concern for their partners than women do in a jealousy experience. The findings demonstrate a distinctively Thai male avoidance of face threat to their partners. Even though Thai women do express concern about other-face saving in a jealousy experience and jealousy expression, they still report less other-face concern than the men do. Apparently, these results are not consistent with previous assertions. DuBrin (1991) argued that in their relationships, women care more about others than men do. However, this study underlines the fact that Thai men still practice a detachment attitude to secure themselves from displaying their jealousy. In contrast to this finding, Angelis (2012) emphasized that male characters are traditionally portrayed as strong, unemotional, and central. Therefore, some men display a need to have total control over their partners by hiding their insecurity and dependency on women (p. 40). Angelis (2012) even concurred with statements made by many experts that “a man is uncomfortable when he sees a woman becoming emotional because he is uncomfortable with his own vulnerable feelings” (p.109). Perhaps in line with this common observation, it is possible to conclude that Thai men do not want to make their partners upset and deal with unpleasant consequences as a result of their jealousy expressions. Notably, Thai men in this study also demonstrate socially expected patterns of face practice. More importantly, men claim that they comply with the social norms of protecting women. Despite a contemporary increase in gender equality, Thai men and women still display differences in terms of face saving.

Also, the study's findings reveal that there is no gender difference in saving self-face and mutual-face. Even though Thai men and women are culturally oriented towards

collectivism, the findings show that they are in a transitional process to individualism due to a greater consideration of self-face.

Gender differences in relationships between communicative responses to romantic jealousy and face saving.

According to communicative responses to romantic jealousy (CRJ), it is surprising that negative communication patterns, such as blaming a partner, enacting some punitive acts, devaluing the potential rival, and monitoring a partner, are common among women in this study. These 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). Additionally, this study supports past work that women are more likely to use counter-jealousy induction as a punitive act (White, 1980). Although it is socially expected that women would be less aggressive than men, Angelis (2012) argues that it is acceptable for women to express emotions whereas men are expected to suppress theirs. Hence, the findings provide some profound implications for romantic relationships in which men find it difficult to enact potentially destructive behaviors which may lead them to displaying more of their emotions and thus losing control over themselves and their partners. Perhaps this is a reason why Thai men reported positive 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 protects patriarchal patterns, taking care of their women.

In contrast to previous studies, there is no gender difference in integrative communication. Prior research reported that more women than men tend to use integrating styles to express their jealousy (Lans, Mosek, & Yagil, 2014). Interestingly, the present study provides the contrasting result that Thai men and women do not display a sharp distinction in this regard, especially as Aylor and Dainton (2001) claimed that integrative communication was positively associated with femininity. With this assertion, the findings imply that jealousy expressions among Thai men and women are equivalent in terms of using soft and constructive strategies. More importantly, the findings also

indicate that face saving for other-face and mutual-face, in times of enacting integrative styles and thus expressing emotions in a polite manner, is still pervasive in Thai culture regardless of gender.

Regarding positive associations between silence and face saving for self-face, the findings identify stronger associations for women. Specifically, the Thai women in this study demonstrate more care than men about their self-image in a jealousy experience. They claim that they are not willing to display their vulnerability and insecurity to their partners through overly jealous expressions. As a result, Thai women seem to opt rather to shut down emotionally in an attempt to protect themselves. Guerrero's (1998) suggestion supports the findings above that an avoidance of disclosing emotions is a result of fear of judgement. Guerrero even adds that jealous individuals with negative thoughts of others use avoidance strategies (e.g., silence) more frequently than those with positive views of others. Additionally, the findings imply that Thai women become more individualistic 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. With reference to this, previous researchers have argued that men are more likely to use dismissive behaviors to protect and regain their self-esteem (Bryson, 1977; Buunk, 1986; Mathes, 2003; Wongpakaran, Wongpakaran, & Wedding, 2012). As a consequence, it is probable that Thai men care more about their self-esteem than their face during a jealousy expression.

Besides the above, surveillance was negatively associated with mutual-face. With a negative relationship between surveillance and mutual-face, the more women make use of monitoring behaviors the less respect they display for their partners' privacy and care about their relationship. Guerrero (1998) explained that surveillance behaviors are a result of a lack of confidence where jealous individuals display suspicion and worry in their cognitive dimensions (p.287). Moreover, Guerrero asserted that monitoring behaviors are practiced to reduce uncertainty and to regain confidence. Correspondingly, the use of surveillance behaviors also shows that individuals may be displaying a fearful avoidance of attachment styles (Guerrero, 1998). Tentatively, the Thai women in this study may

have a hard time displaying their jealousy due to a lack of confidence. Unfortunately, Angelis (2012) pointed out that watching behaviors may induce in men a feeling of being controlled. Indeed, when men feel controlled, they feel resentment and pull away. Consequently, when their man pulls away, the woman would feel more confused and suspicious. Therefore, the findings suggest that taking into account the effect of a particular response on a partner may yield a more meaningful understanding of gender communication among Thai people.

Limitations and recommendations for future research

Since this study takes a quantitative-based approach, there are several limitations that need to be addressed in future studies. Although the strength of the study is to provide an instrument applied in Thai contexts, the study does not provide an in-depth explanation of the likelihood of different behaviors manifesting in romantic jealousy. This is due to the fact that a quantitative survey cannot produce a complete information overview on the contextual factors that help explain variations in behaviors and perceptions.

Target populations and methodological approach

The study's sample size is also a limitation as 112 respondents cannot represent Thai society as a whole. Since the research is constructed to test the instrument, the number of respondents above is limited and based on convenient samplings which cannot be used to make a significant claim. Additionally, the samples in this study are exclusively middle class representatives, and are heterosexual who, therefore, cannot portray a snapshot of homosexual individuals' behavior. Future research should be able to include more samples that can represent a wider population range, and thus ensure structured random samplings with no bias.

In terms of methodological implication, the questionnaires showed an acceptable reliability for the collected data. Nevertheless, the obvious limitation is a mutual

understanding of the situation the study expected the respondents to have in common. In other word, the survey questionnaires do not contain an experimental case for the respondents. Therefore, future research should construct a case study for respondents which can ensure increased accuracy. Such accuracy is crucial in order to ensure an accurate evaluation of the respondents' prone behaviors during a romantic jealousy experience.

Methodological terms

Accordingly, methodological definitions of various terms produce different outcomes. Specifically, potential ambiguity, due to its extensive meaning, around terms such as silence should be diminished so that the term can be defined with more caution and accuracy. This study solely portrays silence at the behavioral level. For this reason, qualitative examination should be conducted with respect to an inclusive set of possible meanings.

Moreover, the current study does not look at face concerns from a deeper perspective that may reflect personal differences. Face is practiced according to different personal values. Cultural and personal perceptions are more complicated; thus, future studies may utilize a qualitative approach to examine concerns for face. Future narratives may also help enhance understandings and dimensions of face saving (rak sa na) in romantic relationships. What is more, the face concern theory used in this study does not include the dimension of acquisition of face and restoration of face. Future studies may consider the aforementioned aspects in behavioral jealousy expressions, as well as other situations. Last, but not least, the study focuses on face practice during jealousy expressions which cannot cover a fully informative explanation of the exertion of face saving before and after a jealousy experience.

Conclusions

Overall, the research of this study provides a model for further professional studies to explore behavioral jealousy expressions and face saving amongst Thai people. The study is an initial step in demonstrating gender difference in face saving during jealousy expressions. It reflects how gender affects face concerns and jealousy behaviors as well as the relationship between face concerns and jealousy behaviors during an eruption of romantic jealousy. The study's findings are 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 a jealousy explosion. As a result, the importance of this study is to reduce relational conflicts and gender-based misunderstandings.

References

Angelis, B. D. (2012). *Secret about men: Every woman should know*. London: HarperCollins.

Aylor, B., & Dainton, M. (2001). Antecedents in romantic jealousy experience, expression, and goals. *Western Journal of Communication*, 65, 370-391.

Bowen, M. (1978). *Family therapy and clinical practice*. New York, NY: Jason Aronson.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bryson, J. B. (1977). *Situational determinants of the expression of jealousy*. Paper presented at the 85th annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Buunk, B. P. (1986). Husband's jealousy. In R. A. Lewis, & R. Salt (Eds.), *Men in families* (pp. 97-114). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Buunk, B. P., & Dijkstra, P. (2000). Extradadic relationship and jealousy. In C. Hendrick, & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationship: A sourcebook* (pp. 317-329). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Canelon, J., & Ryan, T. (2013, April). 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 Chirstian appreciation of Buddhist holiness*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Croucher, S. M., Homsey, D., Linda, G., Bohlin, B., Trumpetto, J., Izzo, A., et al. (2012). Jealousy in Four Nations: A Cross-Cultural Analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, 29, 353-360.

De Weerth, C., & Kalma, A. P. (1993). Female aggression as a response to sexual jealousy: A sex role reversal? *Aggressive Behavior*, 19, 265-279.

DuBrin, A. J. (1991). Sex and gender differences in tactics and influence. *Psychological Reports*, 68(2), 635-646.

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, 49-73.

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual: Essays on face to face behavior. London, England: Doubleday.

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: HarperCollins.

Guerrero, L. K. (1998). Attachment-style differences in the experience and expression of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships*(5), 273-291.

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. Cannary, & K. Dindia (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication* (pp. 321-350). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2003, July). *Communicative responses to jealousy*. Featured research presentation at the annual conference of International Association for Relationship Research, Madison, WI.

Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., Jorgensen, P. F., Spitzberg, B. H., & Eloy, S. V. (1995). Coping with the green-eyed monster: Conceptualizing and measuring

communicative responses to romantic jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication*, 59, 270-304.

Guerrero, L. K., 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.

Ingle, M. (1983). Local governance and rural development in Thailand. In N. T. Uphoff (Ed.), *Rural development and local organization in Asia* (pp. 62-201). Delhi, India: Macmillan India, Ltd.

Knutson, T. J. (1994). Comparison of Thai and US American cultural values: 'mai pen rai' versus 'just do it'. *ABAC Journal*, 14, 1-38.

Komin, S. (1990). Culture and work-related values in Thai organization. *International Journal of Psychology*, 25, 681-704.

Komin, S. (1991). *Psychology of the Thai people: Values and behavioral patterns*. Bangkok: National Institution of Development Administration.

Komin, S. (1996). *Psychology of the Thai people: Values and behavioral patterns*. Bangkok: National Institution of Development Administration.

Lans, O., Mosek, A., & Yagil, Y. (2014). Romantic jealousy from the perspectives of Bowen's concept of differentiation and gender differences. *The Family Journal: Counselling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 22(3), 321-331.

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, 895-906.

McIntosh, E. G., & Matthews, C. O. (1992). Use of direct coping resources in dealing with jealousy. *Psychological Reports*, 70, 1037-1038.

Mulder, N. (1992a). *Inside Thai society: An interpretation of everyday life* (3 ed.). Bangkok: Editions Duang Kamol.

Qetzel, J., Garcia, A. J., & Ting-Toomey, S. (2007). 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.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). A face negotiation theory. In Y. Kim, & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 213-235). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict: An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22, 187-225.

Wells, K. E. (1960). *Thai Buddhism: Its rites and activities*. New York: AMS Press.

White, G. L. (1980). Inducing jealousy: A power perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6, 222-227.

Wongpakaran, T., Wongpakaran, N., & Wedding, D. (2012). Gender differences, attachment styles, self-esteem and romantic relationship in Thailand. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36, 409-417.