



STUDIA DOCTORALIA

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATIONAL SCIENCE



UNIVERSITY OF
BUCHAREST
— VIRTUTE ET SAPIENTIA —

Frequency of Mate Retention Strategies in Relation to Couple Satisfaction: The Moderating Effect of Partner Jealousy

Sorina Naidin

University of Bucharest

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 29-June-2022

Accepted 30-October-2022

Available online 01-November-2022

This article should be cited as: Naidin, S. (2022). Frequency of mate retention strategies in relation to couple satisfaction: The moderating effect of partner jealousy. *Studia Doctoralia. Psychology and Educational Science*, 13(2), 107-116. <https://doi.org/10.47040/sdpsych.v13i2.148>

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Corresponding author at: University of Bucharest, Department of Psychology, 90 Panduri Av, Bucharest, RO.

Tel.: +40 (0) 31-425.34.45

E-mail address: sorina.naidin54@drd.unibuc.ro

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to expand knowledge about the causality of relationship satisfaction and about the moderating effect of partner jealousy on the relationship between mate retention strategies and satisfaction. The sample on which the analyzes were based consisted of 481 Romanians 78.6% women (n = 378) and 21.4% men (n = 103) involved in romantic relationships. The results of the statistical analysis suggest that participants who used direct guarding of the partner and negative intersexual or intrasexual inducements experienced a low level of relationship satisfaction and participants who adopted public signals of possession and positive inducements are significantly more satisfied in the relationship. Although partner jealousy measured according to multidimensional theorizing (cognitive, emotional, and behavioral) did not have a moderating effect on the relationship between mate retention strategies and satisfaction, significant negative correlations were observed between cognitive jealousy and satisfaction and between behavioral jealousy and satisfaction. Thus, the current paper serves as a theoretical basis for future studies.

Keywords: satisfaction, jealousy, mate retention strategies, cost induction, benefit provision

1. INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal relationships are an intensely studied topic in evolutionary psychology, and couple relationships are an important extension of them. Thus, this type of relationship is encountered and, implicitly, widely experienced, which makes the most accurate delimitation of the factors of satisfaction in the relationship and the dynamics between them to present practical and theoretical applicability. Keeping a long-term romantic partner and preventing the deterioration of the relationship with that partner are problems in the recurrent evolutionary area, adaptive to humans (Atari, Barbaro, Shackelford, & Chegeni, 2017), so they use different behaviors or tactics in order to maintain the relationship in which they are involved..

Satisfactory relationships and their causality have been consistently studied in the literature in order to find ways of improvement. The importance of relationship satisfaction is revealed by the implications of this construct, relationship satisfaction and stability being the indicators most often used to measure the quality of the relationship. (Rusbult et al. 1998 citat în Ault & Lee, 2016).

Relationship satisfaction is considered one of the strongest predictors of relationship stability, individual psychophysical health and subjective well-being, thus representing a significant source of happiness throughout life (Bookwala, 2005; Dush & Amato, 2005).

Relationship satisfaction is a psychological concept that is based on cost and benefit monitoring mechanisms. High scores correspond to positive inductions and public signals of possession and low scores correspond to direct guarding and negative intrasexual inductions in the relationship (Salkicevic et al., 2014). Therefore, theorizing and analyzing these strategies is essential in understanding satisfaction.

Jealousy is another factor that exerts a substantial influence on the progress of romantic relationships (Knobloch et al., 2001), emotional jealousy positively correlating with couple satisfaction (Dandurand & Lafontaine, 2014). Feeling jealous allows the individual to identify rivals or circumstances that are threatening to the relationship, and identifying these threats can lead to the use of partner retention strategies (Buunk, Massar, and Dijkstra, 2007 cited in Brewer & Riley, 2009), which increases interest on how jealousy could influence the relationship between partner retention strategies and couple satisfaction.

Mate Retention Strategies

In the context of evolutionary psychology, the term of mate retention strategies refers to a variety of behavioral methods whose function is to maintain romantic partners and prevent them from switching to alternative partners (Buss & Shackelford, 1997).

Recent research has examined whether various behaviors are part of a broader repertoire of partner

retention, being classified into providing benefits (providing the partner with financial, physical, or emotional benefits to maintain or increase satisfaction) and costs (applying actual or potential costs to the partner; Miner, Starratt, & Shackelford, 2009). These behaviors are adopted more frequently in romantic relationships due to the contribution they bring to the dynamics of the long-term relationship, depending on the specifics of the tactics used. Thus, the main tactics for keeping the intersex partner are the following: (a) direct guarding; (b) negative inductions, such as threats of infidelity, punishing the partner for the perceived threat of infidelity, emotional and commitment manipulation or derogation from competitors; and (c) positive inductions in the form of gifts / meals, sexual encouragement, emphasis on love and care, improvements in physical appearance, obedience and devaluation. Unlike other tactics, the positive ones are benefit strategies. Intersex manipulations of partner retention include: (a) public possession signals; (b) derogation of the partner from rivals; (c) threats against rivals and even violence (Buss & Shackelford, 1997).

Cost-keeping behaviors are those that involve direct guarding (eg, keeping the partner isolated), negative intersex or intrasexual inductions (threats, or acts of violence against a partner or a person of the same sex; Arnocky, Albert, Carré, & Ortiz, 2018). Because the purpose of partner retention tactics is to prevent partner infidelity or removal, such behaviors are more common when an individual perceives an increased risk of partner infidelity (Buss & Shackelford, 1997). Tactics of this type influence the sustainability of the couple's relationship by avoiding or eliminating possible opponents perceived as a threat against the relationship.

Cost-causing behaviors reduce the risk of infidelity or relationship deterioration, causing an individual's partner to feel unworthy of the current relationship; inducing this feeling alters the partner's self-esteem and, at the same time, his perception regarding the possibility of finding partnership alternatives and thus leaving the current relationship (Miner, Shackelford & Starratt, 2009). Also, the durability of the relationship is influenced by the fact that, with the use of these strategies, the possibility of partners to have the opportunity to develop other romantic interests decreases as their contacts are limited, their devotion is forced or obtained through manipulation and are presented as less desirable in front of other people (Shackelford et al., 2005). Unlike cost-inducing strategies, the use of benefit-type tactics involves less risk and causes the partner to remain in that relationship as these favors attract the partner and create the impression that in other relationships they will not be treated as well and that other partners would not represent such a source of favors (Miner et al., 2009). These tactics were also classified

as intersex or intrasexual, with different particularities for each category. Thus, intersex tactics can range from monopolizing a partner's time, emotionally manipulating a partner, using sexual inductions, or purchasing expensive and extravagant gifts. Intrasexual tactics are aimed at same-sex competitors and include signaling romantic commitment to romantic competitors, both verbally and physically (e.g., bragging about the relationship or putting your arm around a partner), but also using verbal intimidation, physical intimidation or even violence against same-sex competitors (Oltmanns et al., 2017).

An important aspect of partner maintenance strategies is that the predisposition to choose cost-inducing rather than benefit-giving manifests in accordance with the particularities of the person using them, so that individuals with a high degree of violence or those who perceive possible higher losses than the partner do not have the emotional capacity needed to provide benefits so they resort to negative intrasexual and intersex inductions (Shackelford et al., 2005). Also, the increased risk of sexual infidelity determines the highlighting of social status and the valorization of resources that constitute a reproductive role in interpersonal relationships. In contrast, women, more than men, emphasize their reproductive value by improving their appearance, because men appreciate the youth and fertility of their partner (Buss & Shackelford, 1997).

The physical attraction or the perceived attractiveness of the partner are aspects that determine the predisposition to engage in behaviors with the role of keeping the partner. Individuals who are objectively assessed as less physically attractive and whose partner is objectively assessed as more physically attractive engage in more frequent intersex sexual behaviors (Sela et al., 2017). The reasoning behind this statement is explained by the relationship between the resources invested and the advantages gained, which motivates the implementation of a partner-centered or rival-centered approach in using techniques to maintain the romantic partner and, implicitly, the couple's relationship. Higher value partners are more or less by definition difficult to replace, and alternative partners who also have a high perceived value can afford to be more selective in choosing a partner and will be more difficult to attract (Conroy-Beam et al., 2016).

Man's perceptions of their partner's physical attractiveness have been shown to have predictive value, especially in terms of partner maintenance tactics, especially in tactics such as: increased vigilance, commitment, display of resources, verbal signals of possession, physical signs of possession and intrasexual threats (Buss, 2013). In contrast, the more attractive partner has less to lose if the relationship ends (he or she gains fewer benefits than he or she provides) and is therefore less likely to use partner retention tactics to protect the relationship (Buss, 2013; Oltmanns et al., 2017).

There are also some studies that suggest that partner retention tactics (both positive and negative) decrease as couples maintain a high level of engagement with the relationship over time (Redlick & Vangelisti, 2018). This indicates that one of the reasons for adopting partner retention tactics is engagement in the couple, which could support the hypothesis that these tactics bring satisfaction in the relationship.

Relationship Satisfaction

The efficiency of a couple's relationship is one of the objectives of the behaviors adopted when the partners seek to maintain the relationship and, thus, the long-term romantic partner. Couple satisfaction is defined as an affective response that is based on the subjective assessment of the positive and negative dimensions associated with the relationship (Lawrance & Byers, 1995). Satisfaction can be a relevant indicator in these situations being studied in the literature to provide a clear and in-depth picture of the components that contribute to establishing an interpersonal relationship that meets the needs, desires or expectations of an individual.

These behaviors include actions that increase the degree of both emotional and sexual intimacy within the couple. The link between couple intimacy and overall relationship satisfaction is well established in the current literature, couples tend to report high levels of relationship satisfaction when they have feelings of intimacy (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). Emotional intimacy has as its main indicator, in terms of couple satisfaction, communication, more precisely an open communication style that gives the partner the feeling of acceptance and security. Partners feel a greater degree of emotional and sexual intimacy when the other's communication style is perceived as positive, high intimacy causing increased satisfaction in the couple's relationship (Yoo et al., 2014).

The satisfaction felt by the individual regarding the couple's relationship with the romantic partner can be correlated with the granting of sexual benefits that increase the perceived sexual satisfaction. For both people who have had a low initial and high level of couple satisfaction, this is predicted in its later form by sexual satisfaction (Fallis et al., 2016). Sprecher (2002) also reported that initial levels of relationship satisfaction were positively associated with subsequent sexual satisfaction and vice versa.

Implementing behaviors that accentuate the sense of belonging in the couple is essential for the satisfaction of the couple's relationship (Vedes et al., 2016). The primary behavior in this regard is to provide emotional support to solve perceived problems. The support provided by the partner was indicated as the most important predictor for the assessments made by men about the satisfaction of their relationship (Rochlen, McKelley, Suizzo, & Scaringi, 2008). In addition to emotional support, research has also found

that relationship dissatisfaction is associated with increased negative interactions (Donnellan, Assad, Robins, & Conger, 2007).

Numerous studies in literature support the hypothesis that partner retention strategies influence relationship satisfaction, however, focusing on behaviors that provide emotional and sexual benefits to the detriment of those that induce a range of costs. There are sources according to which the retention tactic of the partner offering benefits is positively associated with the satisfaction of the relationship, while the retention tactics of the partners that involve costs are negatively associated with it, as cost induction causes the partner to crystallize the feeling of mistrust and constraint (Salkicevic, Stanic & Grabovac, 2014; Lindová et al., 2019). Moreover, satisfaction is directly associated with well-being in relationships and predicts partner retention behaviors (Conroy-Beam et al., 2016). This aspect emphasizes the importance of resources, from an evolutionary point of view, and their investment as the right selection of the partner is a crucial step in the relationship and in its continuity. The investment of initial resources is connected to the tactics of maintaining the partner by offering benefits.

Partner Jealousy

Couple relationships can experience different threats from the external environment, more precisely from people who show interest in the romantic partner, or internally, in the dynamics of the relationship. In the case of an external threat subjectively perceived by one of the individuals involved, jealousy can be one of the main emotions experienced. Occurring in such circumstances, jealousy produces the motivation to make the connection between the rival and the loved one (physically, psychologically or emotionally) to prevent or stop a threatening relationship, which works to restore or maintain relationships. Cognitive jealousy refers to paranoid suspicions that arise in response to the perceived threat. Emotional jealousy is experienced as an emotional response to a threat and conditioned by the presence of certain stimuli. In connection with behavioral jealousy, she may engage in preventive action because she or she perceives the existence of threats to her relationship (Himawan, 2017).

Evolutionary psychologists argue that jealousy is an evolved adaptation activated by a threat to a valued relationship, having a protective role against a partial or total loss (Buss & Haselton, 2005). Thus, from an evolutionary point of view, the role of jealousy in the behavior within the reproductive process is considered significant. Jealousy has been hypothesized to function in motivating behavior designed to avoid threats to relationships valued through actions ranging from vigilance to violence (Buss & Shackelford, 1997). In fact, according to the evolutionary model, women involved in a romantic relationship that is

threatened are at risk of losing the resources offered by their partner. Such actions have the potential to produce offspring that a man will end up supporting, therefore losing valuable resources and the chance to achieve reproductive success (Zuo, Wen, & Wu, 2019). Cognitive jealousy refers to worry and suspicion in response to a real or perceived threat to the relationship by a rival (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989); emotional jealousy sums up negative-affective responses, for example: anger, fear and envy to a threat to the relationship; and behavioral jealousy refers to tactical responses triggered by a threat or potential threat to the relationship, which may involve supervision, aggression, revenge, and relationship improvement (Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg, & Eloy; Tortoriello & Hart, 2019). Such a differentiation of the levels of the romantic aspect, gives jealousy a multidimensional characteristic and can provide a broader picture of jealousy as a predictor of couple satisfaction.

Diversity in manifestation and perception of jealousy is closely related to interpersonal differences. Jealousy is a dynamic, interpersonal process, because a person's reactions to a situation of inducing jealousy cannot be understood without taking into account the behaviors of the partner and rival (Huelsenitz, Farrell, Simpson, Griskevicius, & Szepeswol, 2018). Therefore, men are more bothered by sexual infidelity than by emotional infidelity, as sexual infidelity increases the risk of investing resources in genetic offspring with whom they have no biological ties, which affects the purpose of reproduction. In contrast, women are more bothered by emotional infidelity than by sexual infidelity, as emotional infidelity increases the risk of abandonment and loss of valuable resources to successfully raise offspring (DeSteno, Bartlett, Braverman, & Salovey, 2002). At the same time, it is predominant in the case of certain nuanced personal characteristics. Individuals with increased intrasexual competitiveness and orientation towards social comparison, show more intense feelings of jealousy in general and especially in response to the social attributes of a rival (Zurriaga, González-Navarro, Buunk, & Dijkstra, 2018). Also, anxious people with a high level of jealousy and distrust are determined to monitor the activities of a romantic partner through other forms of intrusive behavior, such as checking the pockets, wallet or mobile phone of the partner (Marshall, Bejanyan, Di Castro, & Lee, 2013).

The primary functions of sexual jealousy are considered to discourage rivals interested in partners, to discourage infidelity and estrangement - effects that contribute to a man's reproductive success, ensuring certainty of paternity and monopolizing the reproductive value of his partner (Buss, 2013).

Jealousy and partner-keeping strategies could have significant effects on satisfaction in a relationship between two romantic partners given that they serve a common

purpose, that of protecting the relationship, especially by maintaining rival-centered behaviors or the threatening factor in the relationship. Jealousy has evolved not only to warn individuals of potential relationship threats, but also to activate partner protective behaviors (Buss, 2003). Unlike partner-centered behaviors that materialize in the monopolization of time and their attention, their pursuit, search through personal things, rival-centered behaviors highlight the partner's belonging to the romantic relationship. Tactics focused on the potential rival include signals of beholding the partner (for example, putting one's arm around the partner) or threatening him (for example, aggressive behavior; Huelsnitz et al., 2018).

Studies conducted so far, taking into account the length of the relationship and gender differences between partners, have revealed a significant influence on the adoption of strategies to keep the partner (benefit tactics) only one facet of jealousy, namely anxious jealousy. This finding indicates that those who face unsettling thoughts about a partner's suspected or potential infidelity are more likely to use a wide range of partner retention tactics (Davis et al., 2018). Thus, the feeling of insecurity in the romantic relationship is correlated with the individual's jealousy. Security and jealousy have also been associated with a lack of emotional or sexual insecurity between partners (Yoo et al., 2014).

In the literature so far, jealousy, although studied in a multidimensional theorizing: cognitive jealousy, emotional jealousy and behavioral jealousy has not been proposed as a possible moderator by all its dimensions on the relationship between the frequency of partner retention strategies and satisfaction in relationship.

In the literature, the partner's jealousy, the frequency of partner keeping strategies and couple satisfaction are intensely studied constructs given the interest given to the aspects that describe romantic relationships. Thus, the current study is a continuation of the investigation of the implications of couple satisfaction and possible predictors. The importance of this form of satisfaction being highlighted over time, it having substantial effects on the mental health and physical well-being of the individual (Raffagnino & Matera, 2015; Cepukiene, 2019). Given that jealousy can be

interpreted by suspicion of relationship infidelity (Knobloch et al., 2001), it is necessary to investigate how the frequency of partner retention strategies, which is higher when the individual perceives an increased risk of partner infidelity (Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Lindová et al., 2019) will influence or not the satisfaction in the relationship. Even if these concepts have been studied separately or the possible effect of one on the other has been studied, there are no results of a model that includes all these 3 variables that this paper focuses on, especially since the facets of jealousy in this study aim the perceived jealousy of the partner.

Based on the limitations found in literature, investigating a model that integrates romantic satisfaction, the frequency of mate retention strategies and partner jealousy is mandatory.

Objective and Hypotheses

The study aims to measure the relationship between the frequency of mate retention strategies and couple satisfaction. As mentioned earlier, there are already studies in the literature that support the connection between the two, especially in the case of providing benefits as a maintenance technique. The second objective is to test the moderating effect of jealousy (with all its facets: cognitive, emotional and behavioral) in the relationship between the use of partner retention strategies and couple satisfaction. This reasoning can be explained by the links already studied between the approach of techniques, but also of satisfaction.

H1. *The frequency of partner induction retention strategies will negatively predict couple satisfaction.*

H2. *The frequency of benefit-type strategies will positively predict couple satisfaction.*

H3. *Cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy will significantly influence the relationship between partner retention strategies such as cost induction and couple satisfaction.*

H4. *Emotional jealousy will have a moderating effect on the relationship between partner retention strategies such as benefit-giving and couple satisfaction.*

2. METHODOLOGY

Participants and procedure

The sample included in this study consisted of 481 people who are in a relationship, from Romania, 78.6% women ($n = 378$) and 21.4% men ($n = 103$). The environment of origin was 79.8% urban ($n = 384$) and 20.2% rural ($n = 97$). The average age of the sample was 22 ($SD = 4.40$), and the average duration of the couple, measured in months, is 31.47 ($SD = 36.80$). Only one inclusion criterion was imposed, namely the condition that each respondent be

engaged in a romantic relationship. Participants were recruited through social media platforms and e-mail addresses.

Instruments

Relationship Satisfaction. Satisfaction was measured using the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick, 1988). The scale contains 7 items with a score from 1 to 5 (1 = low, 5 = high) that measures the satisfaction of the participants

in the romantic relationship ("To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?"). The scale score was calculated by averaging the scores of item responses. The internal consistency of the scale is $\alpha = .86$.

Partner jealousy. In this case, we used The Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MSJ; Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). The scale contains 24 items that covers three dimensions of jealousy: cognitive jealousy, emotional jealousy and behavioral jealousy. Cognitive jealousy presents the question "How often do they have the following thoughts about you?" followed by 8 items ("They are worried that someone of the opposite sex might be chasing after you."). The scoring is done on a Likert scale from 1 to 7 (1 = never, 7 = all the time). The scale score was calculated by averaging the scores of item responses. The internal consistency of the scale is $\alpha = .90$. Emotional jealousy is measured starting with the question "How would they emotionally react to the following situations?" with 8 items ("You show great deal of interest or excitement in talking to someone of the opposite sex."), scoring from 1 to 7 (1 = very pleased, 7 = very upset). The scale score was calculated by averaging the scores of item responses. The internal consistency of the scale is $\alpha = .89$. Behavioral jealousy raises the question "How often do they engage in the following behaviors?" and 8 items ("They look through your drawers, bag or pockets."), the score was 1 to 7 (1 = never, 7 = all the time). The scale score was calculated by averaging the scores of item responses. The internal consistency of the scale is $\alpha = .85$.

The study measures the perceived jealousy of the partner, therefore the items were stated in third person. The participants were asked to determine the extent to which they believe their partners engage in those behaviors and have those thoughts and emotions about the relationship.

Mate Retention Behavior. It was measured using Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form (MRI-SF; Buss, Shackelford, & McKibbin, 2008). MRI-SF contains 38 items that describe the behavior performed within the past one

year, using a Likert-type scale from 0 to 3 (0 = never performed this act and 3 = often performed this act). Items include actions on the five partner retention strategies: positive inductions, public possession signals, direct guarding, negative intersex inductions, and negative intrasexual inductions, which are included in two distinct central factors: benefit provision and cost induction.

The benefit includes the following facets: Positive Inductions ("Bought my partner an expensive gift.") And Public Possession Signals ("Gave my partner jewelry to signify that they were taken"). Induction of costs includes the following facets: Direct guarding ("Spent all my free time with my partner so that they could not meet anyone else."), Negative intersex inductions ("Talked to another woman/man at a party to make my partner jealous.") and Negative intrasexual inductions ("Gave a man/woman a dirty look when they looked at my partner."). The scale score was made by calculating the average score of the answers. Internal consistency of faceted scales: Benefit provision ($\alpha = .62$), Cost induction ($\alpha = .77$).

Data analysis and design

SPSS 21.0 was used to perform multiple linear regression analyzes to test whether the frequency of partner retention strategies influenced couple satisfaction; Jamovi (Version 1.2) was used to investigate the moderating effect of partner jealousy on the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The multivariate analysis Mahalanobis distance was performed, identifying 11 outliers, after which they were removed from the distribution. The research design is non-experimental cross-sectional. The independent variable is represented by the mate retention strategies, the dependent variable is the relationship satisfaction, and the moderator is the partner jealousy.

3. RESULTS

Descriptive statistics

Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations for the research variables as well as the indicators that refer to the form of the distribution. Correlations between research variables are also reported. A statistically significant positive correlation was also observed between Benefit Provision and Satisfaction ($r = .15$, $p < .01$). There is a

significant negative correlation between Cost Induction and Satisfaction ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$). Also, a significant negative correlation was observed between Cognitive Jealousy and Satisfaction ($r = -.34$, $p < .01$) and between Behavioral Jealousy and Satisfaction ($r = -.29$, $p < .01$).

Table 1. *Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations among research variables*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	M (SD)
1. Benefit Provision	-						1.51 (.44)
2. Cost Induction	.50**	-					.68 (.38)
3. Cognitive Jealousy	.18**	.42**	-				2.16 (1.12)
4. Emotional Jealousy	.15**	.21**	.37**	-			3.89 (1.60)
5. Behavioral Jealousy	.25**	.53**	.60**	.32**	-		1.63 (.86)
6. Satisfaction	.15**	-.27**	-.34**	-.07	-.29**	-	4.22 (.66)

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ Table 2. *Multiple regression on the predictive value of factors: Benefit Provision and Cost Induction on Satisfaction*

Independent Variables	Satisfaction	
	β	R^2
1. Benefit Provision	.38**	.18**
2. Cost Induction	-.46**	

Table 2 shows the results of the linear regression analysis. The two facets of Mate Retention Strategies have been introduced as predictors of Satisfaction. Regarding the Prediction of Benefit Provision, the model is statistically significant with $F(52.62) = 7.90$, $p < .01$ and ($\beta = .38$, $p < .01$),

predicting 18% of the variance. In relation to the cost induction prediction, the model is statistically significant with $F(52.62) = -9.61$, $p < .01$ and ($\beta = -.46$, $p < .01$), predicting 18% of the variance. Thus, both facets of Mate Retention Strategies are a predictor of Satisfaction.

Table 3. *The moderating effect of Jealousy on the relationship between Mate Retention Strategies and Satisfaction*

Dependent Variable	Predictor	$B (SE)$	z
Satisfaction	Benefit Provision	0.10 (0.13)	0.82
	Cognitive Jealousy	-0.38 (0.08)	-4.24
	Benefit Provision \times Cognitive Jealousy	0.09 (0.05)	1.78
Satisfaction	Benefit Provision	0.26 (0.17)	1.55
	Emotional Jealousy	0.02 (0.06)	-0.41
	Benefit Provision \times Emotional Jealousy	-0.00 (0.04)	-0.18
Satisfaction	Benefit Provision	0.16 (0.13)	1.25
	Behavioral Jealousy	-0.48 (0.13)	-3.65
	Benefit Provision \times Behavioral Jealousy	0.12 (0.07)	1.59
Satisfaction	Cost Induction	-0.45 (0.16)	-2.77
	Cognitive Jealousy	-0.24 (0.06)	-3.85
	Cost Induction \times Cognitive Jealousy	0.08 (0.06)	1.36
Satisfaction	Cost Induction	-0.41 (0.19)	-2.17
	Emotional Jealousy	0.00 (0.03)	0.06
	Cost Induction \times Emotional Jealousy	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.24
Satisfaction	Cost Induction	-0.36 (0.15)	-2.28
	Behavioral Jealousy	-0.22 (0.09)	-2.35
	Cost Induction \times Behavioral Jealousy	0.05 (0.08)	0.67

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

According to statistical results, the Emotional Jealousy of the partner did not moderate the relationship between Benefit Provision and Satisfaction. It was also observed that the

Behavioral Jealousy and the Partner Cognitive Jealousy did not moderate the relationship between Cost Induction and Satisfaction.

4. DISCUSSION

The present study investigated the moderating effect of multidimensional jealousy on the relationship between the frequency of partner retention strategies and couple satisfaction. The paper was based on the lack of clear results in the literature on a model for explaining couple satisfaction that integrates both the facets of jealousy and the frequency of partner retention strategies. Despite the non-existence of such a model, the 3 variables of this paper have been intensively studied, given the scientific interest given to relationship satisfaction. Information on the influence of partner's jealousy on satisfaction is still incomplete, so the study aimed to measure whether or not the partner's jealousy, theorized multidimensional, will have a significant influence.

The hypothesis of the study according to which the induction of costs will negatively influence the satisfaction in the couple was supported by the data, as well as the hypothesis according to which the offer of benefit will positively influence the satisfaction. The results show that the provision of benefits is positively associated with couple satisfaction, and cost-inducing strategies are negatively associated with satisfaction, according to the literature. There was a positive association between benefit and satisfaction and a negative association between satisfaction and cost induction (Salkicevic et al., 2014). The results are explained by the fact that the use of Benefit-providing strategies involves reduced risks for the quality of the relationship compared to Cost Induction; the low costs and the provision of benefits lead, in the partner's perception, to the idea that another individual could not represent an equally tender partner and implicitly determines the desire to maintain the current relationship (Miner et al., 2009). Thus, the more the partner uses positive retention tactics to demonstrate a higher potential in the relationship and investing more, the individual feels a higher satisfaction and fewer reasons why he could get out of the romantic relationship. Also, in the approach by the partner of punitive tactics that bring costs, the individual feels less satisfaction, but ends up remaining in the relationship forced by the constraints and costs that impose risks on him.

Both types of these strategies have predictive value on satisfaction, according to the results based on the hypotheses of the paper that observed that adopting the behavior of maintaining the partner predicted satisfaction in the relationship when benefits were offered and predicted distrust in the relationship when costs were induced (Conroy-Beam et al., 2016).

The hypotheses stating the moderating effect of multidimensional jealousy were not supported by the data. Regarding the partner's jealousy, the literature highlights previous unclear conclusions. Some researchers argue that although the experience or expression of jealousy can be

perceived as rather negative, it may have positive effects on the survival of the relationship (Barelds & Dijkstra, 2006), therefore according to literature, a possible explanation would be that the partner jealousy mainly influences the relationship durability, relationship satisfaction data being mixed.

In the present paper, cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy strongly correlated negatively with relationship satisfaction according to existing results, jealousy being associated with greater general relationship dissatisfaction (Andersen et al., 1995). In another study of homosexual and heterosexual relationships, when jealousy was in response to a threat to the relationship (i.e., reactive emotional jealousy), it was positively related to the quality of the relationship, while anxious (i.e., suspicious) jealousy was negatively related to the quality of the relationship (Barelds & Dijkstra, 2006), while Knobloch (2001) explained the positive association of emotional jealousy with satisfaction through increased intimacy and the association between cognitive jealousy and dissatisfaction through the perception of uncertainty in the relationship. (Attridge, 2013). Contrary to the reasoning and results of previous studies, emotional jealousy did not correlate significantly with couple satisfaction.

The concepts – subject of research have been studied in the past as a result of the interest given to the knowledge of the causality of romantically satisfactory relationships and their improvement. This paper aimed to fill the gaps in the literature on satisfaction in couple relationships and determinants; these factors include cost-benefit monitoring mechanisms (Salkicevic et al., 2014). A study by Davis, Desrochers, DiFilippo, Vaillancourt, and Arnocky (2018) concluded that people who experience unsettling thoughts about their suspected or potential romantic partner's infidelity are more likely to use a variety of partner restraint tactics, both high and low risk.

Practical and theoretical implications

The implications of this study emerge from the need to streamline romantic interpersonal relationships and such a broad delimitation and theorizing of constructs that are directly related to perceived satisfaction. Practical applicability highlights the importance of conceptualizing couple satisfaction; satisfaction and emotional stability felt in the relationship are the primary indicators used in measuring the quality of the relationship (Rusbult et al. 1998; Lara K. Ault & Ashley Lee, 2016). Moreover, a study conducted by Bookwala (2005) shows that relationship stability is itself positively influenced by satisfaction in that relationship, satisfaction having predictive value for individual well-being, subjective psychophysical health and even one of the sources of perceived happiness.

From a theoretical point of view, framing the partner's jealousy in the explanatory model of relationship satisfaction

contributes to reducing the ambiguity that may arise as a result of such a conceptual omission. In the context of awareness of the positive correlation between emotional jealousy and satisfaction (Dandurand & Lafontaine, 2014) and the possibility of feeling jealousy in identifying romantic rivals (Buunk, Massar, and Dijkstra, 2007; Brewer & Riley, 2009) the theoretical and practical implications of jealousy they become implicit, especially in an evolutionary approach. Thus, in this approach, the factors that contribute to couple satisfaction as well as satisfaction alone have adaptive value.

Limitations

This study has various limitations that could affect the data and the results of the analysis. In this case, the data comes from two types of combined sources, more specifically, self-reporting to measure the frequency of partner retention strategies and partner reporting to measure partner jealousy, which does not always provide a strong basis for drawing conclusions. The research design is non-experimental cross-sectional, in order to perceive causal relationships, a longitudinal design would have been more effective. Also, the data were collected online, so the respondents did not benefit from the same conditions, lowering the degree of standardization. The study used a sample of students in monogamous, heterosexual relationships, and the age variation was very low, these aspects contributing to a poor representativeness of the sample.

In addition, no questions were asked about previous cases of sexual infidelity that may have occurred in the relationship, which would likely influence jealousy levels and

frequency of partner retention behavior (Burchell & Ward, 2011).

Moreover, we did not perform the statistical analysis taking into account the gender difference, this influencing the dynamics of partner retention strategies and the couple relationship. According to Delecce (2017) in married couples, the most important predictor of separation for men was the lack of improvement in the physical appearance of the wife, awhile women, instead, sought in their partner a low frequency of adopting strategies such as cost induction. Given the limitations of this paper, future directions of study may follow the moderating effect of partner jealousy on the relationship between retention strategies and couple satisfaction in a dyad-type study to increase statistical validity. External validity in future studies could also be higher if various relational categories were included, for example polygamy or polyamory, as well as age and occupation variations of respondents.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the study examined how the frequency of partner retention strategies influences satisfaction in heterosexual monogamous relationships. In the context of evolutionary psychology, retention strategies predict satisfaction in different couples depending on their type. According to this argument, the provision of benefits predicts satisfaction in the relationship, and cost induction has a negative influence on it. Thus, participants who used direct partner guarding and negative intersex or intrasexual inductions experienced a low level of relationship satisfaction, and participants who preferred public signals of possession and positive inductions are significantly more satisfied in the relationship.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, P. A., Eloy, S. V., Guerrero, L. K., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1995). Romantic jealousy and relational satisfaction: A look at the impact of jealousy experience and expression. *Communication Reports*, 8(2), 77–85.
- Atari, M., Barbaro, N., Shackelford, T. K., & Chegeni, R. (2017). Psychometric Evaluation and Cultural Correlates of the Mate Retention Inventory–Short Form (MRI-SF) in Iran. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 15(1), 14–74.
- Attridge, M. (2013). Jealousy and Relationship Closeness: Exploring the Good (Reactive) and Bad (Suspicious) Sides of Romantic Jealousy. 17.
- Barelds, D. P. H., & Dijkstra, P. (2006). Reactive, Anxious and Possessive Forms of Jealousy and Their Relation to Relationship Quality Among Heterosexuals and Homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51(3), 183–198.
- Burchell, J. L., & Ward, J. (2011). Sex drive, attachment style, relationship status and previous infidelity as predictors of sex differences in romantic jealousy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(5), 657–661.
- Buss, D. M. (2013). Sexual jealousy. *Psihologijske Teme*, 22(2), 155–182.
- Buss, D. M., & Haselton, M. (2005). *The evolution of jealousy*. 2.
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). *From Vigilance to Violence: Mate Retention Tactics in Married Couples*. 16.
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Susceptibility to Infidelity in the First Year of Marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(2), 193–221.
- Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., & McKibbin, W. F. (2008). The Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form (MRI-SF). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44(1), 322–334.
- Cepukiene, V. (2019). Does Relationship Satisfaction Always Mean Satisfaction? Development of the Couple Relationship Satisfaction Scale. *Journal of Relationships Research*, 10, e14.
- Conroy-Beam, D., Goetz, C. D., & Buss, D. M. (2016). What predicts romantic relationship satisfaction and mate retention intensity: Mate preference fulfillment or mate value

- discrepancies? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 37(6), 440–448.
- Dandurand, C., & Lafontaine, M.-F. (2014). Jealousy and Couple Satisfaction: A Romantic Attachment Perspective. *Marriage & Family Review*, 50(2), 154–173.
- Davis, A. C., Desrochers, J., DiFilippo, A., Vaillancourt, T., & Arnocky, S. (2018). Type of jealousy differentially predicts cost-inflicting and benefit-provisioning mate retention. *Personal Relationships*, 25(4), 596–610.
- Delece, T. (2017). *Measuring The Effectiveness Of Benefit-Provisioning And Cost-Inflicting Mate Retention Tactics Through Relationship Outcomes*. 120.
- DeSteno, D., Bartlett, M. Y., Braverman, J., & Salovey, P. (2002). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolutionary mechanism or artifact of measurement? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(5), 1103–1116.
- Donnellan, M. B., Assad, K. K., Robins, R. W., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Do negative interactions mediate the effects of Negative Emotionality, Communal Positive Emotionality, and Constraint on relationship satisfaction? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24(4), 557–573.
- Dush, C. M. K., & Amato, P. R. (2005). Consequences of relationship status and quality for subjective well-being. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22(5), 607–627.
- Fallis, E. E., Rehman, U. S., Woody, E. Z., & Purdon, C. (2016). The longitudinal association of relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction in long-term relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(7), 822–831.
- Hendrick, S. S., Dicke, A., & Hendrick, C. (1998). The Relationship Assessment Scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(1), 137–142.
- Himawan, K. K. (2017). Jealousy and relationship satisfaction among Indonesian dating adults: Jealousy and relationship satisfaction. *PsyCh Journal*, 6(4), 328–329.
- Huelsnitz, C. O., Farrell, A. K., Simpson, J. A., Griskevicius, V., & Szepeswol, O. (2018). Attachment and Jealousy: Understanding the Dynamic Experience of Jealousy Using the Response Escalation Paradigm. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44(12), 1664–1680.
- Knobloch, L. K., Solomon, D. H., & Cruz, M. G. (2001). The role of relationship development and attachment in the experience of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships*, 8(2), 205–224.
- Lara K. Ault, & Ashley Lee. (2016). Affective and Interpersonal Correlates of Relationship Satisfaction. *Philosophy Study*, 6(3).
- Lawrance, K.-A., & Byers, E. S. (1995). Sexual satisfaction in long-term heterosexual relationships: The interpersonal exchange model of sexual satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 2(4), 267–285.
- Lindová, J., Klapilová, K., Johnson, D., Vobořilová, A., Chlápková, B., & Havlíček, J. (2019). Non-verbal mate retention behaviour in women and its relation to couple's relationship adjustment and satisfaction. *Ethology*, 125(12), 925–939.
- Marshall, T. C., Bejanyan, K., Di Castro, G., & Lee, R. A. (2013). Attachment styles as predictors of Facebook-related jealousy and surveillance in romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 20(1), 1–22.
- Miner, E. J., Starratt, V. G., & Shackelford, T. K. (2009). It's not all about her: Men's mate value and mate retention. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(3), 214–218.
- Oltmanns, J. R., Markey, P. M., & French, J. E. (2017). Dissimilarity in physical attractiveness within romantic dyads and mate retention behaviors. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 34(4), 565–577.
- Pfeiffer, S. M., & Wong, P. T. P. (1989). Multidimensional Jealousy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 6(2), 181–196.
- Rochlen, A. B., McKelley, R. A., Suizzo, M.-A., & Scaringi, V. (2008). Predictors of relationship satisfaction, psychological well-being, and life satisfaction among stay-at-home fathers. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9(1), 17–28.
- Salkicevic, S., Stanic, A. L., & Grabovac, M. T. (2014). Good Mates Retain Us Right: Investigating the Relationship between Mate Retention Strategies, Mate Value, and Relationship Satisfaction. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 12(5).
- Schaefer, M. T., & Olson, D. H. (1981). Assessing Intimacy: The Pair Inventory*. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 7(1), 47–60.
- Sela, Y., Mogilski, J. K., Shackelford, T. K., Zeigler-Hill, V., & Fink, B. (2017). Mate Value Discrepancy and Mate Retention Behaviors of Self and Partner: Mate Value Discrepancy and Mate Retention. *Journal of Personality*, 85(5), 730–740.
- Sprecher, S. (2002). Sexual satisfaction in premarital relationships: Associations with satisfaction, love, commitment, and stability. *Journal of Sex Research*, 39(3), 190–196.
- Tortoriello, G. K., & Hart, W. (2019). Modeling the interplay between narcissism, relational motives, and jealousy-induced responses to infidelity threat. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(7), 2156–2179.
- Vedes, A., Hilpert, P., Nussbeck, F. W., Randall, A. K., Bodenmann, G., & Lind, W. R. (2016). Love styles, coping, and relationship satisfaction: A dyadic approach: Love styles and dyadic coping. *Personal Relationships*, 23(1), 84–97.
- Yoo, H., Bartle-Haring, S., Day, R. D., & Gangamma, R. (2014). Couple Communication, Emotional and Sexual Intimacy, and Relationship Satisfaction. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 40(4), 275–293.
- Zuo, B., Wen, F., & Wu, Y. (2019). Sex Differences in Mate Retention and Mate Quality Enhancement: The Effect of Facial Sexual Dimorphism Cues on Willingness to Introduce a New Friend to One's Partner. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48(6), 1785–1794.
- Zurriaga, R., González-Navarro, P., Buunk, A. P., & Dijkstra, P. (2018). Jealousy at work: The role of rivals' characteristics. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 59(4), 443–450.