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ABSTRACT

MOTIVATIONS FOR DISCLOSING PAST PARTNER INFORMATION TO CURRENT PARTNERS: A NEW MEASURE

Name: Adelson, Megan Janelle
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. Lee Dixon

Past research has reported self-disclosure as an important process in both general and romantic relationships. However, research demonstrates that certain disclosures are risky in content (e.g., past relationship experiences) and could lead to subsequent relationship conflict, such as embarrassment or alienation. However, several advantages of self-disclosure have been identified, such as establishment of mutual liking and increased intimacy. Other theories have posited that specific social incentives often drive the decision to disclose or not disclose. Newman (1982) developed a theory about why partners talk about past partners to current partners, and theorized that there are five potential motivations explaining this behavior. To our knowledge, no current studies exist that empirically measure how different motivations for talking about past partner experiences to current partners might be related to various relational and personal characteristics. The purpose of this study is twofold. Study one focuses on the creation of a measure assessing Newman’s differing motivations. Cronbach’s alphas were run to assess internal consistency of motivational scale items. Study two seeks to re-establish
internal consistency and demonstrate construct validity between motivational subscales and correlates under investigation. Thus, the ability of the motivational subscales to predict outcome variables above and beyond the general tendency to disclose was achieved by controlling for general disclosure through partial correlation analyses. Findings demonstrate evidence for the predictive power of three out of the five motivational subscales independent of one’s general tendency to disclose. Suggestions are made regarding the remaining subscales less predictive of the tested outcome variables.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Creating Psychological and Emotional Closeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Creating Psychological and Emotional Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Negotiating Relationship Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>Confirming a Self-Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Relating Past History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Relationship Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXA</td>
<td>Anxious Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVA</td>
<td>Avoidant Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Self-Silencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSQ</td>
<td>Rejection Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>Demand-Withdraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Criticize-Defend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Positive Interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Dyadic Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Revenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Benevolence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER 1

STUDY ONE INTRODUCTION

Individuals sometimes share information about themselves to others in different interpersonal contexts (i.e., with friends, family members, significant others, etc.). Research identifies this process as self-disclosure, or opening up to another about one’s deep and inner attitudes, emotions, and personal experiences (Derlega, Metts, Petronio, & Margulis, 1993; Sprecher & Hendrick, 2004). Disclosure plays a particularly important role in close relationships, namely, romantic relationships (Hendrick, 1981; Sprecher & Hendrick, 2004). Attribution theories of communication posit that self-disclosure helps the discloser make sense of his or her own thoughts and behaviors in romantic relationships (Manusov & Harvey, 2001). In other words, it allows disclosers to understand their identity as both an individual and romantic partner.

However, research has found that disclosure can have both positive and negative impacts on personal relationships. Studies have found self-disclosure to increase liking and loving between romantic partners, as well as contribute to relationship longevity (Hendrick, 1981; Sprecher & Hendrick, 2004; Sprecher, 1987). On the other hand, findings from other studies reveal the potential risks of self-disclosure, such as vulnerability, feelings of weakness, and relationship conflict (Anderson, Kunkel, & Dennis, 2011; Petronio & Martin, 1986). Indeed, Greene, Derlega, and Mathews (2006) posit that some disclosures increase intimacy, while others might disrupt the relationship.
One possible explanation for these different outcomes is the motivations partners have for disclosing personal information to one another. One largely theoretical paper by Newman (1982), proposed five motivations for talking about past partners to current partners (i.e., TAPP). Newman theorized that these differing motivations might lead to varied relationship outcomes. To our knowledge, no one has developed a way to measure these motivations. Thus, the purpose of the current study is to develop a measure assessing these motivations and to examine the relationship between levels of motivations and relationship satisfaction, relationship functioning, and other personal characteristics. Two studies will be presented.

**General Self-Disclosure**

Most of our current understanding about self-disclosure in interpersonal contexts comes from the theory of social exchange. According to this theory, those who frequently disclose emotionally intimate content are typically well-liked by the recipient, as this type of disclosure metacommunicates the desire for further relationship development (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Worthy, Gary, & Kahn, 1969). Such disclosures help to facilitate closeness between the discloser and the recipient (Collins & Miller, 1994; Green, Derlega, & Mathews, 2006). In addition, social penetration theory posits that relationships then grow gradually in self-disclosure depth and breadth (Altman & Taylor, 1973). That is, as mutual liking is established between two people, self-disclosures will become more frequent and intimate in nature, and relational expectations will gradually establish over time (Green et al., 2006). On the other hand, an inability to disclose might fundamentally short-circuit healthy relationship development and lead to self-repression (Jourard, 1964). Indeed, Cozby (1973) theorized that high disclosers experience better
mental health outcomes than low disclosers, because low disclosers might struggle with cultivating close interpersonal relationships.

Both social exchange and penetration theories propose that social incentives are likely at the heart of disclosing behaviors. Consistent with each theory, Buss (1983) posited that people have a desire for basic social attention, because it feels rewarding when others demonstrate interest in them. Self-disclosure is one way to access such social opportunities (Buss, 1983; Worthy et al., 1969). For example, one study found that participants disclosed factual information about themselves when asked to make an accurate impression, while more self-enhancing information was disclosed when asked to make a positive impression (Berg & Archer, 1982). Therefore, disclosure content was contingent upon differing social expectations (Berg & Archer, 1982). To summarize, self-disclosure in interpersonal relationships offers social incentives that ultimately predict its occurrence or lack thereof.

Although much of the research frames self-disclosure as a specific behavior driven by contextual social cues, an alternative explanation has been considered. Some researchers have empirically demonstrated high disclosure tendencies as a personality trait (Miller, Berg, & Archer, 1983), in which social contexts are simply utilized for emotional release by making private information public (Buss, 1983). If this notion is correct, it is likely that other personal characteristics would predict self-disclosing behaviors.

**Self-Disclosure in Romantic Relationships**

As with more general interpersonal relationships, self-disclosure is also important in romantic relationships. In general, past research has found positive associations
between self-disclosure and relationship satisfaction. As relationships progress, intimacy level of disclosure content tends to increase (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Hendrick, 1981). Following this trend, it is not surprising that research has found levels of self-disclosure to be positively correlated with marital satisfaction (Hendrick, 1981). Along these lines, Sprecher and Hendrick (2004) found that disclosures communicate the desire to meet the other’s needs, and is therefore an effective relationship maintenance strategy. One explanation for this might be that disclosures increase discloser likeability, particularly for those individuals in long-term, intimate relationships (Collins & Miller, 1994).

However, there is some evidence to suggest that the liking effect may not always hold true in romantic relationships. For example, in a study with romantic partners, Rubin, Hill, Peplau, and Dunkel-Schetter (1980) found only a weak relationship between self-disclosure and liking for one’s significant other. Therefore, it seems likely that disclosures do not always indicate a desire for closeness, and thus, might occur for other reasons. It is possible that these decisions are made to accommodate the goals the discloser has for that relationship through assessing the costs and benefits of disclosing. Unfortunately, very little is known about the motivations for disclosing personal information to their partners and how it relates to relationship satisfaction.

If self-disclosure can have positive effects in increasing relationship satisfaction, why might partners sometimes choose to avoid sharing personal information with each other? Furthermore, is there an intrinsic benefit to concealment? One study demonstrated this; participants were found to selectively conceal or expose information relative to their personal goals (Quattrone & Jones, 1978). This tendency is also retained within romantic contexts (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996; Lucchetti, 1999; Petronio, 2002; Sprecher &
Hendrick, 2004), because self-disclosure in romantic relationships is dialectical in nature, such that the need for openness and intimacy must coexist with the need for privacy and autonomy (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996; Sprecher & Hendrick, 2004). If partners fail to strike this balance, they compromise opportunities for growth and risk uncovering their deepest vulnerabilities (Petronio, 2002).

Following this argument, the dialectical balance serves as a method of protection over the self and the relationship. However, some self-disclosures might be detrimental to the relationship. Specifically, content that compels the receiving partner to re-evaluate the relationship may have potentially negative consequences for the discloser. The discloser might feel humiliated and/or fearful of the relationship being jeopardized (Collins & Miller, 1994). Consistent with this notion, Lucchetti (1999) conducted a study in which college students were asked to report their reasons for withholding information about their sexual histories with current partners. The students reported a fear of embarrassment and ultimate sabotage of the relationship, though revealing such information might actually serve to protect their partners and the relationship (Lucchetti, 1999). Along these lines, participants reported disclosures about past romantic experiences to be the biggest taboo topic amongst romantic couples in another study (Anderson et al., 2011). Therefore, talking about past romantic partners to current partners has been identified as a high-risk type of disclosure (Anderson et al., 2011; Newman, 1982; Omarzu, 1999). The lack of research on this topic is surprising, considering the high relational risk involved with this type of disclosure. To my knowledge, only theoretical studies exist examining why partners talk about past relationship experiences.
Consistent with Quattrone and Jones (1978) and Anderson et al. (2011), partners avoid various taboo topics with the goal of bypassing potential relationship disruption. Perhaps, then, disclosure content strongly determines whether or not the dialectical balance is achieved. If this is true, the decision to withhold or reveal information should correspond with the type of information itself. Another explanation to consider, however, is that those individuals who disclose less about past partner experiences might have a greater need to maintain privacy than those who disclose more. Thus, characteristics specific to either the individual or the nature of the relationship might influence the decision to disclose.

**Attachment Theory and Relevance to Self-Disclosure**

Attachment theory posits that internal working models of relationships develop from caretaker responsiveness in childhood, ultimately influencing relationship development in adulthood (Bowlby, 1988; Bretherton, 1992). According to this theory, children will develop one of three styles of relating to others: secure, ambivalent/anxious, or avoidant (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). Mikulincer and Nachson (1991) characterize attachment avoidance as feeling uneasy with intimacy and reliance on others. Studies have found that, as adults, these individuals employ a more detached, uninterested style of communication during observed interactions with their partners (Guerrero, 1996; Tucker & Anders, 1998). Simpson’s (1990) study found these individuals also report more relationship distress. On the other hand, one study found that ambivalent/anxiously attached individuals report dependence and need for commitment (Feeney & Noller, 1990). Finally, securely attached individuals perceive themselves as
socially competent and well-liked by others, thus reporting more positive experiences in their romantic relationships (Simpson, 1990).

As with other couple interactions, self-disclosure patterns vary in correspondence with the discloser’s particular attachment style. In a two-part study, Mikulincer and Nachson (1991) found higher levels of partner disclosure in securely and anxiously attached individuals, compared to those high in attachment avoidance. Another study examined the relationship between attachment and disclosing thoughts and feelings about the relationship. Anxiously attached partners engaged in more relationship-specific disclosures than avoidant partners, and also evaluated their relationships more positively (Tan, Overall, & Taylor, 2011). The differences between anxiously attached and avoidant individuals suggest that certain types of self-disclosure might serve as a buffer only for insecurely attached individuals. However, securely attached partners experience the most fruitful outcomes, as they engage in more reciprocal patterns of communication and allow flexibility of discussion topics (Keelan, Dion, & Dion, 1998).

**Motivations for Disclosing about Past Romantic Partners**

Though existing literature on self-disclosure in romantic relationships is extensive, the main focus has been on the benefits of self-disclosure and when self-disclosure might be more detrimental than beneficial. Little is known about why partners disclose information about their personal histories. In addition, it is possible that personal and relational characteristics play a role in predicting these motivations.

As mentioned earlier, one article by Newman (1982) discussed how individuals often preserve past relationships by perpetually thinking about past partners or by simply remembering them. Moreover, this can lead to discussions about them with current
romantic partners, further reinforcing past relationship schemas. Such information might convey metacommunicative messages to the current partner to shape and control the relationship in the desired way. Newman proposed five potential motivational reasons for engaging in TAPP with current partners. The first is to relate past relationship history, in which the function of TAPP is to simply educate the other on the essence of who they are and why. The second reason is to create psychological and emotional closeness, in which the goal is to achieve intimacy and connectedness. The third reason is to create psychological and emotional distance in order to establish and maintain emotional separation. The fourth possible function of TAPP is to negotiate relationship rules and expectations, in which the discloser aims to obtain a sense of control and dominance in the relationship. The final function is to confirm a self-image, which enables the justification of actions due to the aftermath of past relationships.

Based on two case studies, Newman made preliminary hypotheses about the ways in which relationship outcomes might differ as a function of the TAPP motivation. That is, partners who TAPP with the intention of creating psychological and emotional distance, negotiating relationship rules and expectations, and/or confirming a self-image are more likely to be less satisfied in their relationships. On the other hand, those who TAPP in order to create emotional and psychological closeness and/or to relate past relationship history are more likely to be happy with their relationships.

The Current Studies

These studies had two specific objectives. In study one, I aimed to create a measure that assesses motivations for TAPP containing items that reliably reflect each
construct. In study two, I wished to reassess reliability through data collection of a second sample as well as establish external validity of the measure.
CHAPTER 2
STUDY ONE METHODS

The goal of my first study was to develop a measure that assesses motivations for past partner disclosure. Individual items for each subscale were constructed based on the descriptions of each of the five motivations proposed by Newman (1982). A pool of 21, 14, 15, 10, and 11 items were created for each subscale, with the goal of selecting approximately 6 items per construct that would result in Chronbach’s alphas of .70 or higher for each subscale.

Subjects

The sample consisted of 101 undergraduate students in introductory psychology courses from a Midwestern private university. Participants were recruited through the Psychology Department’s research sign-up system, SONA. Exclusion criteria specified that in order to participate in the study, participants must currently be in a romantic relationship for the duration of at least 3 months.

Measures

A demographic questionnaire assessed sex, age, race, length of relationship, and nature of the current romantic relationship (i.e., friends with benefits, dating exclusively, married, etc.; See APPENDIX A). Developed for this study, the motivations for TAPP
questionnaire (See APPENDIX B) initially consisted of a total of 74 items, each question answered on a 7-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from “not at all true” = 1 to “completely true” = 7. Newman seems to indicate that the goals of confirming self-image, negotiating rules and expectations, and relating important past relationship history can be obtained independent of specific content valence. That is, disclosure content may contain negative, positive, or neutral information about past partners. Thus, no specifications were made regarding the content of the disclosure, and posed an identical opening statement: “I have shared experiences I have had in past romantic relationships with my current partner, hoping that doing so would...” Again, the three subscales that followed this statement were TAPPing to confirm a self-image (e.g., “make my partner see me as a good partner to have”), negotiate relationship rules and expectations (e.g., “threaten my partner to NOT treat me poorly”), and relate important past relationship history (e.g., “help he/she better understand who I am”). The final two goals (represented by the fourth and fifth constructs), according to Newman, are achieved because of specific content valence. The fourth construct, TAPPing to create psychological and/or emotional closeness (e.g., “make me feel closer to my partner”), is more likely obtained through sharing unpleasant past experiences, as it is meant to elicit sympathy from the current partner towards the discloser. Thus, it poses the same opening statement as the first three constructs, but asks participants to think about negative past partner experiences. The final subscale, TAPPing to create psychological and/or emotional distance, urges participants to think about positive past partner experiences (e.g., “make my partner feel jealous”). Newman proposed that talking positively about a past partner might lead the current partner to feel threatened and/or alienated.
Procedure

Participants were recruited through the university’s research portal for course credit in their introductory psychology classes. A minimum of one and maximum of 15 participants attended scheduled study sessions. Participants completed paper and pencil consent forms and questionnaire packets. Participants were fully debriefed upon completion of the study. This study, along with Study 2, was approved by the appropriate Institutional Review Board.
CHAPTER 3

STUDY ONE RESULTS

As demonstrated in Table 1, Cronbach’s alphas were calculated for each subscale, yielding values ranging from .78 to .92.

Table 1

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach’s Alphas for Motivational Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating Psychological and Emotional Closeness Creating</td>
<td>107.58 (20.78)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Psychological and Emotional Distance Negotiating</td>
<td>33.21 (13.94)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating Relationship Rules Confirming a Self-Image Relating Past Relationship History General Disclosure Tendencies</td>
<td>60.54 (20.14)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.62 (13.16)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.23 (9.49)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.21 (13.94)</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
STUDY TWO INTRODUCTION

The objective of this study was to re-examine the internal consistency of the motivational subscales using reduced-item subscales with a new sample and to investigate the psychometric qualities and external validity of the subscales. Based on the responses from Study 1, fewer items for each subscale were chosen using an item reduction procedure. Construct validity was measured by assessing the associations between the motivational subscales and other relational constructs, including adult attachment style, rejection sensitivity, self-silencing, depression, communication, forgiveness, and tendency to self-disclose. Multiple predictions were made.

**Tendency to disclose.** The majority of the literature on self-disclosure focuses on self-disclosure characteristics, such as frequency, depth, and willingness, and their impact on relationships. Motivations behind disclosures between romantic partners have yet to be measured, nor have their associations with relational functioning constructs been assessed. In order to determine that one’s motivations behind disclosure are predictive above and beyond the basic tendency to disclose or not disclose, it is necessary to measure this tendency. No predictions were made with regards to the relationship between tendency to disclose to one’s partner and other constructs, as doing so would fall outside the scope of this study.
**Attachment style.** Drawing from the aforementioned research on the impact anxious and avoidant attachment styles have on romantic relationships, I developed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1a: Those high in insecure attachment styles will be more likely to TAPP in order to create distance, negotiate relationship rules, and/or confirm a self-image.

Hypothesis 1b: Those low in insecure attachment styles will be more likely to TAPP in order to create closeness and/or relate past relationship history.

**Relationship satisfaction.** Consistent with the literature mentioned earlier, self-disclosure has been found to have a positive impact on the quality of romantic relationships (Hendrick, 1981; Sprecher & Hendrick, 2004). If disclosure is done for purposes other than to foster intimacy, however, the relationship may be jeopardized (Rubin, Hill, Peplau, & Dunkel-Schetter, 1980). Following Newman’s (1980) framework, I believe such implications about the impact of disclosure motivations on relationship functioning will hold true for specific past partner content. The following hypotheses were made:

Hypothesis 2a: Individuals more satisfied in their relationships will be more likely to TAPP in order to create closeness and/or relate past relationship history.

Hypothesis 2b: Individuals less satisfied in their relationships will be more likely to TAPP in order to create distance, negotiate relationship rules, and/or confirm a self-image.

**Depressive symptomology.** Not only has marital quality been casually linked to symptoms of depression, but there is also evidence to suggest that depression impacts
marital quality (Fincham, Beach, Harold, & Osborne, 1997). Referring back to previously mentioned research findings, self-disclosure has been found to impact relationship intimacy in both positive and negative ways (Hendrick, 1981; Sprecher & Hendrick, 2004; Collins & Miller, 1994, Luchetti, 1999). If there is a link between disclosure and low relationship satisfaction in depressed individuals, disclosure motivations might be the mechanism behind this relationship. Therefore, our hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis 3a: Less depressed individuals will be more likely to TAPP in order to create closeness and/or relate past relationship history.

Hypothesis 3b: More depressed individuals who TAPP will do so in order to create distance, negotiate relationship rules, and/or confirm a self-image.

Silencing the self. Jack and Dill (1992) define self-silencing as the tendency to withhold thoughts and feelings in order to maintain important relationships that coincide with their own relationship schemas. Much of the research on self-silencing behaviors has focused on women. However, more recent research has demonstrated and examined self-silencing tendencies in men, as well (e.g., Lutz-Zois et al., 2013). Self-silencing compromises one’s sense of self in insecurely attached individuals, making it difficult to form healthy connections with others (Thompson, 1995). The self-silencer’s objective is ultimately to maintain the relationship and avoid conflict at all costs (Jack & Dill, 1992). Thus, I predict that for those high in self-silencing, sharing feelings about past relationship experiences may serve as an effort to obtain a sense of control within the relationship. My hypotheses are:
Hypothesis 4a: Individuals high in self-silencing will be more likely to have the motivations of creating distance, negotiating relationship rules, and/or to confirm a self-image when they TAPP.

Hypothesis 4b: Individuals low in self-silencing will be more likely to have the motivations of creating closeness and/or relate past relationship history when they TAPP.

**Rejection sensitivity.** Downey and Feldman (1996) describe rejection sensitivity as the way in which individuals respond to and perceive rejection. Fear of rejection likely influences partner willingness to share personal information with one another (Anderson et al., 2011; Lucchetti, 1999). From a self-disclosure perspective, openly expressing needs to romantic partners will likely trigger underlying rejection expectations for the individual high in rejection sensitivity (Downey & Feldman, 1996). Thus, it is likely that shared disclosures might serve as a self-protection strategy, leading to these hypotheses:

Hypothesis 5a: Individuals high in rejection sensitivity will be more likely to have the motivations of creating distance, negotiating relationship rules, and/or confirming a self-image when they TAPP.

Hypothesis 5b: Individuals low in rejection sensitivity will be more likely to have the motivations of creating closeness and/or relating past relationship history when they TAPP.

**Communication.** Patterns of communication between romantic partners likely predict self-disclosure tendencies. Communication styles during conflict between romantic couples have been found to be closely linked to attachment style (Domingue & Mollen, 2009). Consistent with this finding, Pietromonaco et al. (2004) proposed that
relationship goals differ for insecurely and securely attached individuals. Securely attached partners communicate with the goal of achieving intimacy while insecurely attached partners communicate with the goal of self-protection; conflict is perceived as a threat and therefore, high demandingness and/or withdrawal are common responses. Christensen and Heavey (1990) point to these demand/withdraw patterns as a negative, yet common, style of communication, such that one partner places heavy, emotional demands on the other, while the other reacts through avoidance and emotional withdrawal. Given that insecurely attached individuals not only endorse goals of relationship resistance and detachment, but also pursue these goals with unhealthy communication styles, I made the following predictions:

Hypothesis 6a: Individuals high in either demand or withdrawal and criticize or defend communication patterns will be more likely to have the motivations of creating distance, negotiating relationship rules, and/or confirming a self-image when they TAPP.

Hypothesis 6b: Individuals low in either demand or withdrawal and criticize or defend communication patterns will be more likely to have the motivations of creating closeness and/or relating past relationship history when they TAPP.

**Dyadic trust.** Lazelere and Huston (1980) define trust within the context of a romantic relationship as the extent to which one partner views the other partner as selfless and honest. This study found that couples reporting higher levels of trust for their partners engage in more intimate self-disclosures than couples reporting lower levels of trust. Such findings are consistent with Altman and Taylor’s (1973) theory that trust is a requirement for intimate disclosure as relationships progress. If and when disclosure does
occur between partners less trusting of one another, it is possible they will perceive the
goal of the disclosure as an effort to control or manipulate some aspect of the relationship
(Derlega & Chaikin, 1977). In light of the above arguments, I predict:

Hypothesis 7a: Individuals high in dyadic trust will be more likely to have the
motivations of creating closeness and/or relating past relationship history when
they TAPP.

Hypothesis 7b: Individuals low in dyadic trust will be more likely to have the
motivations of creating distance, negotiating relationship rules, and/or confirming
a self-image when they TAPP.

Forgiveness following a transgression. Links have been demonstrated between
attachment styles and willingness to forgive, such that more avoidant individuals tend to
forgive less due to negative interpretations of the betrayal (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2006).
Forgiveness of a partner betrayal is indicated by the extent to which the betrayed avoids
the betrayer, seeks revenge on the betrayer, and/or maintains a desire for benevolence
with the betrayer (McCullough, Fincham, & Tsang, 2003). Perhaps, then, those who are
unwilling to forgive their partners might retain ill-willed motivations when they TAPP,
yielding the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 8a: Individuals low in episodic forgiveness will be more likely to
TAPP in order to create distance, negotiate relationship rules, and/or confirm a
self-image.

Hypothesis 8b: Individuals high in episodic forgiveness will be more likely to
TAPP in order to create closeness and/or relate past relationship history.
CHAPTER 5
STUDY TWO METHODS

Subjects
The sample consisted of 141 undergraduate students in introductory psychology courses from a Midwestern private university. Participants were recruited through the university’s research sign-up system, SONA. Exclusion criteria specified that in order to participate in the study, participants at that time must have been in a romantic relationship for at least 3 months.

Measures

Self-disclosure index (SDI; Miller, Berg, & Archer, 1983; See APPENDIX C). The SDI is a 10-item measure assessed by a 5-point scale (0 = Discuss not at all; 4 = discuss fully and completely). The index was created so the stem of each question could be modified based on the research question at hand regarding target of disclosure. For the current study, the stem of each question will be in regards to the current romantic partner. The items for this measure have been found to yield a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .88 for disclosures to a romantic partner and .91 for disclosures to a same-sex friend (Derlega, Metts, Petronio, & Margulis, 1993).

Relationship assessment scale (Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick, 1998; See APPENDIX D). This is a 7-item scale which assesses relationship satisfaction within romantic relationships (e.g., “In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?”).
It has been found to have a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .86 (Hendrick et al., 1998) and test–retest reliability of .88 and .93 (Floyd, Boren, Hannawa, Hesse, McEwan, & Veksler, 2009). This scale has been shown to correlate with the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale; for men $r = .64$ and for women $r = .74$ (Hendrick et al., 1998). The items are answered on a 5-point Likert scale, with different verbal labels for each item (e.g., on item 1 the range is from 1-poorly to 5-extremely well; on item 2 the range is from 1-unsatisfied to 5-extremely satisfied). Higher scores indicate greater relationship satisfaction.

**Experiences in close relationships-revised** (ECR-R; Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000; See APPENDIX E). This scale is composed of 36 items that assess attachment anxiety and avoidance. The measure consists of two subscales, Anxiety and Avoidance. Responses are assessed on a 7-point scale, with scores ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. This measure has high internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for attachment anxiety of .92 and .95 for attachment avoidance (Fraley et al., 2000). ECR-R and the Relationship Questionnaire measures of anxiety were moderately positively correlated, $r = .69$, as were measures of avoidance, $r = .45$, demonstrating convergent construct validity (Sibley, Fischer, & Liu, 2005).

**Silencing the self scale** (Jack & Dill, 1992; See APPENDIX F). This scale consists of 31 items that are divided into four separate factors: silencing the self, externalized self-perception, care as self-sacrifice, and divided self. This scale was initially created to assess women’s schemas regarding intimacy, but since then has been found to be useful for both men and women (e.g., Flet et al., 2007). Internal reliability coefficients using a sample comprising both males and females were .78, .85, .79, and .81.
for silencing the self, externalized self-perception, care as self-sacrifice, and divided self, respectively (Flet et al., 2007).

**Rejection sensitivity questionnaire** (Downey & Feldman, 1996; See APPENDIX G). This scale is intended to measure one’s level of sensitivity to rejection and consists of 18 interpersonal situations followed by questions that assess one’s anxiety or concern regarding the outcomes of each situation. Initial testing has shown this measure to have good internal reliability (Cronbach’s alpha = .83) as well as test-retest reliability (Downey & Feldman, 1996).

**Communication patterns questionnaire-short form** (CPQ-SF Christensen & Heavey, 1990; See APPENDIX H). Initially, this was a 35-item self-report measure created by Christensen and Sullaway (1984). This scale aims to assess how romantic partners perceive their interactions with one another. It is an 11-item scale organized into three subscales: demand/withdraw communication, demand/withdraw roles, and equal constructive communication. Responses are recorded on a 9-point Likert scale and range from 1 = *very unlikely* to 9 = *very likely*. This scale has shown strong internal reliability (Cronbach’s alpha = .83) and convergent validity.

**Center for epidemiological studies-depression scale** (CESD; Radloff, 1977; See APPENDIX I). This 20-item measure is used to assess depressive symptomatology occurring over the last week. Responses range from 1 = *less than 1 day* to 4 = *most or all of the time*. It has been shown to have adequate test–retest reliability. In a recent study examining the links between marital satisfaction and depression, Kuoros et al. (2008) found Cronbach’s alpha to range from .83-.87 for husbands, and .87-.91 for wives. During initial research with the scale, the CESD correlated significantly and positively
with another measure of depression, Hamilton’s (1960) Clinician’s Rating Scale (r=.44). The CESD was shown further to discriminate between general and patient populations, with significantly higher mean scores noted for patient groups (Radloff, 1977).

**Dyadic trust scale** (Larzelere & Huston, 1980; See APPENDIX J). This 8-item scale is used to measure overall trust towards the current romantic partner. Items are scored on a 7-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. This scale is widely used and has demonstrated strong reliability (Cronbach’s alpha = .93) and discriminant validity with generalized, interpersonal trust.

**Transgression-related interpersonal motivations scale – revised** (McCullough, Root, & Cohen, 2006; See APPENDIX K). This 18-item measure assesses the extent to which a specific betrayal has been forgiven. For this study, participants were asked to report levels of forgiveness regarding a wrongdoing their partners had committed. Items are divided into three subscales: revenge, avoidance, and benevolence. Responses are recorded on a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. Subscales have demonstrated high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha ≥ .85) with some evidence of construct validity.

**Procedure**

**Data collection.** The procedure for this study was identical to that of study one. Participants completed the questionnaire packets after signing informed consent forms and were debriefed upon completion of the study.
CHAPTER 6
STUDY TWO RESULTS

As shown in Table 2, alphas for the reduced-term subscales were calculated, yielding moderate to high values ranging from .62 to .91. Table 2 also shows bivariate correlations between subscales and general disclosure.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Bivariate Correlations between Motivational Subscales and General Disclosure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Creating Distance</th>
<th>Negotiating Rules</th>
<th>Confirming Self-Image</th>
<th>Relating Past History</th>
<th>General Disclosure</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating Closeness</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirming Self-Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Past History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, **p < .01

As demonstrated in Table 3, simple bivariate correlations were calculated to assess associations between the motivational subscales and outcome variables (including general disclosure tendencies). Further, in order to ensure that the motivational subscales
are predicting the outcome variables above and beyond one’s general tendency to
disclose, partial correlations were also calculated, controlling for general disclosure.

As can be seen in Table 3, for individuals TAPPing to create psychological and/or
emotional closeness with their partners, hypotheses 1b and 2a were supported while
hypotheses 3a, 4b, 5b, 6b, 7a, and 8b were unsupported. That is, participants reporting
higher relationship satisfaction were more likely to TAPP in order to create psychological
and/or emotional closeness with their partners (garnering support for hypotheses 2a).
Individuals TAPPing to create closeness also scored higher on positive interactions
during conflict, while scoring lower on avoidant attachment (supporting hypothesis 1b).
Contrary to expectations, it is worth noting that lower levels of dyadic trust yielded a
higher likelihood of TAPPing for the purpose of creating psychological and/or emotional
closeness (contrary to hypothesis 7a). That is, those individuals who evaluate their
partners as less trustworthy and more interested in their own welfare over that of their
partners’ are the same individuals who are TAPPing in an attempt to obtain closeness. All
remaining outcome variables were unrelated to the TAPPing to create closeness subscale,
thus there was a lack of support for hypotheses 3a, 4b, 5b, 6b, 7a, and 8b.
Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, Alphas, and Bivariate and Partial Correlations between Motivational Subscales and Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CSI</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>GD</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXA</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>63.08</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVA</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>(19.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>82.22</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSQ</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.92)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Subscale names have been abbreviated to the following: Creating Closeness (CC), Creating Distance (CD), Negotiating Rules (NR), Confirming a Self-Image (CSI), Relating History (RH), General Disclosure (GD), Relationship Satisfaction (RS), Anxious Attachment (AXA), Avoidant Attachment (AVA), Self-Silencing (SS), Rejection Sensitivity (RSQ), Demand-Withdraw (DW), Criticize-Defend (CD), Positive Interactions (PI), Depression (D), Dyadic Trust (DT), Revenge (R), Avoidance (A), Benevolence (B). Partial correlations are listed underneath bivariate correlations in italics.

As Table 3 demonstrates, several of the tested outcome variables were found to have strong associations with TAPPing to create psychological and/or emotional
distance, providing support for hypotheses 1a, 2b, 3b, 4a, 6a, and 8a. Participants reporting more anxious attachment, symptoms of depression, and self-silencing tendencies are likely TAPPing to create distance with their partners. Furthermore, negative communication styles (i.e., both demand-withdraw and criticize-defend) are significantly and positively related to TAPPing to create distance; partners needing more emotional boundaries are probably handling conflict less positively. Not surprisingly, these individuals are also more likely to seek revenge on their partners or avoid their partners altogether following a specific betrayal. No significant relationship was found between the distance subscale and sensitivity to rejection, yielding a lack of support for hypothesis 5a. Consistent with the above finding on the relationship between dyadic trust and TAPPing for closeness, the inverse is true for the distance subscale: those who are more trusting of their partners are TAPPing to create distance, demonstrating a lack of support for hypothesis 7b.

Support was found for hypotheses 2b, 6a, and 8a for individuals who TAPP in order to confirm a self-image. That is, participants who reported to be less satisfied in their relationship are more likely to TAPP for this purpose. Additionally, maladaptive communication patterns are likely present for individuals who TAPP with this purpose, as Table 3 shows us. Furthermore, it is also likely that these individuals wish to either avoid their partner or pursue retaliation in response to an isolated betrayal. No support was found for hypothesis 7b, in that higher feelings of trust towards partners yields a stronger likelihood of TAPPing to confirm a self-image. Further, the remaining outcome variables were found to be unrelated to this subscale, evidencing a lack of support for hypotheses 1b, 3b, 4a, and 5a.
TAPPing to negotiate relationship rules yielded no significant relationship with any of the tested outcome variables; thus, hypotheses 1a, 2b, 3b, 4a, 5a, 6a, 7b, and 8a were all unsupported. In short, this subscale does not predict outcome variables independently from an individual’s overall tendency to disclose to their partners.

Finally, all hypotheses corresponding to the TAPPing to relate past history subscale were unsupported in that no relationship was found between it and the outcome variables of interest. Therefore, TAPPing to simply relay basic relationship information failed to demonstrate predictive power over participant’s general tendency to disclose.

Despite the above meaningful findings, several of the outcome variables were not found to be related to TAPPing motivations as anticipated. Depressive symptoms and self-silencing, were found to only positively predict TAPPing to create distance, contrary to our prediction that these variables would also positively predict TAPPing to negotiate rules and confirm a self-image (no support for hypotheses 3b and 4a) and negatively predicting TAPPing to create closeness and relate past history (no support for hypotheses 3a and 4b). TAPPing to negotiate relationship rules could not be predicted by dyadic trust (no support for hypothesis 7b), unlike its close relatives (e.g., TAPPing to create distance and confirm and self-image). Furthermore, findings reveal that less anxiously attached individuals are not TAPPing to create closeness or relate past history (no support for hypothesis 1b), suggesting that TAPPing for each purpose is not necessarily done by securely attached individuals. In a similar vein, individuals with avoidant attachment styles are not more likely than their secure counterparts to TAPP in order to create distance, negotiate relationship rules, or confirm a self-image (no support for higher levels of avoidant attachment asserted by hypothesis 1a); rather, TAPPing to create
distance was positively related only to an anxious attachment style (support found only for higher levels of anxious attachment asserted by hypothesis 1a). Responses to isolated betrayals were unrelated to a person’s likelihood to TAPP to create closeness, relate past history (no support for hypothesis 8b) and to negotiate relationship rules (no support for hypothesis 8a). Possible explanations and implications for these findings will be proposed below.
CHAPTER 7
DISCUSSION

The bulk of self-disclosure research has focused on the links between its occurrence, frequency, depth, and romantic relationship health. There has been little investigation of the mechanisms that might drive these behaviors and how they might uniquely be related to the overall well-being of the individual and his or her relationship. Newman (1982) proposed specific motivations as one such mechanism that gives partners a reason to share information about past partner experiences to current partners; that is, partners may believe that such disclosure might benefit the self and/or the relationship. The motivational measure developed for the current studies serves to empirically evaluate Newman’s specific predictions. Results both confirm and disconfirm her theory of motivational TAPPing, suggesting a need to perhaps modify certain aspects of her theory. Therefore, potential explanations for the findings will be offered and speculations will be made about the implications that can be drawn and those that cannot.

Hypotheses 1a and 1b posited that those high in anxious and/or avoidant attachment would likely TAPP to create distance, negotiate rules, or confirm a self-image, while low levels of insecure attachment would predict TAPPing for closeness and for relating past history. Both hypotheses were only partially supported. Neither avoidant nor anxious attachment was related to TAPPing for the purpose of negotiating relationship rules or to confirm a self-image. However, anxiously attached individuals
are, in fact, more likely to TAPP in order to create distance. Though TAPPing to create distance might seem more characteristic of more avoidant individuals, there is some support demonstrating that anxiously attached individuals seek little social support compared to their secure counterparts, thus conflict is less likely to be resolved through approach methods (Ognibene & Collins, 1998). It is possible that anxiously attached individuals feel unsafe confronting conflict directly with their partners and use TAPPing as an alternative method for expressing their feelings about the relationship. Furthermore, while those low in avoidant attachment TAPP to create closeness with their partners, neither avoidant nor anxious attachment was related to TAPPing to relate past relationship history.

Partial support was found for hypothesis 2a, which stated that higher relationship satisfaction would predict TAPPing for closeness and for relating past history. Consistent with past research findings about the influence intimate disclosures have on strengthening romantic bonds (Collins & Miller, 1994; Green et al., 2006), relationship quality was found to be positively correlated to TAPPing to create closeness. However, it was not found to be linked to TAPPing to relate past relationship history. Hypothesis 2b stated that individuals less satisfied in their relationships would be more likely to TAPP to create distance, negotiating rules, and confirming a self-image. This prediction was partially supported, as relationship satisfaction was found to be negatively related only to TAPPing to create distance and confirm a self-image. Couples less satisfied in their relationships are more likely to rely on poor communication strategies (Christensen & Heavey, 1990), lending support for our finding that relationship satisfaction is directly linked to disclosures aimed to alienate or manipulate the current partner.
Hypothesis 3a declared that less depressed individuals would likely TAPP to create closeness and relate past history, but was unsupported, as no significant relationship was found with either subscale. However, partial support was found for hypothesis 3b, which asserted that more depressed individuals will TAPP to create distance, negotiate rules, and confirm a self-image. Indeed, depressed individuals were found to TAPP with the intention of creating distance with their partners. Depressive symptoms have long been linked to the maintenance of couple conflict (Mackinnon, Sherry, Antony, Stewart, Sherry, & Hartling, 2012), and thus might encourage the use of past partner disclosure as a tool of emotional leverage. However, depression failed to yield a significant relationship with TAPPing for both negotiating relationship rules and confirming a self-image.

Findings demonstrate partial support for hypothesis 4a, which posited that higher levels of self-silencing would correlate positively with TAPPing to create distance. Analyses confirmed this relationship. However, self-silencing traits were not found to correlate with TAPPing to negotiate rules or confirm a self-image. Since self-silencing individuals are typically characterized by an anticipated fear of rejection in response to vulnerable emotional expression, it is plausible that when they do disclose about past romantic experiences, disclosures manifest as passive-aggressive wishes that have been repressed. Conversely, self-silencing was not found to be related to TAPPing to create closeness or to relate past relationship history; thus, no support was found for hypothesis 4b.

Hypothesis 5a proposed that those more sensitive to rejection would TAPP to create distance, negotiate rules, and confirm a self-image. No support was found for this
claim in that sensitivity to rejection was not found to predict any of those three subscales. Hypothesis 5b predicted a negative relationship between rejection sensitivity and TAPPing for closeness and/or to relate past history, but no relationship was found between rejection sensitivity and the two subscales.

The relationship between TAPP motivations and communication style subscales lent partial support of hypothesis 6a, which argued for a positive link between maladaptive communication styles and TAPPing to create distance, negotiate rules, and/or confirm a self-image. The tendency to recruit criticize-defend and demand-withdrawal strategies during conflict were positively related to TAPPing both to create distance and confirm a self-image, while TAPPing to create distance was also found to be negatively related to engaging in positive interactions. Past research has found that partners who withdraw from conflict often leave their partners feeling misunderstood, and thus unjustified in their behaviors (Weger, 2005). In response, partners might pursue harder through TAPPing methods in order to gain a sense of verification of feelings. However, the communication subscales were not related to TAPPing to negotiate rules. Hypothesis 6b was unsupported, which asserted that individuals low in the demand-withdraw and high in the positive interaction communication pattern are more likely to TAPP in order to create closeness and relate past relationship history, yet neither subscale was found to be significantly related to communication patterns.

Statistical analyses indicate a lack of support for both hypotheses 7a and 7b. Hypothesis 7a stated that higher levels of dyadic trust would predict TAPPing for closeness and/or relating past history. However, dyadic trust was not significantly related to either TAPPing subscale. Hypothesis 7b posited that lower levels of dyadic trust would
predict TAPPing for distance, negotiating rules, and/or to confirm a self-image. Dyadic trust was unrelated to TAPPing to negotiate rules, but was positively correlated with TAPPing to create distance and confirm a self-image. Again, despite this surprising finding, it is important to note that TAPPing for these purposes aims to shape the partner’s behavior and relationship itself in a fashion that the TAPPer would consider desirable. Perhaps, in the midst of such partner and relationship manipulation, the discloser must also manipulate his or her own perceptions about the relationship to fit his or her TAPP disclosure goals. In fact, one study has shown that in order for a relationship to persevere, individuals must perceive their partners as trustworthy and honest (Larzelere & Huston, 1980), but relationship (mis)perceptions are heavily dependent on partners’ wishes for the future of the relationship (Murray & Holmes, 2015).

Partial support was found for hypothesis 8a, which argued that unforgiving responses following a specific betrayal would predict TAPPing to create distance, negotiate rules, and/or confirm a self-image. All subscales of episodic forgiveness were unrelated to TAPPing to negotiate relationship rules. However, seeking revenge and partner avoidance following a specific transgression were both positively correlated with TAPPing to create distance and to confirm a self-image, and a return to benevolence negatively correlated with the TAPPing to create distance subscale. Forgiveness is highly associated with behavior motivated for the well-being of the relationship (Alleman, Amberg, Zimprich, & Fincham, 2007). However, relationship goals are less relationship-focused and more self-focused when TAPPing is done to create distance or confirm a self-image; therefore, forgiveness tendencies are likely weaker. Furthermore, no support was found for hypothesis 8b, which stated that higher levels of forgiveness following a
specific betrayal would predict TAPPing for closeness and/or to relate past history. Rather, all subscales of episodic forgiveness were unrelated to both TAPPing motivations.

One question the current study answers is why partners might decide to talk about past romantic relationships to current and future partners. While future studies must shed more light on which motivations and how many of them actually exist for TAPPing, our data suggest that TAPPing is either done to build intimacy or to establish the upper-hand in a romantic relationship. Due to the stark differences of these goals, the next question to ask is: who is motivated to TAPP?

Results indicate that individuals who constructively communicate with their partners in the midst of conflict and feel that their needs are adequately met by their partners TAPP with the intention of growing closer with their partners. Consistent with this notion, constructive communication is characterized by the respect and understanding of other’s perspectives, which engenders feelings of love and fuels relationship commitment in romantic contexts (Meeks, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 1998). Thus, the desire to strengthen romantic bonds might compel partners to TAPP in order to achieve this goal.

Individuals who are unhappy in their romantic relationships might also utilize TAPPing, albeit as a method for relational and emotional control. Such goals are achievable by TAPPing to create distance and to confirm a self-image. The current study suggests that depressed, self-silencing, and rejection sensitive individuals are the ones TAPPing for this purpose. One study found self-silencing traits and low self-esteem to predict symptoms of depression (Cramer, Gallant, & Langlois, 2005), and negative
partner attributions are often made by those with low self-esteem as a self-protective mechanism (Marigold, Holmes, & Ross, 2007). These individuals are likely to be poor communicators, as self-silencers adopt rigid roles and behaviors deemed permissible in relationships, which stifles authentic emotional expression (Cramer, Gallant, & Langlois, 2005).

In order to understand which individuals are more likely to TAPP to create emotional distance or confirm a self-image, the nature of each goal must be revisited. That is, where there is a need for control or dominance, there is also an underlying resistance to personal change and a push for partner change. If an individual perceives the partner as needing to change rather than the self, then the partner is to blame while the self escapes blame. Partner blame following relationship transgressions have been found to negatively impact judgments of the relationship (Hira & Overall, 2010). Thus, it is plausible that partner-blaming individuals will seek revenge or pure avoidance, and then confirm their righteous positions through TAPPing to create distance and/or confirm a self-image. Finally, individuals who report trusting their partners will TAPP to obtain relational control. Returning to the characteristics of dyadic trust, partners must be perceived as both benevolent (i.e., fostering concern for partner’s welfare over own welfare) and honest (i.e., the extent to which partners can be taken for their word). The current study does successfully identify individuals who attribute these characteristics to their partners, in which partners are viewed as completely reliable, truthful, and unselfish. However, dyadic data was not gathered in the current study, thus it is unclear whether or not reciprocal responses would shed light on a power differential within the relationship. For example, in a relationship in which Partner A fully trusts that Partner B will always
meet Partner A’s expectations of benevolence and honesty and Partner B passively complies, Partner A is in a superior position to take emotional advantage of Partner B. If Partner B is able to identify this power differential, trust attributions may not be comparable to those of Partner A. In this scenario, it could be argued that Partner B is more emotionally involved than Partner A, as evidenced by continuous efforts to satisfy the expectations of Partner A. Additionally, Partner A’s trust towards Partner B may not necessarily translate to emotional investment. In fact, one study found that less emotionally invested partners may emotionally exploit their more invested counterparts (Sprecher, Schmeeckle, & Felmlee, 2006). Thus, in the absence of commitment to relationship longevity, dyadic trust could simply serve as one’s tool to manipulate his or her partner.

For those who choose TAPPing as a method towards relationship-goal achievement, does it work? Cross-sectional data makes it difficult to determine directionality of effects, but if healthier, happier individuals are TAPPing to become closer to their partners and then retain feelings of closeness and satisfaction as the relationship progresses, TAPPing for this purpose might contribute to relationship satisfaction and certain aspects of personal well-being. Longitudinal studies, however, are needed to address the long-term effects of TAPPing for closeness. On the other hand, the current study would suggest that pursuing emotional control and self-protection in a romantic relationship is poorly achieved through means of TAPPing. Thus, I recommend approaching motivational TAPPing with caution, as consequences are either negative or outcomes are muddled due to the need for further study.
The findings from this study demonstrate overall poor efficacy of TAPPing to satisfy relationship and personal goals, but are they important in better understanding romantic relationship functioning, and if so, why? Past relationship experiences accumulate to construct relational schemas, and thus remain present to a degree in current and future relationships (Newman, 1982). Romantic relationships are integral in the construction of our personalities and behaviors (Lehnart & Neyer, 2006), which then manifest in the things we do with our partners and the conversations we have, for instance. Arguably, current relationship behaviors are, to an extent, reproductions and modifications of past relationship experiences. Therefore, it is not inconceivable to imagine the likelihood of past partner topics infiltrating into new relationship narratives. One might even argue that past relationship information is leaked fairly regularly in relationships, whether superficial or intimate in depth.

Furthermore, the significance of the current study rests partly in the literature on relationship conflict. First, romantic relationship conflict is commonplace and even healthy in reasonable doses. Using a community sample, one study found conflict among married couples to take place once or twice a month, and this rate remained stable three years later (McGonagle, Kessler, & Schilling, 1992). In light of such normalcy, it is easy to say things we do not mean when emotions are heightened (Baxter & Wilmot, 1985), or behave in certain ways to get partners to do what we want and need to them to do without realizing the means we use to make this happen. Thus, the current study serves to draw our attention to the potential dangers of using TAPPing as a means of relationship goal-attainment. Doing so could elicit poor conflict management and relationship maintenance.
strategies, potentially leading to divorce in married couples (Bradbury & Karney, 1993) and relationship dissolution in dating couples (Le, Dove, Agnew, Korn, & Mutso, 2010).

Overall, a few preliminary conclusions can be drawn based on the results of the current study. First, the current study only focuses on the personal and relational effects of the motivations behind TAPPing, rather than the act of TAPPing itself. Thus, this study can offer no insight into whether or not talking about past partners is detrimental to relationships. In order to answer this question, future studies might look at the impact of past relationship disclosure content on current relationships via qualitative methods (e.g., daily diaries, video taping, etc.). It appears that having motivations when TAPPing, particularly negative ones, is potentially harmful for the relationship. Based on these findings, Newman’s predictions might be insufficient for fully understanding the role of motivations in talking about past relationship experiences with current romantic partners.

The measure developed for this study models Newman’s predictions, including the proposition that the goal of creating closeness can only be obtained through negative past partner disclosures, while the goal of creating distance can only be achieved through positive past partner disclosures. However, it is worth noting the limitations of the positive and negative valences Newman assigned to correspond to specific goals. For example, perhaps partners could successfully create closeness by TAPPing about a positive experience they had with a past partner (e.g., “I’m lucky that I have had good dating experiences because I have very little emotional baggage in my relationship with you.”). Similarly, partners could achieve distance by TAPPing about negative past partner experiences (e.g., “I hate my last boyfriend/girlfriend so much.”), as disclosures of this nature might metacommunicate to the current partner that the disclosing partner
has not yet moved on from that relationship, thus creating a rift between partners. Therefore, the validity of the valence-goal correspondence could be tested in the future by re-assigning positive TAPPing information to the creating closeness subscale and negative TAPPing information to the creating distance subscale. If these subscales continue to be endorsed, then goal obtainment may not be dependent upon the extent to which disclosures reflect negative or positive experiences.

The motivational TAPPing measure used in this study demonstrated adequate to high internal consistency, indicating that subscale items accurately capture each motivational construct. One exception is the TAPPing to relate past relationship history subscale, in which Cronbach’s alpha fell slightly short of the projected value of .70. Though items might capture this subscale to a degree, items likely overlap substantially with other subscales, such as TAPPing to creating closeness. This would be especially true if further investigation yielded valence significance as obsolete, as the TAPPing to relate history subscale in the measure could be endorsed through negative, positive, and neutral past partner disclosures. Moreover, TAPPing to negotiate relationship rules did not predict outcome variables above and beyond general disclosure tendencies. In fact, only three out of the five subscales successfully predicted outcome variables after controlling for general disclosure: TAPPing to create closeness, distance, and to confirm a self-image. Following this line of thought, conducting a factor analysis for this measure might be beneficial in understanding how many motivational constructs actually exist when partners TAPP. In doing this, the true reasons couples have for TAPPing and how they translate to the health of the relationship might become clearer.
Other limitations of this study involve the methodological design. As a cross-sectional study, our understanding of directionality is limited. Longitudinal studies might reveal the long-term effects of motivations on relationship quality and personal well-being. Additionally, the race of our sample minimizes diversity, which narrows generalizability to other populations. Finally, as briefly mentioned before, the current study did not examine how specific content might impact motivations, so future studies might investigate this relationship, as it could carry important implications about motivations based on specific disclosure characteristics.
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APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Please complete the following questionnaire by checking or circling the appropriate number. All of your responses will remain confidential. Please do not place your name on this questionnaire.

1. Gender: Male ____ Female ____
2. Age: ____
4. Race:
   1. ____ Caucasian (White)         2. ____ Asian or Pacific Islander
   3. ____ African American          4. ____ Latino/a
   5. ____ American Indian           6. ____ Other (Specify)

5. How long have you been in the romantic relationship with your current partner?
   Years ___    Months ____

6. What is the nature of your current romantic relationship?
   1. Friends with Benefits
   2. Dating (open relationship)
   3. Dating (exclusively)
   4. Engaged (not living together)
   5. Engaged (living together)
   6. Married
APPENDIX B

MOTIVATIONS FOR TAPP QUESTIONNAIRE

Part One

INSTRUCTIONS: Some people talk to their current romantic partners about other people they have dated in the past. These items ask about different aspects of communicating about a past romantic partner(s). Please read each item carefully and circle the option that best applies to you.

*NOTE: Please consider any and all situations in which you might have talked about a past romantic partner to your current partner. For instance, a comment as simple as “he/she was bad” DOES count as information about a past partner given to your current partner.

1. I have talked with my current romantic partner about experiences I have had with past romantic partners.
   Yes No
   If you responded “No” to question #1, please skip question #3.

2. On average, during your relationship, how often have you talked to your current romantic partner about experiences with past romantic partners?
   
   Every Day 2-3 times Once Twice Less than once
   per week per week per month per month

3. I have talked with my current romantic partner about positive experiences I have had with a past romantic partner.
   Yes No
   If you responded “No” to question #3, please skip to question #5.

4. On average, during your relationship, how often have you talked to your current romantic partner about positive experiences with past romantic partners?
   
   Every Day 2-3 times Once Twice Less than once
   per week per week per month per month
5. I have talked with my current romantic partner about negative experiences I have had with a past romantic partner.
Yes  No

If you responded “No” to question #5, please skip to page 9.

6. On average, during your relationship, how often have you talked to your current romantic partner about negative experiences with past romantic partners?
Every 2-3 times Once Twice Less than once
Day per week per week per month per month
INSTRUCTIONS: The following items will ask for more details about times when you have talked about ANY experiences (i.e. positive OR negative) you have had with a past romantic partner(s) to your current partner. Please read each item carefully and circle the option that best applies to you.

I have shared experiences I have had in past romantic relationships with my current partner, hoping that doing so would…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Completely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Help him/her better understand who I am
2. Make my partner share his/her past experiences with me, as well
3. Help my current partner envision what my past partner(s) were like
4. Help my current partner to understand my behaviors better
5. Help my current partner know more about my past life
6. Make my current partner less likely to act the way my past partner acted
7. Make my partner obey the expectations I have for the relationship
8. Make my partner less likely to upset me
9. Help my current partner meet my standards
10. Send a “warning message” to keep my partner from doing things I don’t like
11. Make my current partner less likely to do things I consider to be “deal-breakers”
12. Help excuse my poor behavior caused by past negative relationships
13. Make my current partner see me as a good partner to have
14. Make my partner less likely to blame me when we fight/argue
15. Make my partner view me more positively
16. Make my partner respect me more
17. Make my current partner more sensitive towards me
### Part Two

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The following items will ask for more details about times when you have talked about **NEGATIVE** experiences you have had with a past romantic partner(s) to your current partner. Please read each item carefully and circle the option that best applies to you.

*I have shared **NEGATIVE** experiences I have had in past romantic relationships with my current partner, hoping that doing so would…*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Completely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Help us share our feelings with one another
2. Make me feel closer to my partner
3. Strengthen our relationship
4. Make my partner feel closer to me
5. Make me feel more connected to him/her
6. Help us trust each other more
Part Three

INSTRUCTIONS: The following items will ask for more details about times when you have talked about POSITIVE experiences you have had with a past romantic partner(s) to your current partner. Please read each item carefully and circle the option that best applies to you.

I have shared POSITIVE experiences I have had in past romantic relationships with my current partner, hoping that doing so would…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Completely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Make my partner feel jealous
2. Make my partner feel angry
3. Give me and my partner some emotional distance
4. Give me a stronger sense of control in the relationship
5. Give me a stronger sense of dominance in the relationship
6. Make my partner see my past romantic partner(s) as a threat
APPENDIX C
SELF-DISCLOSURE INDEX

Instructions: Please indicate how much you discuss the following topics with your current romantic partner.

0 = Discuss not at all  4 = Discuss fully and completely

1. My personal habits………………………………0 1 2 3 4
2. Things I have done which I feel guilty about……0 1 2 3 4
3. Things I wouldn't do in public. .....................0 1 2 3 4
4. My deepest feelings ..............................0 1 2 3 4
5. What I like and dislike about myself ............0 1 2 3 4
6. What is important to me in life ...................0 1 2 3 4
7. What makes me the person I am .................0 1 2 3 4
8. My worst fears .....................................0 1 2 3 4
9. Things I have done which I am proud of .......0 1 2 3 4
10. My close relationships with other people……. 0 1 2 3 4
APPENDIX D

RELATIONSHIP ASSESSMENT SCALE

Instructions: Please circle the number for each item which best answers that item for you.

1) How well does your partner meet your needs?
   1   2   3   4   5
   Poorly         Average       Extremely Well

2) In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?
   1   2   3   4   5
   Unsatisfied       Average       Extremely Satisfied

3) How good is your relationship compared to most?
   1   2   3   4   5
   Poor         Average       Excellent

4) How often do you wish you hadn't gotten into this relationship?
   1   2   3   4   5
   Never       Average       Very Often

5) To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?
   1   2   3   4   5
   Not at All       Average       Completely

6) How much do you love your partner?
   1   2   3   4   5
   Not Much       Average       Very Much

7) How many problems are there in your relationship?
   1   2   3   4   5
   Very Few       Average       Very Many
APPENDIX E

EXPERIENCES IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS – REVISED SCALE

Instructions: The statements below concern how you feel in your relationships with others. We are interested in how you *generally* experience relationships, not just in what is happening in a current relationship. Respond to each statement by circling a number to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

1. I'm afraid that I will lose the love of others.
   1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 ----------- 5 ----------- 6 ----------- 7
   Strongly Disagree                        Strongly Agree

2. I often worry that others will not want to stay with me.
   1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 ----------- 5 ----------- 6 ----------- 7
   Strongly Disagree                        Strongly Agree

3. I often worry that others do not really love me.
   1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 ----------- 5 ----------- 6 ----------- 7
   Strongly Disagree                        Strongly Agree

4. I worry that others won’t care about me as much as I care about them.
   1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 ----------- 5 ----------- 6 ----------- 7
   Strongly Disagree                        Strongly Agree

5. I often wish that others’ feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for them.
   1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 ----------- 5 ----------- 6 ----------- 7
   Strongly Disagree                        Strongly Agree

6. I worry a lot about my relationships.
   1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 ----------- 5 ----------- 6 ----------- 7
   Strongly Disagree                        Strongly Agree
7. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.
   1-2-3-4-5-6-7
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

8. When I show my feelings for others, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me.
   1-2-3-4-5-6-7
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

9. I rarely worry about others leaving me.
   1-2-3-4-5-6-7
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

10. Others make me doubt myself.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

11. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

12. I find that others don't want to get as close as I would like.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

13. Sometimes others change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

14. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

15. I'm afraid that once someone gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

16. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from others.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

17. I worry that I won't measure up to other people.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

18. Others only seem to notice me when I'm angry.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

19. I prefer not to show others how I feel deep down.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

20. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with others.
    1-2-3-4-5-6-7
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on others.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   Strongly Disagree

22. I am very comfortable being close to others.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   Strongly Disagree

23. I don't feel comfortable opening up to others.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   Strongly Disagree

24. I prefer not to be too close to romantic others.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   Strongly Disagree

25. I get uncomfortable when others want to be very close.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   Strongly Disagree

26. I find it relatively easy to get close to others.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   Strongly Disagree

27. It's not difficult for me to get close others.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   Strongly Disagree

28. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with others.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   Strongly Disagree

29. It helps to turn to others in times of need.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   Strongly Disagree

30. I tell others just about everything.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
   Strongly Disagree
31. I talk things over with others.
1 -------------2-------------3-------------4-------------5-------------6-------------7
   Strongly Disagree                            Strongly Agree

32. I am nervous when others get too close to me.
1 -------------2-------------3-------------4-------------5-------------6-------------7
   Strongly Disagree                            Strongly Agree

33. I feel comfortable depending on others.
1 -------------2-------------3-------------4-------------5-------------6-------------7
   Strongly Disagree                            Strongly Agree

34. I find it easy to depend on others.
1 -------------2-------------3-------------4-------------5-------------6-------------7
   Strongly Disagree                            Strongly Agree

35. It's easy for me to be affectionate with others.
1 -------------2-------------3-------------4-------------5-------------6-------------7
   Strongly Disagree                            Strongly Agree

36. Others really understand me and my needs.
1 -------------2-------------3-------------4-------------5-------------6-------------7
   Strongly Disagree                            Strongly Agree
APPENDIX F
SILENCING THE SELF SCALE

Instructions: Please circle the number that best describes how you feel about each of the statements listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I think it is best to put myself first because no one else will look out for me.
2. I don't speak my feelings in an intimate relationship when I know they will cause disagreement.
3. Caring means putting the other person's needs in front of my own.
4. Considering my needs to be as important as those of the people I love is selfish.
5. I find it is harder to be myself when I am in a close relationship than when I am on my own.
6. I tend to judge myself by how I think other people see me.
7. I feel dissatisfied with myself because I should be able to do all the things people are supposed to be able to do these days.
8. When my partner's needs and feelings conflict with my own, I always state mine clearly.
9. In a close relationship, my responsibility is to make the other person happy.
10. Caring means choosing to do what the other person wants, even when I want to do something different.
11. In order to feel good about myself, I need to feel independent and self-sufficient.
12. One of the worst things I can do is to be selfish.
13. I feel I have to act in a certain way to please my partner.
14. Instead of risking confrontations in close relationships, I would rather not rock the boat.
15. I speak my feelings with my partner, even when it leads to problems or disagreements.
16. Often I look happy enough on the outside, but inwardly I feel angry and rebellious.
17. In order for my partner to love me, I cannot reveal certain things about myself to him/her.
18. When my partner's needs or opinions conflict with mine, rather than asserting my own point of view I usually end up agreeing with him/her.
19. When I am in a close relationship I lose my sense of who I am.
20. When it looks as though certain of my needs can’t be met in a relationship, I usually realize that they weren’t very important anyway.
21. My partner loves and appreciates me for who I am.
22. Doing things just for myself is selfish.
23. When I make decisions, other people's thoughts and opinions influence me more than my own thoughts and opinions.
24. I rarely express my anger at those close to me.
25. I feel that my partner does not know my real self.
26. I think it's better to keep my feelings to myself when they do conflict with my partner's.
27. I often feel responsible for other people's feelings.
28. I find it hard to know what I think and feel because I spend a lot of time thinking about how other people are feeling.
29. In a close relationship I don't usually care what we do, as long as the other person is happy.
30. I try to bury my feelings when I think they will cause trouble in my close relationship(s).
31. I never seem to measure up to the standards I set for myself.

* If you answered the last question with a 4 or 5, please list up to three standards you feel you don't measure up to.

1.
2.
APPENDIX G

REJECTION SENSITIVITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Each of the items below describes things college students sometimes ask of other people. Please imagine that you are in each situation. You will be asked to answer the following questions:
1) How concerned or anxious would you be about how the other person would respond?

2) How do you think the other person would be likely to respond?

1. You ask someone in class if you can borrow his/her notes.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to lend you his/her notes?

very unconcerned | very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that the person would willingly give me his/her notes.

very likely | very unlikely
1 2 3 4 5 6

2. You ask your boyfriend/girlfriend to move in with you.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to move in with you?

very unconcerned | very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that he/she would want to move in with me.

very likely | very unlikely
1 2 3 4 5 6

3. You ask your parents for help in deciding what programs to apply to.
How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would want to help you?

very unconcerned                       very concerned
1      2      3      4      5      6

I would expect that they would want to help me.

very likely                       very unlikely
1      2      3      4      5      6

4. You ask someone you don’t know well out on a date.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to go out with you?

very unconcerned                       very concerned
1      2      3      4      5      6

I would expect that the person would want to go out with me.

very likely                       very unlikely
1      2      3      4      5      6

5. Your boyfriend/girlfriend has plans to go out with friends tonight, but you really want to spend the evening with him/her, and you tell him/her so.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would decide to stay in?

very unconcerned                       very concerned
1      2      3      4      5      6

I would expect that the person would willingly choose to stay in.

very likely                       very unlikely
1      2      3      4      5      6

6. You ask your parents for extra money to cover living expenses.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would help you out?

very unconcerned                       very concerned
1      2      3      4      5      6
I would expect that my parents would not mind helping me out.

very likely  very unlikely
1 2 3 4 5 6

7. After class, you tell your professor that you have been having some trouble with a section of the course and ask if he/she can give you some extra help.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your professor would want to help you out?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that my professor would want to help me out.

very likely  very unlikely
1 2 3 4 5 6

8. You approach a close friend to talk after doing or saying something that seriously upset him/her.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to talk with you?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that he/she would want to talk with me to try to work things out.

very likely  very unlikely
1 2 3 4 5 6

9. You ask someone in one of your classes to coffee.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to go?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that the person would want to go with me.
10. After graduation, you can’t find a job and ask your parents if you can live at home for awhile.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would want you to come home?

very unconcerned very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect I would be welcome at home.

very likely very unlikely
1 2 3 4 5 6

11. You ask your friend to go on a vacation with you over Spring Break.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to go with you?

very unconcerned very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that he/she would want to go with me.

very likely very unlikely
1 2 3 4 5 6

12. You call your boyfriend/girlfriend after a bitter argument and tell him/her you want to see him/her.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would want to see you?

very unconcerned very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that he/she would want to see me.

very likely very unlikely
1 2 3 4 5 6

13. You ask a friend if you can borrow something of his/hers.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to loan it to you?
very unconcerned  very concerned
1  2  3  4  5  6

I would expect that he/she would willingly loan me it.

very likely  very unlikely
1  2  3  4  5  6

14. You ask your parents to come to an occasion important to you.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would want to come?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1  2  3  4  5  6

I would expect that my parents would want to come.

very likely  very unlikely
1  2  3  4  5  6

15. You ask a friend to do you a big favor.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would do this favor?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1  2  3  4  5  6

I would expect that he/she would willing to do this favor for me.

very likely  very unlikely
1  2  3  4  5  6

16. You ask your boyfriend/girlfriend if he/she really loves you.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would say yes?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1  2  3  4  5  6

I would expect that he/she would answer yes sincerely.

very likely  very unlikely
1  2  3  4  5  6
17. You go to a party and notice someone on the other side of the room and then you ask them to dance.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to dance with you?

very unconcerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that he/she would want to dance with me.

very likely
1 2 3 4 5 6

18. You ask your boyfriend/girlfriend to come home to meet your parents.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would want to meet your parents?

very unconcerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that he/she would want to meet my parents.

very likely
1 2 3 4 5 6
When issues or problems arise in your current romantic relationship, how likely is it that . . . .

1. Both partners avoid discussing the problem.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Very unlikely        Very likely

2. Both partners try to discuss the problem.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Very unlikely        Very likely

3. Female tries to start a discussion while male tries to avoid a discussion.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Very unlikely        Very likely

4. Male tries to start a discussion while female tries to avoid a discussion.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Very unlikely        Very likely

During a discussion of issues or problems with your current romantic partner, how likely is it that...

5. Both partners express feelings to each other.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Very unlikely        Very likely

6. Both partners blame, accuse, or criticize each other.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Very unlikely        Very likely
7. Both partners suggest possible solutions and compromises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Female pressures, nags, or demands while male withdraws, becomes silent, or refuses to discuss the matter further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Male pressures, nags, or demands while female withdraws, becomes silent, or refuses to discuss the matter further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Female criticizes while male defends himself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Male criticizes while female defends herself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX I**

**CENTER FOR EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES – DEPRESSION SCALE**

**Instructions:** Circle the number for each statement that best describes how often you felt or behaved this way.

**DURING THE PAST WEEK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)</th>
<th>Some or a little of the time (1-2 days)</th>
<th>Occasionally, or a moderate amount of the time (3-4 days)</th>
<th>Most or all of the time (5-7 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not feel like eating: my appetite was poor.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I was just as good as other people.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt depressed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that everything I did was an effort</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt hopeful about the future.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought my life had been a failure.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt fearful.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sleep was restless.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was happy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talked less than usual.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt lonely.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People were unfriendly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed life.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had crying spells.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt sad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that people disliked me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not get “going.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

DYADIC TRUST SCALE

Instructions: Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement below.

1. My partner is primarily interested in his or her own welfare.
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. There are times when my partner cannot be trusted.
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. My partner is perfectly honest and truthful with me.
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I feel that I can trust my partner completely.
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. My partner is truly sincere in his or her promises.
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I feel that my partner does not show me enough consideration.
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. My partner treats me fairly and justly.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree - Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel that my partner can be counted on to help me.</td>
<td>Strongly agree - Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

TRANSGRESSION-RELATED INTERPERSONAL MOTIVATIONS SCALE – REVISED

Instructions: Please focus upon some event or series of events in which you feel your current romantic partner did something that significantly hurt you and disrupted your relationship (for example, lied, cheated on you, betrayed a secret). If such an event has happened recently in your current romantic relationship, please choose that event. If not, then you may choose an event that happened in the past.

1. In the space below, please briefly describe the event or series of events that you have chosen.

Please answer the following questions as they apply to your current romantic partner you were describing above. Please answer the following questions using this scale:

Strongly disagree (SD)
I tend to disagree (D)
I’m not sure (NS)
I tend to agree (A)
I strongly agree (SA)

SD  D  NS  A  SA  1. I’ll make him/her pay.
SD  D  NS  A  SA  2. I am trying to keep as much distance between us as possible.
SD  D  NS  A  SA  3. Even though his/her actions hurt me, I have goodwill for him/her.
SD  D  NS  A  SA  4. I wish that something bad would happen to him/her.
SD  D  NS  A  SA  5. I am living as if he/she doesn’t exist, isn’t around.
SD  D  NS  A  SA  6. I want us to bury the hatchet and move forward with our relationship.
SD  D  NS  A  SA  7. I don’t trust him/her.
8. Despite what he/she did, I want us to have a positive relationship again.

9. I want him/her to get what he/she deserves.

10. I am finding it difficult to act warmly toward him/her.

11. I am avoiding him/her.

12. Although he/she hurt me, I am putting the hurts aside so we could resume our relationship.

13. I’m going to get even.

14. I forgive him/her for what he/she did to me.

15. I cut off the relationship with him/her.

16. I have released my anger so I can work on restoring our relationship to health.

17. I want to see him/her hurt and miserable.

18. I withdraw from him/her.