Psychopathy is characterized by superficial charm, manipulation, callousness, impulsivity, egocentricity, antisocial behaviors, and a fundamental lack of empathy (e.g., Hare, 2003; Newman, MacCoon, Vaughn, & Sadé, 2005; Williams, Paulhus, & Hare, 2007). It can be seen as existing on a continuum, ranging from “successful” (i.e., noncriminal or subclinical psychopaths) to “criminal” (Hare & Neumann, 2008; Hall & Benning, 2006), and may exist in two main forms: primary and secondary psychopathy (Karpman, 1941; Pothress & Skeem, 2007). Primary psychopathy is characterized by instrumental and manipulative tendencies in peer and romantic relationships, and a lack in emotions such as empathy, anxiety, or remorse (Hare, 2003; Mealey, 1995; Newman et al., 2005). Secondary psychopathy includes aspects such as risky and impulsive behaviors, the absence of long-term goals, and a low frustration tolerance. It is characterized by high levels of anxiety and is theorized to be more influenced by environmental factors than primary psychopathy (Hare, 2003; Mealey, 1995; Newman et al., 2005). With regard to personal and romantic relationships, psychopathic traits are associated with more relationship dissatisfaction and distress in both partners (Savard, Sabourin, & Lussier, 2006), short-term mating preferences (Jonason, Li, Webster, & Schmitt, 2009), the endorsement of a game-playing love style (Jonason & Kavanagh, 2010), limited mate retention but enhanced mate poaching (Jonason, Li, & Buss, 2010), and deception (Seto, Khattar, Lalumiere, & Quinsey, 1997). However, not much is known about psychopaths’ capacity and propensity towards experiencing jealousy.

Generally, romantic jealousy is defined as the negative emotional state generated in response to a threatened or actual loss of a valued relationship because of the presence of a real or imagined rival (Parrott & Smith, 1993). There are at least three forms of jealousy: emotional, behavioral, and cognitive jealousy (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). Emotional jealousy is best described as an emotional reaction to a perceived threat, and it is associated with more positive relationship qualities and outcomes than other types of jealousy (Elphinston, Feeney, & Noller, 2011). Cognitive jealousy revolves around thoughts and worries of the partner committing an infidelity, whereas behavioral jealousy instigates behaviors such as checking one’s partners’ belongings and communications for signs of possible infidelities. While emotional jealousy is reactive, cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy are pre-emptive, in that they are rooted in suspicions and anxiety that infidelity will or has already occurred (Ryedell & Bringle, 2007). Together, behavioral and cognitive jealousy can be conceptualized as suspicious jealousy, and when...
experienced to a large degree, can lead to controlling and obsessive behaviors towards one's partner.

The experience of jealousy has been described as a "narcissistic injury" to the psychopath's self-esteem (Spidel et al., 2007), but these statements apply to forensic populations rather than subclinical psychopathic individuals. Individuals with primary and secondary psychopathic traits might respond differentially to jealousy-arousing situations. For example, primary psychopaths are characterized by callous affect and a diminished ability to monitor their own emotions (Malterer, Glass, & Newman, 2008). In response to interpersonal conflict they tend to show inhibited anger (Reidy et al., 2013). We therefore predict that in response to a relationship threat, primary psychopaths are less likely to experience emotional and suspicious jealousy. In contrast, secondary psychopaths are characterized by an impulsive, anxious, and emotional behavioral style and a diminished capacity to regulate and repair emotions (Malterer et al., 2008). Moreover, they react with increased anger in response to conflicts (Reidy et al., 2013). We therefore expect that after a relationship threat, secondary psychopaths will report emotional and suspicious jealousy.

Jealousy is not only a result of a real or imagined transgression; it is sometimes used as a means to an end. Romantic jealousy induction is a strategic behavioral process designed to elicit a reactive jealousy response from a partner to achieve a goal—usually mate retention (Jonason et al., 2010; Mattingly, Whitson, & Mattingly, 2012). For instance, women tend to induce jealousy more often than men and they tend to do so for reasons such as testing the relationship and a desire for power or control (White, 1980). Furthermore, jealousy induction is associated with aggression in relationships and a need for control (Brainerd, Hunter, Moore, & Thompson, 1996), and it is positively correlated with jealous thoughts and behaviors (i.e., suspicious jealousy) but not with jealous emotions (Mattingly et al., 2012).

Individuals with psychopathic traits are likely to use jealousy induction as a mate retention tactic (Jonason et al., 2010). Overall, inducing jealousy in one's partner tends to be related to relational power and control (e.g., Dainton & Gross, 2008; Mattingly et al., 2012). Jealousy induction might be employed for various reasons like testing the relationship, revenge, power/control, security seeking, and gaining self-esteem (Mattingly et al., 2012). Since jealousy induction can be motivated by seemingly malevolent reasons (i.e. to get revenge on or control the partner), it is of interest to distinguish the more benign reasons from hurtful ones when examining psychopathy traits of inducers. Because jealousy induction involves manipulating and controlling one's partner, which is typical of psychopaths, these individuals might be more likely to induce jealousy for these reasons rather than to strengthen their relationship. In addition, an individual's experience of jealousy may influence the various motivational drives to induce jealousy in their partner. Specifically, we expect that primary psychopathy will predict the more malevolent motives for jealousy induction (power/control and revenge), whereas secondary psychopathy will be associated with the 'benign' motives (testing the relationship, security, and gaining self-esteem). In addition, since men consistently score higher on psychopathy measures than women (e.g. Jonason et al., 2010; Jonason et al., 2009), we will explore moderation and mediation of participant sex in the relationships between the psychopathy factors and our dependent variables.

1. Method

1.1. Participants & procedure

Heterosexual participants in a relationship (specified as lasting at least 2 months) were recruited from various sources (e.g., the university student participant pool, MTurk, Facebook, etc.). In total, 244 women (Mage = 28.00, SD = 9.29) and 103 men (Mage = 31.16, SD = 9.61) participated. Of these participants, 72% were American, 20.2% were Dutch, 4.3% were German, 2% were Belgian, and 1.5% reported another nationality (e.g., Japanese, British, Chilean).

After logging on to the online survey, participants were informed about the global aim of the study—the interaction between personality traits and relationship processes. Then they provided informed consent and demographic information, and completed the measures listed below. Ethical approval for all measures and procedures was obtained from the local Ethics Committee of Psychology.

1.2. Materials

More detailed instructions and materials, as well as the datafile, can be found at the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/gz4b5/). Alpha coefficients reported in this section refer to the current data.

The Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-III (SRP-III; Williams et al., 2007) was used to measure psychopathy. On a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) participants indicate agreement with 64 items. The scale consists of 4 facets which combine to represent the traditional two-factor model of psychopathy: Primary psychopathy consists of callous affect and interpersonal manipulation (Cronbach’s α = .89), and secondary psychopathy consists of erratic lifestyle and antisocial behavior (Cronbach’s α = .87).

The Short-Form of the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (Elphinston et al., 2011) is a 17-item scale measuring one’s general degree of jealousy experiences on three different subscales: Emotional, Cognitive, and Behavioral jealousy. For the questions of this scale, participants were asked to think of their current partner (“X”) in relation to each item. For emotional jealousy (α = .85), respondents used a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = very pleased; 7 = very upset) to rank their degree of upset in response to a perceived relationship threat, e.g., “X is flirting with a member of the opposite sex all the time”. Similarly, on a 7-point scale (1 = never; 7 = all the time) participants indicated their self-assessed frequency of jealous thoughts and behaviors. Example statements are: “I suspect that X may be attracted to someone else”. Together, these latter jealousy types are conceptualized as Suspicious jealousy (Cronbach’s α = .84).

The Romantic Jealousy Induction Scale was used to measure jealousy induction (Mattingly et al., 2012). This scale consists of 18 items and is designed to measure the endorsement of purposeful practices that are aimed at making one's partner jealous. It demonstrated excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's α = .96). Respondents used a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) to indicate their agreement with statements such as “I flirt with people in front of X in order to make X jealous.”

The Motives for Inducing Romantic Jealousy Scale (Mattingly et al., 2012) is a 22-item scale used to measure the different motivations that one has for inducing romantic jealousy in his/her mate. The scale demonstrated overall good internal consistency (Cronbach's α = .94) and consists of the following subscales: Testing the relationship (e.g., “I want to see if my partner still cares about me”; Cronbach's α = .90), Taking revenge (e.g., “I want to punish my partner for something bad s/he has done”; Cronbach's α = .88), Obtaining power/control (e.g., “I want to be able to control my partner/relationship”; Cronbach's α = .84), Seeking security (e.g., “I don’t want my partner to leave me”; Cronbach's α = .90), and Gaining self-esteem (e.g., “I feel inadequate”; Cronbach's α = .84). Respondents used a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) to indicate their level of agreement with each motivation.

2. Results

First, t-tests were conducted to examine sex differences (see Table 1). Men scored significantly higher than women on both factors.

2 In addition to the measures reported here, participants completed measures for another study. These included The Short Dark Triad (Jones & Paulhus, 2014), Mate Guarding scale (Buunk & Solano, 2002), and the Desirability of Control Scale (Burger & Cooper, 1979). All measures of the survey were administered in random order.
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