



Theses and Dissertations

2015-07-01

Shame, Relational Aggression, and Sexual Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Study

Austin Ray Beck
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Marriage and Family Therapy and Counseling Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Beck, Austin Ray, "Shame, Relational Aggression, and Sexual Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Study" (2015). *Theses and Dissertations*. 5919.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/5919>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Shame, Relational Aggression, and Sexual Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Study

Austin R. Beck

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree to

Master of Science

James M. Harper, Chair
Jonathan G. Sandberg
Sarah N. Coyne

School of Family Life
Brigham Young University

July 2015

Copyright © 2015 Austin R. Beck

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Shame, Relational Aggression, and Sexual Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Study

Austin R. Beck
School of Family Life, BYU
Master of Science

This longitudinal study examined the relationship between husband and wife shame and husband and wife sexual satisfaction one year later with husband and wife relational aggression as mediating variables. The sample included 353 heterosexual married couples who participated in the Flourishing Families Research Project, a longitudinal study of daily family life. Results showed that husband and wife shame was negatively related with husband and wife sexual satisfaction, respectively. Husband love withdrawal was negatively related with both husband and wife sexual satisfaction, while wife love withdrawal was negatively related with only husband sexual satisfaction. Each partner's use of social sabotage was negatively related with their partner's sexual satisfaction. Research and clinical implications were discussed.

Key Words: shame, sexual satisfaction, relational aggression, love withdrawal, social sabotage

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my wonderful wife for being so supportive of me as I have chased my dreams. She loves me unconditionally and sees the best in me. Without her, I never would have ever completed my thesis. I feel grateful for every day that I get to spend with her.

I'm also grateful for good parents that taught me to work hard and expected my best efforts in everything that I ever did.

None of this would have been possible without the mentorship that I received from Dr. James Harper. In my opinion, he is the perfect example of a mentor and advocate. I feel lucky that I get to rub shoulders with him on a regular basis.

Finally, I'd like to acknowledge the members of my thesis committee - Dr. Jonathan Sandberg and Dr. Sarah Coyne. They have given me excellent feedback and helped me grow in my journey as a writer and a future professor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	4
Theoretical Foundations.....	4
Current Study and Research Questions.....	11
Methods.....	12
Participants.....	12
Procedure	13
Measures	14
Analytic Plan.....	19
Results.....	19
Discussion.....	23
Implications for Couple Therapy.....	27
Limitations and Future Directions	28
Conclusion	29
References.....	30
Appendix.....	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.....	49
--------------	----

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.....	52
Figure 2.....	53
Figure 3.....	54

Introduction

Factors that help marriages thrive have been studied extensively, and yet scholars are still learning more about what makes marriages successful (Butler & Wampler, 1999; Carroll, Hill, Yorgason, Larson, & Sandberg, 2013; Jackson, Miller, Oka, & Henry, 2014; Twenge, Campbell, Foster, 2003). Couples tend to report high levels of relationship satisfaction when there is a feeling of intimacy between the partners (e.g., Greeff & Malherbe, 2001). While intimacy is a multidimensional construct, the sexual aspects of intimacy are highly correlated with couples' relationship satisfaction (Christopher & Sprecher, 2000; Greeff & Malherbe, 2001; Henderson-King & Veroff, 1994; Sprecher, 2002; Yeh, Lorenz, Wickrama, Conger, & Elder, 2006). It is important to study sexual satisfaction because of its link to overall relationship satisfaction and because it is such an integral part of marital interaction. It is also important to note that the importance placed on the sexual relationship is based on western views of sexuality, and thus many of the studies used in this paper are written from such a standpoint (Agocha, Asencio, & Decena, 2014). Western views of sexuality have influenced the ways respondents have, among other things, defined what constitutes attractiveness (Gangestad & Scheyd, 2005) and what is considered low, medium, and high levels of sexual frequency (Ubillos, Paez, & Gonzalez, 2000). When studying other cultures, one would want to account for different views on sexuality as well as the availability of things like birth control in the culture of interest. Empirical studies of marital sex have included sexual functioning (Chang, Klein, & Gorzalka, 2013) sexual frequency and discrepancy (Mark & Murray, 2012; McNulty & Fisher, 2008), and attraction levels (Mark & Herbenick, 2014), as well as perceived sexual satisfaction (e.g., McNulty, Wenner, & Fisher, 2014).

Trait shame, also known as internalized shame, has been linked with a variety of negative outcomes, both personal and relational (e.g. Baldwin, Baldwin, & Ewald, 2006; Brown, 2004; Gilbert, 2000; Harder, 1995; Lewis, 1971, 1987; Nathanson, 1992; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Shame has been defined as “an emotion in response to a negative evaluation of one’s *self*” (Harper & Hoopes, 1990, p. 3 italics included). Shadbolt (2009) highlighted the transactional nature of shame and the shaming behaviors that are often prompted by or linked with one’s sexuality. While the physical act of sex, with one giving oneself to another, is inherently physically vulnerable, it can also be quite emotionally vulnerable and can trigger a wide variety of shameful feelings, including shame about one’s body. Sexual intimacy is more than just physically vulnerable; it is also emotionally vulnerable (Metz & McCarthy, 2010). Sexual intimacy can trigger shame about one’s body, one’s perceived sexual prowess, or even one’s self-worth (Shadbolt, 2009). Shadbolt (2009) further explained that while shame is a universal experience, it often shows up in the bedroom in intimate sexual experiences where marital partners feel vulnerable and fear their “badness” might be discovered by their partner. It is likely that partners who experience high trait shame have lower sexual satisfaction. One purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of trait shame and marital sexual satisfaction one year later in both husbands and wives.

It is likely that some dynamics of marital interaction mediate the relationship between trait shame and sexual satisfaction. It is important to identify potential mediating variables because they may be more amenable to intervention than trait shame. One possible mediator between shame and sexual satisfaction is a specific type of romantic relational aggression called love withdrawal (Carroll, Nelson, Yorgason, Harper, Ashton, & Jensen, 2010; Karney, 2007). Love withdrawal encompasses behaviors such as ignoring your partner, threatening to leave, and

withholding affection. A second type of romantic relational aggression, social sabotage, involves spreading negative information about one's spouse, damaging his or her reputation with others, recruiting others to take sides in an argument, and intentionally embarrassing one's spouse in front of others. Carroll et. al. (2010) found that love withdrawal and social sabotage are much more likely to occur in a marriage than overt physical aggression. They reported in their sample of 652 married individuals that 88% of husbands and 96% of wives were reported by their partners to have used love withdrawal, and 50% of husbands and 67% of wives were reported to have used social sabotage in their marriage.

A second purpose of the study was to examine love withdrawal and social sabotage as potential mediators between trait shame and sexual satisfaction. While both types of romantic relational aggression were examined as mediators, it was hypothesized that only love withdrawal would be a significant mediator. As mentioned previously, shame is an emotional reaction to one's negative evaluation of one's self. With such a low evaluation of one's self, it is likely that the more private nature of love withdrawal would make it a more appealing option for someone that experiences a lot of shame and does not want their "badness" to be discovered. Engaging in social sabotage requires a person to disclose more about the relationship, and a person with high trait shame might anticipate that those who hear social sabotage comments would conclude that it is the fault of the person making the comments rather than the fault of the person's partner. Specifically, an Actor Partner Interdependence Model, APIM (Kenney, Kashy, & Cook, 2006), shown in Figure 1, was used to examine the relationship between husband and wife trait shame (measured initially) and husband and wife sexual satisfaction one year later with husband and wife love withdrawal and social sabotage (measured in the same year as the outcomes, wife and husband sexual satisfaction) as potential mediating variables.

Literature Review

Theoretical Foundations

Understanding shame has its origins in psychodynamic theory (Kaufman, 1996). Psychodynamic theory includes concepts of unmet needs and the internal working world of affect, including shame. A central concept of the theory is that people develop internal representational worlds or internal working models of their self in relationship to others. These internal working models are developed early in life and last into adulthood (Goodman, 2005). Harper and Hoopes (1990) concluded that trait shame is rooted in the dynamics of early family relationships and is subsequently influenced by interactions with peers, teachers, and in adult relationships. The underlying assumption is that people develop shame early in their lives in response to family dynamics that lead to unmet needs and inhibit and even punish the expression of emotion (Miller, 1996). As shaming experiences punish the normal expression of emotion and begin to “pile up”, the children develop an internal working model in which they conclude “I must be bad because these feelings come from inside of me, and others react negatively to my expression of these feelings”. In these circumstance, children internalize shame and come to expect others to be shaming to them. Over time as these patterns become more consistent, and the shame becomes deeply rooted and bleeds into other aspects of the person’s life, especially relationships (Harper, 2011).

Due to trait shame affecting adult relationships, some (Shadbolt, 2009) have hypothesized that it affects sexual interactions in adult romantic partnerships because a person who has trait shame tends to hide their feelings and emotions, and healthy sexual interaction is about opening up to another and feeling vulnerable. Shame has been associated with feelings of

insecurity in a relationship (Karos, 2006; Wells & Hansen, 2003) as well as with forms of anxiety and avoidance (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998).

Lastly, psychodynamic theory supports the idea that people interact with others based on their internal working models, and this distorts interpersonal perceptions and interactions (Poulton, 2013). Attachment theory incorporated the idea of internal working models from object relations theorists, and as viewed from both theoretical perspectives, a person who has high internalized shame is more prone to viewing others as shaming so they use avoidance of personal disclosure and avoidance of emotional intimacy to defend against others discovering who they are and shaming them more. In this respect, it is likely that trait shame is related to love withdrawal.

However, the theory would indicate that it is unlikely that shame would be related to social sabotage. When a person experiences high levels of trait shame, they withdraw and seek to defend against being discovered by others. Engaging in social sabotage as a form of relational aggression would not help the shame-based person hide. It is likely that partners with high trait shame would assume that their “badness” has somehow influenced their partner’s behavior so they would be unlikely to use social sabotage because it would further expose them as the cause of their partner’s behavior (Harper and Hoopes, 1990).

Shame and Sexual Satisfaction

Harper (2011) identified shame as an innate affect often described as humiliation, embarrassment, or fallen pride. Frequent and intense experiences of shame eventually lead to trait shame or internalized shame, which is a sense of being bad, flawed at the core. Harper and Hoopes (1990) concluded that trait shame is rooted in the dynamics of early family relationships and is subsequently influenced by interactions with peers, teachers, and in adult relationships.

Such shame has been related to feelings of insecurity in relationships (Karos, 2006; Wells & Hansen, 2003) as well as the presence of distress in couple relationships (Greenberg, 2008).

Kaufmann (1996) identified stages of internalization of shame. Initially, frequent shaming experiences in which a person's feelings are invalidated lead to self-blame, self-contempt, and negative comparisons of self with others. As these negative self-evaluations escalate, people move into the second stage where they suppress their desire for connection and feelings that come with that desire to connect. During this stage people disown basic feelings and needs. Eventually, people move to the third stage during which they experience self as all negative and others as all positive. In the final step, people base their entire identity on shame. In unhealthy family systems, these steps proceed quickly and at a young age (Harper, 2011).

The empirical research related to shame and sexual satisfaction is still in its infancy, but early research has found that sexual satisfaction is negatively related to shame (Harper, Hughes, & Bean, in press). Shame has been related to a variety of interpersonal hiding behaviors and a fear of disclosing ones' needs, wants and feelings (Harper & Hoopes, 1990). When one thinks that who they are is bad, it becomes difficult to draw close to others due to the fear that the badness will rub off on others (Harper & Hoopes, 1990). Shame can distort perceptions of sexual experiences, making it difficult for someone to experience a sexual relationship as a satisfying experience. A number of sexual problems have been related to poor disclosure and communication, and quite often one of the main interventions is to try and increase couple communication and openness surrounding the problem (Hertlein, Weeks, & Gambescia, 2009; Hertlein, Weeks, & Sendak, 2009).

Shame is related to a variety of different negative feelings in a relationship, such as insecurity, instability, and a lack of safety (Karos 2006, Wells & Hansen, 2003) and these

feelings, along with the behaviors that are often motivated by those feelings, are associated with various forms of relational dysfunction, including but not limited to decreased sexual satisfaction in couples (Butzer & Campbell, 2008; Davis et. al., 2006; Timm & Keiley, 2011). Shaver & Mikulincer (2006) found that when either partner is anxious or avoidant in his or her expression of relational insecurity, sexual satisfaction is negatively influenced. Birnbaum, Mikulincer, Szepeswol, Shaver, and Mizrahi (2014) also found that individuals with high avoidance in relationships (more likely with high trait shame individuals) are slower in response to sexual stimuli and tend to view sexual stimuli as a source of distress and, therefore, avoid sexual encounters. Love withdrawal could be one strategy for avoiding sexual interaction. Conversely, feelings of security, stability, and safety in adult couples are associated with better intimacy, relationship quality, and functioning (Mikulincer, 1995; Johnson & Whiffen, 2003).

Relational Aggression as a Potential Mediator

Romantic relational aggression is viewed as a separate construct from verbal, emotional, and physical aggression (Linder, Crick, & Collins, 2002). Romantic relational aggression often occurs in a relationship without the presence of any physical aggression (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Crick et. al., 1999; Werner & Crick, 1999). While verbal and physical aggression may include threats, verbal insults, accusations, and coercion (Kasian & Painter, 1992; Murphy & O'Leary, 1989), these behaviors do not completely capture the full range of relational aggression. According to Linder, Crick, and Collins (2002) romantic relational aggression is any action or behavior that causes harm by damaging relationships or feelings of acceptance and love. When such behavior occurs in romantic partnerships, it is called romantic relational aggression. Linder, Crick, and Collins (2002) explain that romantic relational aggression can include things such as flirting with others to make your romantic partner jealous, giving a partner

the silent treatment when angry, and threatening to break up with a partner if they will not comply with a request. While these examples vary in degrees of severity, they are all considered to be forms of relational aggression.

Carroll, et. al., (2010) found love withdrawal and social sabotage to be distinct types of romantic relational aggression in marital relationships. Love withdrawal is a type of romantic relational aggression (Coyne, et al., 2011). It is seen as an indirect, manipulative strategy to either hurt a partner or to control their behavior in an attempt to get them to change relationship behavior. Social sabotage refers to behaviors where the spouse or partner harms his or her partner in indirect and circuitous ways, such as sharing private information with third parties or recruiting others to take their side in an argument (Carroll, et. al., 2010). Love withdrawal and social sabotage have been shown to be negatively related to relationship quality in dating relationships (Linder, Crick, & Collins, 2002), and since sexual satisfaction and relationship satisfaction are highly correlated, love withdrawal is likely related to poorer sexual satisfaction.

Carroll, et. al. (2010) defined love withdrawal as “a form of direct relational aggression, in that the target of the behavior is directly and consistently confronted by the inattentiveness of the spouse (e.g., silent treatment or withdrawal of affection)” (p. 318). While love withdrawal is sometimes considered a direct form of relational aggression due to the fact that the spouse is directly confronted by the inattentiveness or withdrawal of the partner, it is still a way in which partners avoid directly expressing their needs and desires. It has been found that love withdrawal and social sabotage both independently predict lower marital quality as well as marital instability (Carroll et. al., 2010). Harper, Hughes, and Bean (in press) found that when a partner uses love withdrawal and turns things like affection and sex into a bargaining chip, both partners’ sexual satisfaction is negatively affected.

Retzinger (1995) concluded that shame leads to negative coping responses like anger and defensiveness, while in other cases it can lead to withdrawal and hiding. Anger in relationships can lead to aggression, or more specifically a type of aggression that Crick and Grotpeter (1995) identified as relational aggression. When people have higher trait shame, they tend to employ avoidant and hiding behaviors as a means of keeping others from discovering their “badness” (Harper, 2011). Shame may be related to love withdrawal in three ways. First, partners with high amounts of shame tend to struggle to be direct in asking for their needs to be met and will often manipulate their partner using love withdrawal as a means of getting their needs met, getting partner to take notice of them in some way, or to test their partner to see if they will care that they are withholding their love (Carroll et. al., 2010; Madsen, 2013; Lee, 2008). Secondly, Harper and Hoopes (1990) posited that rather than allowing the other partner in a relationship to discover a person’s shame, the person rejects the partner by withdrawing love as a way to avoid the possibility of a partner rejecting them first if their shame is discovered. Using love withdrawal essentially becomes the way that the partner defends against being fully discovered in the relationship. Third, people with high trait shame worry that their shame will “rub off” on others so they withdraw in relationships thinking that this prevents others from becoming polluted by their shame (Harper, 2011). Love withdrawal helps shame based partners calm their fears related to feeling inferior and to worrying that their “badness” will affect their partner. Bagner and colleagues (2007) found that loneliness and depression, correlates of trait shame, were related to romantic relational aggression, which indirectly supports the possible connection between shame and love withdrawal. The problem with seeking reassurance in this sort of manipulative way is that love and the expression of love becomes a bargaining chip and source of emotional coercion in the relationship.

While social sabotage was also examined as a potential mediator between trait shame and sexual satisfaction, it is likely that shame and social sabotage are unrelated. At least, the theoretical foundations of shame would suggest that shame-based individuals would not likely engage in social sabotage because they would risk their shame being uncovered by others if they were to talk negatively about their spouse to others. It is also likely that talking negative about one's partner would allow others to discover that the person's "badness" had actually been the root for her/his partner's behavior (Harper & Hoopes, 1990).

Gender differences.

Carroll et. al., (2010) found that "patterns of love withdrawal, such as intentionally ignoring one's spouse or withholding affection and sex during times of conflict, were used, at least to some degree, by nearly all wives and the vast majority of husbands (as reported by their partners)" (p. 325). Archer and Coyne (2005), along with Crick et. al. (1999) found that women were more likely to use romantic relational aggression than men in dating relationships, even though the likelihood of men using romantic relational aggression increased as they moved into adulthood. Bjorkqvist et. al. (1994) attributed the increase in males' increased use of relational aggression as they move into emerging adulthood to the fact that their previous means of control are no longer as effective. While it may be that wives and husbands differ in the amounts they engage in romantic relational aggressive behaviors, there was no basis in the literature for predicting that the path from shame to romantic relational aggression and from romantic relational aggression to sexual satisfaction would differ based on gender. Thus, no gender related hypotheses were generated because the relationship between these variables has never been studied before. In this study the gender differences will be studied for the first time as a

means of predicting the relationship between shame and romantic relational aggression and between romantic relational aggression and sexual satisfaction.

Current Study and Research Questions

The aim of the current study was to explore the relationship between husband and wife shame and husband and wife sexual satisfaction as mediated by husband and wife love withdrawal and social sabotage using 2 waves of data. More specifically, husband and wife shame was used to predict each partner's sexual satisfaction one year later while still controlling for sexual satisfaction at the first time point. The measurement and structural model is shown in Figure 1.

In terms of actor effects, the following hypotheses were tested:

1. Each partner's shame would be negatively related to his/her own sexual satisfaction.
2. It was also hypothesized that wife and husband love withdrawal would partially mediate the relationship between wife and husband shame and sexual satisfaction, respectively.
3. Based on theoretical formulations of shame, it was hypothesized that social sabotage would not be related to shame for either partner.
4. If shame is not related to social sabotage, it was hypothesized that social sabotage would not be a significant mediator between shame and sexual satisfaction for either husbands or wives.

In terms of partner effects, the following hypotheses were tested:

5. It was hypothesized that wife shame would be negatively related to husband sexual satisfaction and that husband shame would be negatively related to wife sexual satisfaction.

Since the literature has not established support for other partner effects, specific hypotheses were not formulated. Rather the general research question, “What other partner effects are significant?” was raised. As can be seen in Figure 1, predictor variables were measured in the first time period (time 4), and outcome variables were measured one year later (time 5), and the mediating variables were measured at the same time as the outcomes. Sexual satisfaction and marital satisfaction for both partners were also controlled for by including wife and husband sexual satisfaction at time 4 as predictors of the outcome variables time 5. Love withdrawal and social sabotage were also controlled for including wife and husband love withdrawal and social sabotage time 4 with paths to wife and husband love withdrawal and social sabotage time 5. Other control variables are described below in the “Measures” section.

Methods

Participants

The participants for this study were taken from the Flourishing Families Project (FFP), which is an ongoing, longitudinal study of inner family life involving families with a child between the ages of 10 and 13. In the initial wave 500 families (147 single parent and 353 two-parent) participated. Since the current study centers on couple variables, only the adults from the two-parent families comprised the sample for the current study ($n=353$). The current study utilized variables from waves 4 and 5. Earlier waves were not used because some of the variables of interest in this study were not included until these later waves. At wave 5, 94.9% of couples from wave 1 were still participating making 319 couples as the sample for the current study.

The wave 4 mean age for husbands was 48.34 years ($SD=5.96$) and wives 46.50 years ($SD=5.70$), and they had been in their relationships on average for 20.81 years ($SD=5.21$).

Eighty-seven percent of husbands and 82% of wives reported being European American or Caucasian. Five percent of husbands and 5% of wives reported being African American. Two percent of husbands and 5% of wives reported being Asian American. One percent of husbands and 3% of wives reported being Hispanic. Five percent of husbands and 5% of wives reported that they were “mixed/biracial”. Of these 319 couples, no husbands and 1% of wives reported less than high school education. Six percent of husbands and 5% of wives reported having a high school diploma. Twenty-four percent of husbands and 26% of wives reported having some college. Thirty-nine percent of husbands and 40% of wives reported having a bachelor’s degree. Nineteen percent of husbands and 21% of wives reported having a Master’s degree. Twelve percent of husbands and 7% of wives reported having a professional/Ph.D. degree. Forty-six percent reported an annual household income between \$60,000-100,000; 13% reported below \$60,000; 21% reported between \$100-120,000, and 19% reported making more than \$120,000.

Procedure

All of the participant families for the FFP were selected from a large northwestern city. Participant families were interviewed during the first eight months of 2007. A purchased national telephone survey database (Polk Directories/InfoUSA) was used as the primary recruiting apparatus. Eighty-two million households across the United States were claimed to belong to this database. This database claimed to have detailed information about each household. Included was the presence and age of children. These families in the Polk Directory were chosen from targeted census tracts parallel the socio-economic and racial stratification of reports of the local school districts. Every family with a child between ages of 10 and 14 living within the census tracts were considered eligible to participate in the FFP. Four hundred twenty-three of the 692 eligible families agreed to participate (61% response rate). Families of lower

socio-economic status were under-represented due to the nature of the Polk Directory national database. This database was generated using telephone, magazine, and internet subscription reports. Referrals and fliers were employed as an attempt to more closely reflect the demographics of the local area. The number of families recruited through these alternative means were limited ($n = 77$, 15%). This attempt to more accurately reflect the true local demographics was tremendously helpful in increasing the social-economic and ethnic diversity of the sample.

By using a multi-stage recruitment procedure, all families were contacted directly. This process first included a letter of introduction. The letter was sent to potentially qualified families (this first step was skipped for the 15 families who responded to fliers). Home visits and phone calls were then made to confirm eligibility as well as participant willingness to participate in the study. Following the confirmation of eligibility and consent, interviewers made an appointment to come to the family's home to conduct an assessment interview. The assessment interview included video-taped interactions (not used in current study), in addition to questionnaires that were completed in the home. The lack of time and concerns of privacy were the most frequent reasons cited by families for not wanting to participate in the study. There was very little missing data in this study. This was done by screening questionnaires for missing answers and double marking upon collection of each segment of the in-home interview.

Measures

Trait Shame, Time 4. Latent variables for husband and wife trait shame were created using the eight items as indicators from the Inadequacy Scale of the Internalized Shame Scale (Cook, 2001) completed a time 4. Participants responded to a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Almost Always*). Sample items included "I feel like I am never quite good enough",

“I feel as if I am somehow defective as a person,” and “When I compare myself to others I am just not as important.” The Cronbach reliabilities for waves 4 and 5 were .92 and .94 for women and .92 and .94 for men. Factor loadings of the eight items ranged from .64 to .87 for wives and from .66 to .83 for husbands. .

Love withdrawal, Times 4 and 5. As shown in Figure 1, two separate latent variables, one for husbands and one for wives, were created using partner reports on six love withdrawal items ($\alpha = .90$ for women; $\alpha = .88$ for men) from the Couples Relational Aggression and Victimization Scale (CRAViS) developed by Nelson and Carroll (2006) and completed at time 5. CRAViS is a modified version of the original Self-Report of Aggression and Victimization (SRAV) measure developed by Morales and Crick (1998) and extended to romantic relationships of young adults by Linder, Crick, & Collins (2002). Using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all true*) to 7 (*very true*), partners were asked to consider the spouse’s behavior and answer each item. Sample items from the love withdrawal scale included “My partner gives me the silent treatment when I hurt his/her feelings in some way” and “My partner has intentionally ignored me until I give in to his/her way about something.” Carroll and colleagues (2010) found that the CRAViS measure had good discriminate validity in predicting distressed couples. The Cronbach reliabilities for love withdrawal were .88 for wives and .90 for husbands at wave five. Confirmatory factor analysis in the original psychometric study showed that the items loaded on two scales with a range of factor loadings from .65 to .91 for love withdrawal and from .65 to .87 for social sabotage (Carroll et al., 2010). The factor loadings for the six indicators for the latent variable wife love withdrawal, time 5 and for the latent variable husband love withdrawal, time 5 ranged from .54 to .92 and from .54 to .93, respectively.

Social Sabotage, Times 4 and 5. As shown in Figure 1, two separate latent variables, one for husbands and one for wives, were created using partner reports on six social sabotage items ($\alpha = .78$ for women; $\alpha = .90$ for men) from the Couples Relational Aggression and Victimization Scale (CRAViS) developed by Nelson and Carroll (2006) and completed at time 5. CRAViS is a modified version of the original Self-Report of Aggression and Victimization (SRAV) measure developed by Morales and Crick (1998) and extended to romantic relationships of young adults by Linder, Crick, & Collins (2002). Using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all true*) to 7 (*very true*), partners were asked to consider the spouse's behavior and answer each item. Sample items from the social sabotage scale included "My partner gets other people to "take sides" with her/him and gets them upset with me too", and "My partner has spread negative information about me to be mean". Carroll and colleagues (2010) found that the CRAViS measure had good discriminate validity in predicting distressed couples. The Cronbach reliabilities for social sabotage were .88 for wives and .90 for husbands at wave five. Confirmatory factor analysis in the original psychometric study showed that the items loaded on two scales with a range of factor loadings from .65 to .91 for love withdrawal and from .65 to .87 for social sabotage (Carroll et al., 2010). The factor loadings for the six indicators for the latent variable wife social sabotage, time 5 and for the latent variable husband social sabotage, time 5 ranged from .66 to .90 and from .71 to .92, respectively.

Sexual satisfaction, Times 4 and 5. Two latent variables, wife sexual satisfaction and husband sexual satisfaction, were created using seven indicators each. These indicators included a general sexual satisfaction item from the Revised Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire, "I am satisfied with my sex life with my partner" rated from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) (Fraley, Waller, & Breenan), one item from RELATE (Busby, Holman, and

Taniguchi, 2001) about conflict over sex [“How often is intimacy/sexuality a problem in your relationship? reverse scored and rated from 1 (*never*) to 4 (*often*)], and five items from the Sexual Satisfaction subscale of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory–Research (Snyder, 1997) (Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .79 to .84). Participants responded to these last five items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*all of the time*). Examples of items included “I am satisfied with our sexual relationship” and “I would like my partner to express a little more tenderness during intercourse” (reverse scored). Factor loadings for these items for times 4 and 5 ranged from .71 to .84.

RELATE, first developed in 1979 (Busby, Holman, & Taniguchi, 2001), is considered a reliable and valid instrument and has been used in more than 95 studies of marriage (Busby & Gardner, 2008; Busby & Holman, 1989; Busby, Carroll, & Willoughby, 2010; Carroll, Dean, Larson, & Busby, 2011; Holman, Larson, & Harmer, 1994; RELATE Institute, 2012).

Cronbach’s alphas for the original psychometric studies of subscales ranged from .66 to .85, and test-retest reliabilities ranged from .67 to .94. Concurrent validity studies of RELATE show that the subscales are correlated with the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Busby et al., 2001) with ranges from -.48 to .57 indicating that RELATE, while demonstrating some convergent validity, also demonstrates discriminate validity. The score for discrepancy between actual and desired frequency of intercourse created for this study was highly correlated (.83) with measures of relationship satisfaction and (.76) with the general sexual satisfaction item.

Snyder (1997) reported psychometric properties of the MSI–R sexual satisfaction scale. Reliability coefficients ranged between .74 and .85. Original factor loadings of the items in the subscale ranged from .69 to .86. Concurrent validity studies have shown the MSI–R to be highly correlated with other relationship satisfaction measures (Snyder) and predictive validity

studies (e.g., Whisman, Beach, & Snyder, 2008) have shown it to discriminate between distressed and non-distressed couples. Husbands and wives completed both the MSI-R questions at both times 4 and time 5. Time 5 included these MSI-R indicators as part of the latent outcome variable in this study; time 4 was used as a control variable. The factor loadings for these seven items ranged from .52 to .82 for wives and from .57 to .88 for husbands at wave 5. At time 4, the factor loadings ranged from .58 to .84 for wives and from .59 to .89 for husbands.

Marital Satisfaction, Time 4 Covariate. Since studies cited in the literature review indicated that marital satisfaction and sexual satisfaction are highly correlated, marital satisfaction at Time 4 was included as a covariate. Marital Satisfaction was measured with the Norton Marital Quality Index (Norton, 1983). Each partner responded to six items ranging from 1 (*very strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Very strongly agree*). Examples of these items included “We have a good relationship”, “My relationship with my partner makes me happy”, and “My relationship with my partner is very stable”. They also responded to one additional item (also a part of the Norton Marital Quality Index) about the degree of happiness in their relationship using a scale ranging from 1 (*very unhappy*) to 10 (*perfectly happy*). The sum of these items at Time 4 was used to create the control variables for wives and for husbands.

The Norton Marital Quality Index is a widely used measure of global marital satisfaction and is highly correlated with other measures of marital satisfaction (Norton, 1983). The reliability coefficients in this sample were .97 for both wives and husbands.

Covariates. Husband and wife age, education, and annual household income, and husband and wife marital satisfaction at time 4 were also used as covariates with paths to sexual satisfaction at Time 5 since marital quality and sexual satisfaction have been shown to be related to each other (Butzer & Campbell, 2008; Hertlein, Weeks, & Gambescia, 2015).

Analytic Plan

Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, and correlations were calculated for every measured variable. Paired t-tests were used to examine mean differences between wives and husbands. A correlation matrix including the correlations between all measured variables was examined, and there were no correlations between independent variables that were high enough to indicate possible problems with multi-collinearity.

The measurement model for each latent variable was examined to determine that all indicators loaded at least at .50 or above which they did.

Finally, structural equation modeling using AMOS 20 was used to examine the relationships among the predictor variables and the criterion variables. Two separate models were run, one using husband and wife love withdrawal as mediators and one using husband and wife social sabotage as mediators. Initially, a model containing both love withdrawal and social sabotage in the same model was examined. However, the model would not run with these four mediating variables in the same model, likely because of moderately high correlations between love withdrawal and social sabotage. It is also likely that there was not enough couples in the sample to adequately test a model with four mediators because statistical power would be low. Therefore, two separate models, one with wife and husband withdrawal as the mediators and one with wife and husband social withdrawal as the mediators. Finally, bias corrected bootstrapping was used to test if wife and husband love withdrawal significantly mediated the relationship between husband and wife shame and husband and wife sexual satisfaction.

Results

The means, standard deviations, and correlations for all measured variables were reported in Table 1. Paired sample t-tests showed that wife and husband means for love withdrawal ($t=$

4.37, $df = 306$, $p < .001$), social sabotage ($t = 2.19$, $df = 306$, $p < .05$), and sexual satisfaction ($t = 4.19$, $df = 306$, $p < .001$) were significantly different from each other. The mean for wife love withdrawal (2.74, $SD = 1.17$) was significantly greater than the mean for husband love withdrawal (2.38, $SD = 1.26$). The mean for wife social sabotage (1.50, $SD = .75$) was significantly greater than the mean for husband social sabotage (1.39, $SD = .81$). The mean for wife sexual satisfaction (3.67, $SD = .73$) was significantly greater than the mean for husband sexual satisfaction (3.50, $SD = .60$).

As seen in Table 1, wife shame was significantly correlated with wife love withdrawal, wife social sabotage, husband social sabotage, and wife sexual satisfaction with correlations ranging from $-.23$ to $.25$. Husband shame was significantly correlated with wife love withdrawal, husband love withdrawal, wife social sabotage, and husband sexual satisfaction with correlations ranging from $-.32$ to $.22$. Wife love withdrawal was significantly correlated with wife shame, husband shame, husband love withdrawal, wife social sabotage, husband social sabotage, wife sexual satisfaction, and husband social satisfaction with correlations ranging from $-.43$ to $.54$. Husband love withdrawal was significantly correlated with husband shame, wife love withdrawal, wife social sabotage, husband social sabotage, wife sexual satisfaction, and husband sexual satisfaction with correlations ranging from $-.45$ to $.54$. Wife social sabotage was significantly correlated with wife shame, husband shame, wife love withdrawal, husband love withdrawal, husband social sabotage, wife sexual satisfaction, and husband sexual satisfaction with correlations ranging from $-.41$ to $.54$. Husband social sabotage significantly correlated with wife shame, wife love withdrawal, husband love withdrawal, wife social sabotage, wife sexual satisfaction, and husband sexual satisfaction with correlations ranging from $-.35$ to $.53$.

Results from the Actor Partner Interdependence Model are shown in Figures 2 and 3.

The overall fit indices for the model with Love Withdrawal as a mediator (See Figure 2) showed the hypothesized model was a good fit to the data ($X^2 = 528.02, df=483, p=.06, CFI= .992, RMSEA = .018, SRMR = .046$). The overall fit indices for the model with Social Sabotage as a mediator (See Figure 3) also showed the hypothesized model was a good fit to the data ($X^2 = 583.46, df=531, p=.07, CFI = .993, RMSEA = .017, SRMR = .048$). According to Kline (2011) a model with good fit should have a non-significant Chi-square, a *CFI* greater than .95, a *RMSEA* less than .05, and a *SRMR* less than .05.

Shame and Sexual Satisfaction

As shown in Figure 2, wife shame time 4 was negatively related to wife sexual satisfaction time 5 ($\beta = -.22, p < .01$). Likewise, husband shame time 4 was negatively related to husband sexual satisfaction time 5 ($\beta = -.23, p < .001$) in the model with wife and husband love withdrawal at time 5 as mediators. In the model with wife and husband social sabotage as mediators (shown in Figure 3, the actor paths (wife shame time 4 to wife sexual satisfaction time 5 and husband shame time 4 to husband sexual satisfaction time 5) were statistically significant, but the values changed slightly from the values in the model with wife and husband withdrawal as the mediators ($\beta = -.16, p < .05$ for wives; $\beta = -.24, p < .001$) because of the different mediating variables. Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported. However, the partner effect hypothesis 5 that an individual's shame would be related to her/his partner's sexual satisfaction was not supported since the coefficients for those paths were not statistically significant.

Results Related to Love Withdrawal as a Mediator

As shown in Figure 2, wife shame was positively related to her own love withdrawal ($\beta = .17, p < .05$), meaning that as wife shame increases her use of love withdrawal in the relationship

also increases. However, wife love withdrawal time 5 was not related to wife sexual satisfaction time 5. Therefore, the first part of hypothesis 2 that love withdrawal would mediate the relationship between wife shame and wife sexual satisfaction was not supported. Husband shame time 4 was positively related with his own love withdrawal time 5 ($\beta=.16, p<.05$), and husband love withdrawal time 5 was negatively related to husband sexual satisfaction time 5 ($\beta=-.23, p<.001$)

Following Preacher and Hayes (2008) guidelines, bias corrected bootstrapping with 2000 draws was used to test mediation effects. The standardized indirect effect of $-.037$ for husband love withdrawal mediating husband shame and husband sexual satisfaction was statistically significant (95% *CI* $[-.21, -.03]$, $p<.05$). Thus, hypothesis 2 was supported for husbands but not for wives.

Results Related to Social Sabotage as a Mediator

As seen in Figure 3, wife shame time 4 was not related to wife social sabotage time 5, and wife social sabotage time 5 was not related to wife sexual satisfaction time 5. Neither was husband shame time 4 related to husband social sabotage time 5, nor was husband social sabotage time 5 related to husband sexual satisfaction time 5. Therefore, hypothesis 3 that social sabotage would not be related to shame for either partner was supported, and because there were not statistically significant paths between these variables, bootstrapping showed that there were no significant mediation effects, which is in support of hypothesis 4. However, there were interesting partner effects in the model with wife and husband social sabotage as mediators, and those will be explained in the next section.

Results Related to Research Question “What Other Partner Effects are Significant?”

Because the existing empirical literature provided no direction as how to form hypotheses related to other partner effects, the general research question “What other partner effects are significant?” was posed. There were four partner mediation effects that were significant. First, as shown in Figure 2, husband shame time 4 was positively related with wife love withdrawal time 5 ($\beta=.19, p<.01$), and wife love withdrawal time 5 was negatively related with husband sexual satisfaction time 5 ($\beta= -.31, p<.001$). Bootstrapping showed that this was a significant mediation effect ($\beta= -.059, 95\% CI [-.30, -.02], p<.01$).

Second, husband shame time 4 was positively related to husband love withdrawal time 5 ($\beta= .16, p<.05$), which was negatively related to wife sexual satisfaction time 5 ($\beta= -.36, p<.01$). Bootstrapping tests also verified that husband love withdrawal significantly mediated the relationship between husband shame and wife sexual satisfaction ($\beta= -.058, 95\% CI[-.29, -.02] p<.01$).

Third, as shown in Figure 3, wife shame time 4 was positively related to husband social sabotage time 5 ($\beta= .27, p<.001$), and husband social sabotage time 5 was negatively related to wife sexual satisfaction time 5 ($\beta= -.36, p<.001$). The standardized coefficient of $-.10$ showed that this mediation was significant ($95\% CI [-.45, -.01] p<.001$).

Last, husband shame time 4 was positively related to wife social sabotage time 5 ($\beta= .23, p<.05$), which was negatively related to husband sexual satisfaction time 5 ($\beta=.25, p<.001$). Results from bootstrapping verified that this was significant mediation ($\beta= -.058, 95\% CI[-.26, -.01] p<.01$).

Discussion

The current study found that trait shame in wives and husbands was associated with their respective sexual satisfaction over time. Furthermore, both partners’ use of love withdrawal was

shown to be negatively correlated with husband sexual satisfaction, while only husband love withdrawal was negatively correlated with wife sexual satisfaction. It appears from these findings that trait shame is associated with the likelihood of using love withdrawal within the relationship. Mediation tests showed that husband love withdrawal mediated the relationship between his shame and his sexual satisfaction as well as between his shame and his wife's sexual satisfaction. Wife love withdrawal also mediated the relationship between husband shame and husband sexual satisfaction. Husband social sabotage mediated the relationship between wife shame and wife sexual satisfaction, and wife social sabotage mediated the relationship between husband shame and husband sexual satisfaction. Strengths of this study include the sample of both husbands and wives married to each other and the use of two waves of data allowing for a longitudinal examination.

The Importance of Shame and Sexual Satisfaction

While the link between shame and lowered sexual satisfaction has been explored theoretically (e.g. Shadbolt, 2009), this is the first study to empirically validate the relationship between shame and sexual satisfaction for both men and women. This may be explained, in part, with the rational that a persons with trait shame tend to hide their feelings and emotions for fear of having their "badness" discovered by their partner. Sexual intimacy is an innately vulnerable experience that seems to put the desire to hide and the need to be vulnerable at odds with each other (Weeks and Gambescia, 2015). Thus, it seems that a reasonable outcome for increased trait shame would be a decrease in sexual satisfaction.

Types of Romantic Relational Aggression as Mediators

The second purpose of this study was to examine love withdrawal and social sabotage as potential mediators between shame and sexual satisfaction using an Actor Partner

Interdependence Model (Kenny, Kashy, and Cook, 2006). It is interesting to note that husband love withdrawal mediated the husband's shame with his own sexual satisfaction, but wife love withdrawal did not mediate her own shame with her sexual satisfaction. One possible explanation is that wives might use love withdrawal to manipulate their husbands into giving increased attention and as a test of his commitment in the relationship rather than as a means of getting what they want sexually. Another possible explanation might be that stereotypes about sexuality and gender might be contributing to our findings. Men are often stereotyped as being more interested in sex than women, wives are sent the message that sex is something you do to keep your husband's happy rather than for your own personal enjoyment. If one were to buy into these stereotypes, a man would be more likely to interpret his wife's use of love withdrawal as rejection while a wife might interpret her husband's use of love withdrawal as her husband respecting her lack of desire for sex.

A possible explanation for the finding that husband shame is related to wife love withdrawal which, in turn, is related to lower husband sexual satisfaction may be because wives use love withdrawal to manipulate their husbands into giving increased attention, which they aren't getting due to their husband's shame and consequential hiding behaviors that come from his shame. As the wife pulls away she may be less likely to engage in sexual activity, which in turn leaves the husband feeling he is unable to relieve his feels of shame and tension. Thus, the husband may be less sexually satisfied and enjoy sex less when they do have sex.

Husband shame was correlated with both wife and husband use of love withdrawal, and husband love withdrawal was correlated with decreased wife sexual satisfaction. These findings could also be explained in the context of wives seeking emotional closeness through sex and husbands seeking a reduction in relationship tension through sex. If a wife is seeking emotional

closeness through sex and a husband is using love withdrawal as a means of being noticed, it would seem easy to conclude that his withholding of affection would lead to a perceived lack of closeness of the part of the wife, which then could lead to a decrease in sexual satisfaction on the part of the wife.

The finding that social sabotage mediated the relationship between partner shame and partner sexual satisfaction may mean that a partner who has high trait shame is likely to engage in less personal disclosure which leaves the other partner frustrated enough to use social sabotage. The partner of the person feeling shame likely experiences some frustrations with the relationship, and they might feel like they cannot go to their partner for help (because this activates the partner's shame). Bowen System Theory (Kerr, 2003) offers a possible explanation that the partner is unable to deal directly with issues in the relationship, in this case their partner's shame, so they triangle in third parties using social sabotage. While according to Bowen, such behavior may lessen the person's anxiety, the behavior is not ultimately healthy for the relationships. As shown by the findings in this study, the social sabotage is related to partner's lowered sexual satisfaction. Additionally, as a partner uses social sabotage, the partner with trait shame is likely to feel even more unsafe, and likely responsible, since they are more likely to blame themselves. This self-blame and increased shame leaves them less likely to find sexual satisfaction in their relationship, regardless of what other factors they feel contributes to their sexual satisfaction.

There was not a significant relationship between a partner feeling shame and the same partner using social sabotage. This finding might be due to the fact that shame naturally elicits hiding behaviors to avoid others discovering their "badness", and social sabotage behaviors naturally reveal the negative aspects of an individual or a relationship.

Implications for Couple Therapy

A couple coming into a therapist's office complaining of sexual problems or low sexual satisfaction is not an uncommon occurrence (Hertlein & Weeks, 2015). The findings of this study imply that both husbands and wives use of relationally aggressive behaviors could be significant contributing factors to the lowered sexual satisfaction. Carroll et. al. (2010) highlighted the pervasiveness of relational aggression in couples and marriages. Yet, because the concept is relatively new in marital literature, couple therapists are unlikely to assess this dynamic. Therapists need to ask about the presence of romantic relational aggression, both love withdrawal and social sabotage, and intervene to help couples open up conversations with each other rather than resorting to poisoning the well for the partner with others or just withdrawing. Bowen Systems Theory (Kerr, 2003) suggests that partners may be anxious about having direct discussions with each other and so they resort to drawing in third parties to reduce tension in the relationship. According to Bowen theory, the therapist must have a non-anxious presence and be able to help each partner approach relationship tensions more directly with the other, which, in turn, would likely reduce the use of social sabotage.

If one were to apply the techniques from Emotionally Focused Therapy (Johnson, 2009), a therapist could use enactments to have the partners express their fears and needs to each other in such a way that can help calm their fears and ask their partner to respond in such a way that helps them feel less shame and more secure in the relationship. It is in the expression of their fear, where they share their shame and their partner does not reject them for it, that shame is able to be reduced. Partners are able to share the thing that makes them feel unlovable, and they can experience a transformation in which their spouse loves them anyway. Rather than experiencing

their partner's rejection which they anticipate, they begin to believe that their partner can accept even the bad parts of them.

Feminist Family Therapy (Zimmerman & Besel, 2008) suggests that when clients hold rigid gender beliefs (e.g. all women gossip, men only care about the physical aspects of sex, etc.), couple therapists should challenge beliefs and suggest that reducing relationally aggressive tactics will result in more equality and openness. While sex therapy literature is beginning to recognize couple dynamics as part of the etiology in sexual problems (Hertlein, Weeks, and Gambescia, 2015), the findings of this study identify the specific dynamics of love withdrawal and social sabotage as prudent areas of intervention.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study has its limitations. The sample was limited to those living in metropolitan Seattle, Washington, USA. The findings may not generalize to couples in other parts of the U.S. or globally. The area surrounding Seattle, Washington, USA tends to have a higher cost of living when compared to other parts of the United States as well as other parts of the world. The annual income and education levels of husbands and wives in the sample are consistent with the demographic characteristics of the area, but that does not mean that the findings are generalizable to lower income or rural areas of the country. These findings might not also be generalizable to couples with lower levels of education. Asian and Latino couples were underrepresented and so caution is merited in applying the findings to those groups. Additionally, views on sexuality, sexual behaviors, sexual interaction, and relational aggression in marriage may vary in countries outside of the United States so caution should be exercised in generalizing the findings to those groups.

Finally, the couples used in these samples were heterosexual couples that had at least one child in the teenage years. Typically these couples had been married for over a decade and were middle-aged individuals. The maturity of their relationship might contribute to what they deem to be a sexual satisfying relationship, especially when compared to someone in their early twenties at the beginning of a new relationship. Further research should examine couples in different life stages of marriage to see if similar findings would hold true.

Conclusion

This study is first empirical study to directly measure the correlation between shame and sexual satisfaction in marriage relationships. Moreover, relational aggression, both love withdrawal and social sabotage, appear to be processes that partially mediate the relationship between shame and sexual satisfaction. These findings suggest clinical intervention when clients present in couple therapy with low sexual satisfaction.

References

- Agocha, V. B., Asencio, M., & Decena, C. U. (2014). Sexuality and culture. In D. L. Tolman, L. M. Diamond, J. A. Bauermeister, W. H. George, J. G. Pfaus, L. M. Ward (Eds.), *APA handbooks in psychology* (pp. 183-228). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/14194-006
- Archer, J., & Coyne, S. M. (2005). An integrated review of indirect, relational, and social aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9*(3), 212-230.
doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0903_2
- Bagner, D. M., Storch, E. A., & Preston, A. S. (2007). Romantic relational aggression: What about gender? *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(1), 19-24. doi:10.1007/s10896-006-9055-x
- Baldwin, K. M., Baldwin, J. R., & Ewald, T. (2006). The relationship among shame, guilt, and self-efficacy. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 60*(1), 1-21.
- Birnbaum, G. E., Mikulincer, M., Szepeswol, O., Shaver, P. R., & Mizrahi, M. (2014). When sex goes wrong: A behavioral systems perspective on individual differences in sexual attitudes, motives, feelings, and behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(5), 822-842. doi:10.1037/a0036021
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes, J. A. (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

- Brezsnyak, M., & Whisman, M. A. (2004). Sexual desire and relationship functioning: The effects of marital satisfaction and power. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 30*(3), 199-217. doi:10.1080/00926230490262393
- Brophy, M., & Kruger, G. (2013). Sex differences in the attribution of shame and guilt. *Journal of Psychology in Africa, 23*(2), 251-258.
- Brown, J. (2004). Shame and domestic violence: Treatment perspectives for perpetrators from self psychology and affect theory. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy, 19*(1), 39-56. doi:10.1080/14681990410001640826
- Busby, D. M., Carroll, J. S., & Willoughby, B. J. (2010). Compatibility or restraint? The effects of sexual timing on marriage relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology, 24*(6), 766-774. doi:10.1037/a0021690
- Busby, D. M., & Gardner, B. C. (2008). How do I analyze thee? Let me count the ways: Considering empathy in couple relationships using self and partner ratings. *Family Process, 47*(2), 229-242. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2008.00250.x
- Busby, D. M., & Holman, T. B. (1989). The influence of background variables and quality of the home environment on values: A path analysis. *Family Perspective, 23*, 203-213.
- Busby, D. M., Holman, T. B., & Taniguchi, N. (2001). RELATE: Relationship evaluation of the individual, family, cultural, and couple contexts. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 50*(4), 308-316. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2001.00308.x

- Butler, M. H., & Wampler, K. S. (1999). A meta-analytical update of research on the couple communication program. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 27(3), 223-237.
doi:10.1080/019261899261943
- Butzer, B., & Campbell, L. (2008). Adult attachment, sexual satisfaction, and relationship satisfaction: A study of married couples. *Personal Relationships*, 15(1), 141-154.
doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00189.x
- Carroll, J. S., Dean, L. R., Larson, L., & Busby, D. M. (2011). Materialism and marriage: Couple profiles of congruent and incongruent spouses. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 10, 287–308.
- Carroll, J. S., Nelson, D. A., Yorgason, J. B., Harper, J. M., Ashton, R. H., & Jensen, A. C. (2010). Relational aggression in marriage. *Aggressive Behavior*, 36(5), 315-329.
- Carroll, S. J., Hill, E. J., Yorgason, J. B., Larson, J. H., & Sandberg, J. G. (2013). Couple communication as a mediator between work–family conflict and marital satisfaction. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal*, 35(3), 530-545.
doi:10.1007/s10591-013-9237-7
- Chang, S. C. H., Klein, C., & Gorzalka, B. B. (2013). Perceived prevalence and definitions of sexual dysfunction as predictors of sexual function and satisfaction. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50(5), 502-512. doi:10.1080/00224499.2012.661488
- Coyne, S. M., Nelson, D. A., Graham-Kevan, N., Tew, E., Meng, K. N., & Olsen, J. A. (2011). Media depictions of physical and relational aggression: Connections with aggression in

young adults' romantic relationships. *Aggressive Behavior*, 37(1), 56-62.

doi:10.1002/ab.20372

Coyne, S. M., Stockdale, L., Busby, D., Iverson, B., & Grant, D. M. (2011). 'I luv u :)!': A descriptive study of the media use of individuals in romantic relationships. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 60(2), 150-162.

doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00639.x

Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66(3), 710-722. doi:10.2307/1131945

Crick, N. R., Werner, N. E., Casas, J. F., O'Brien, K. M., Nelson, D. A., Grotpeter, J. K., & Markon, K. (1999). Childhood aggression and gender: A new look at an old problem. In D. Bernstein (Ed.), *Gender and motivation* (pp. 75-141). Lincoln, NE, US: University of Nebraska Press.

Czub, T. (2013). Shame as a self-conscious emotion and its role in identity formation. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 44(3), 245-253. doi:10.2478/ppb-2013-0028

Davis, D., Shaver, P. R., Widaman, K. F., Vernon, M. L., Follette, W. C., & Beitz, K. (2006). 'I can't get no satisfaction': Insecure attachment, inhibited sexual communication, and sexual dissatisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 13(4), 465-483. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2006.00130.x

Elise, D. (2008). Sex and shame: The inhibition of female desires. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 56(1), 73-98. doi:10.1177/0003065108315685

- Epstein, N. B., & Falconier, M. K. (2011). Shame in couple therapy: Helping to heal the intimacy bond. In R. L. Dearing, J. P. Tangney, R. L. Dearing, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Shame in the therapy hour* (pp. 167-193). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/12326-007
- Gangestad, S.W., & Scheyd, G.J. (2005). The evolution of human physical attractiveness. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34, 523-548.
doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.33.070203.143733
- Goodman, G. (2005). Empirical evidence supporting the conceptual relatedness of object representations and internal working models. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 53, 597-617. doi.org/10.1177/00030651050530021101
- Gilbert, P. (2000). The relationship of shame, social anxiety and depression: The role of the evaluation of social rank. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 7(3), 174-189.
doi:10.1002/1099-0879
- Greeff, A. P., & Malherbe, H. L. (2001). Intimacy and marital satisfaction in spouses. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 27(3), 247-257. doi:10.1080/009262301750257100
- Greenberg, L. (2011). Is shame all there is? *Gestalt Review*, 15(3), 287-295.
- Greenberg, L. S., & Goldman, R. N. (2008). *Shame in couples therapy* (pp. 315-349). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/11750-011
- Hansen, A. B. (2005). *Expressions of pain and shame in the marital relationship and its correlation with individual subjective well-being*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Brigham Young University, UT.

- Harder, D. W. (1995). Shame and guilt assessment, and relationships of shame- and guilt-proneness to psychopathology. In J. P. Tangney, K. W. Fischer, J. P. Tangney, K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 368-392). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Harper, J.M. (2011). Regulating and coping with shame. In R. Trnka, K. Balcar, M. Kuska (Eds.) *Re-constructing emotional spaces* (pp. 189-206). Prague, CZ: Prague Univeristy Press
- Harper, J.M., Hughes, A. A., Bean, R.A. (in press). Husband and wife insecure attachment and sexual satisfaction with covert relational aggression as a mediator: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.
- Harper, J. M., & Hoopes, M. H. (1990). *Uncovering shame: An approach integrating individuals and their family systems*. New York, NY, US: W W Norton & Co.
- Henderson-King, D., & Veroff, J. (1994). Sexual satisfaction and marital well-being in the first years of marriage. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11(4), 509-534.
doi:10.1177/0265407594114002
- Hertlein, K. M., Weeks, G. R., & Gambescia, N. (2015). *System sex therapy*, 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Hertlein, K. M., Weeks, G. R., & Gambescia, N. (2009). In Hertlein K. M., Weeks G. R. and Gambescia N. (Eds.), *Systemic sex therapy*. New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

- Hertlein, K. M., Weeks, G. R., & Sendak, S. K. (2009). *A clinician's guide to systemic sex therapy*. New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Holman, T. B., Larson, J. H., & Harmer, S. L. (1994). The development and predictive validity of a new premarital assessment instrument: The PREPARation for marriage questionnaire. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 43(1), 46-52.
doi:10.2307/585141
- Jackson, J. B., Miller, R. B., Oka, M., & Henry, R. G. (2014). Gender differences in marital satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(1), 105-129.
- Jacobsen, J. (2013). Mormon women's experiences with same-sex sexuality. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com/dissertations/docview/1316612086/abstract/CEE3F39F09304D3DPQ/1?accountid=4488>
- Johnson, D. (2005). Two-wave panel analysis: Comparing statistical methods for studying the effects of transitions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(4), 1061-1075.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00194.x
- Johnson, S. (2009). Extravagant emotion: Understanding and transforming love relationships in emotionally focused therapy. In D. Fosha, D. J. Siegel, M. F. Solomon, D. Fosha, D. J. Siegel, & M. F. Solomon (Eds.), *The healing power of emotion: Affective neuroscience, development & clinical practice* (pp. 257-279). New York, NY, US: W W Norton & Co.
- Johnson, S. M., & Whiffen, V. E. (2003). *Attachment processes in couple and family therapy*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

- Karavasilis Karos, L. (2007). An attachment framework for the study of shame: Associations between security, parenting, temperament and shame-proneness in early childhood. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com/dissertations/docview/304983397/abstract/20CD7B3FB49F4C4APQ/1?accountid=4488>
- Karney, B. R. (2007). Not shifting but broadening marital research: Comments on Fincham, Stanley, and Beach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(2), 310-314. doi:10.1111/1741-3737.2007.00366.x
- Kasian, M., & Painter, S. L. (1992). Frequency and severity of psychological abuse in a dating population. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7(3), 350-364. doi:10.1177/088626092007003005
- Kaufman, G. (1996). *The psychology of shame: Theory and treatment of shame-based syndromes (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY, US: Springer Publishing Co.
- Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Kerr, M. (2003). Multigenerational family systems theory of bowen and its application. In G. P. Sholevar, & G. P. Sholevar (Eds.), *Textbook of family and couples therapy: Clinical applications* (pp. 103-126). Arlington, VA, US: American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc.
- Lee, R. G. (2008). *Couple shame cycles*. New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Lewis, H. B. (1971). Shame and guilt in neurosis. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 58(3), 419-438.

- Lewis, H. B. (1987). Shame--The "sleeper" in psychopathology. In Lewis H. B. (Ed.), *The role of shame in symptom formation* (pp. 1-28). Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Linder, J. R., Crick, N. R., & Collins, W. A. (2002). Relational aggression and victimization in young adults' romantic relationships: Associations with perceptions of parent, peer, and romantic relationship quality. *Social Development, 11*(1), 69-86. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00187
- Loving, T. J., Heffner, K. L., Kiecolt-Glaser, J., Glaser, R., & Malarkey, W. B. (2004). Stress hormone changes and marital conflict: Spouses' relative power makes a difference. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*(3), 595-612. doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00040.x
- Madsen, C. A. (2013). The impact of marital power on relational aggression. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com/dissertations/docview/1027144649/113351FACBF34EFBPQ/1?accountid=4488>
- Mark, K. P., & Herbenick, D. (2014). The influence of attraction to partner on heterosexual women's sexual and relationship satisfaction in long-term relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*(3), 563-570. doi:10.1007/s10508-013-0184-z
- Mark, K. P., & Murray, S. H. (2012). Gender differences in desire discrepancy as a predictor of sexual and relationship satisfaction in a college sample of heterosexual romantic relationships. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 38*(2), 198-215. doi:10.1080/0092623X.2011.606877

- McNulty, J. K., Wenner, C. A., & Fisher, T. D. (2014). Longitudinal associations among relationship satisfaction, sexual satisfaction, and frequency of sex in early marriage. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, Advance online publication. doi:10.1007/s10508-014-0444-6
- Metz, M. E., & McCarthy, B. W. (2010). *Enduring desire: Your guide to lifelong intimacy*. New York: Routledge.
- Mikulincer, M. (1995). Attachment style and the mental representation of the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(6), 1203-1215. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.69.6.1203
- Miller, A., & Ward, R. (1981). *Prisoners of childhood: The drama of the gifted child and the search for the true self*. New York, NY, US: Basic Books.
- Murphy, C. M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1989). Psychological aggression predicts physical aggression in early marriage. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57(5), 579-582. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.57.5.579
- Norton, R. (1983). Measuring marital quality: A critical look at the dependent variable. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45(1), 141-151. doi:10.2307/351302
- Poulton, J. L. (2013). *Object relations and relationality in couple therapy: Exploring the middle ground*. Lanham, MD, US: Jason Aronson
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Contemporary approaches to assessing mediation in communication research. In A. F. Hayes, M. D. Slater, L. B. Snyder, A. F. Hayes, M. D. Slater & L. B. Snyder (Eds.), *The Sage sourcebook of advanced data analysis methods for communication research* (pp. 13-54). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Quinn, W. H., & Davidson, B. (1986). Marital type and the marital relationship. *Marriage & Family Review, 10*(1), 117-137. doi:10.1300/J002v10n01_06
- Resneck-Sannes, H. (1991). Shame, sexuality, and vulnerability. *Women & Therapy, 11*(2), 111-125. doi:10.1300/J015V11N02_09
- Retzinger, S. M. (1995). Shame and anger in personal relationships. In S. Duck, J. T. Wood, S. Duck & J. T. Wood (Eds.), *Confronting relationship challenges* (pp. 22-42). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Russell, V. M., & McNulty, J. K. (2011). Frequent sex protects intimates from the negative implications of their neuroticism. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 2*(2), 220-227. doi:10.1177/1948550610387162
- Schaefer, M. T., & Olson, D. H. (1981). Assessing intimacy: The PAIR inventory. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 7*(1), 47-60. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.1981.tb01351.x
- Shadbolt, C. (2009). Sexuality and shame. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 39*(2), 163-172. doi:10.1177/036215370903900210
- Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2006). Attachment theory, individual psychodynamics, and relationship functioning. In A. L. Vangelisti, D. Perlman, A. L. Vangelisti, & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 251-271). New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press.

- Sprecher, S. (2002). Sexual satisfaction in premarital relationships: Associations with satisfaction, love, commitment, and stability. *Journal of Sex Research, 39*(3), 190-196. doi:10.1080/00224490209552141
- Sprecher, S., Christopher, F. S., & Cate, R. (2006). Sexuality in close relationships. In A. L. Vangelisti, D. Perlman, A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 463-482). New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press.
- Stockdale, L., Tackett, S., & Coyne, S. M. (2013). Sex differences in verbal aggression use in romantic relationships: A meta-analytic study and review. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 5*(3), 167-178. doi:10.1108/JACPR-09-2012-0003
- Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Timm, T. M., & Keiley, M. K. (2011). The effects of differentiation of self, adult attachment, and sexual communication on sexual and marital satisfaction: A path analysis. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 37*(3), 206-223. doi:10.1080/0092623X.2011.564513
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Foster, C. A. (2003). Parenthood and marital satisfaction: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*(3), 574-583. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00574.x
- Ubillos, S., Paez, D., & Gonzalez, J.L. (2000). Culture and sexual behavior. *Psicothema, 12*(Suppl), 70-82.

- Weeks, G. R., & Gambescia, N. (2015). Toward a new paradigm in sex therapy. In K. M. Hertlein, G. R. Weeks, & N. Gambescia (Eds.). *Systemic sex therapy* (pp. 32-52). New York: Routledge.
- Wells, G. B., & Hansen, N. D. (2003). Lesbian shame: Its relationship to identity integration and attachment. *Journal of Homosexuality, 45*(1), 93-110. doi:10.1300/J082v45n01_05
- Werner, N. E., & Crick, N. R. (1999). Relational aggression and social-psychological adjustment in a college sample. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 108*(4), 615-623. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.108.4.615
- Whisman, M. A., Beach, S. R. H., & Snyder, D. K. (2008). Is marital discord taxonic and can taxonic status be assessed reliably? Results from a national, representative sample of married couples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 76*(5), 745-755. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.76.5.745
- Yeh, H., Lorenz, F. O., Wickrama, K. A. S., Conger, R. D., & Elder, G. H. J. (2006). Relationships among sexual satisfaction, marital quality, and marital instability at midlife. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*(2), 339-343. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.20.2.339
- 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. doi:10.1080/0092623X.2012.751072
- Zimmerman, T. S., & Besel, A. (2008). Feminist family theory and therapy. In K. Jordan, & K. Jordan (Eds.), *The quick theory reference guide: A resource for expert and novice mental health professionals* (pp. 501-510). Hauppauge, NY, US: Nova Science Publishers.

Appendix

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Wife and Husband Shame Time 4 Predicting Wife and Husband Sexual Satisfaction T5 with Wife and Husband Love Withdrawal and Social Sabotage T5 as Potential Mediating Variables.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.Wife Shame T4	1.0									
2.Husband Shame T4	.09	1.0								
3.Wife Love Withdrawal T5	.16*	.19**	1.0							
4.Husband Love Withdrawal T5	.08	.16*	.29***	1.0						
5.Wife Social Sabotage T5	.13*	.22**	.54***	.35***	1.0					
6.Husband Social Sabotage T5	.25***	.07	.32***	.53***	.44***	1.0				
7.Wife Sexual Satisfaction T5	-.23**	-.10	-.18**	-.45***	-.22**	-.35***	1.0			
8.Husband Sexual Satisfaction T5	-.07	-.32***	-.43***	-.37***	-.41***	-.25***	.45***	1.0		
Control Variables										
9.Wife Love Withdrawal T4	.13*	.09	.69***	.32***	.34***	.48***	-.39***	-.36***	1.0	
10.Husband Love Withdrawal T4	.17**	.28***	.23**	.71***	.51***	.36***	-.20**	-.43***	.31***	1.0
11.Wife Social Sabotage T4	.23**	.15*	.45***	.45***	.43***	.68***	-.26***	-.27***	.60***	.46***
12.Husband Social Sabotage T4	.16*	.27***	.26***	.39***	.74***	.41***	-.19**	-.34***	.40***	.45***
13.Wife Marital Quality T4	-.18**	-.18**	-.31***	-.40***	-.38***	-.41***	.52***	.42***	-.47***	-.46***
14.Husband Marital Quality T4	-.19**	-.27***	-.33***	-.38***	-.48***	-.45***	.33***	.53***	-.43***	-.48***
15.Length of Relationship	.08	.02	-.02	-.05	-.12	-.05	.03	.01	-.00	-.04
16.# of Children	.11	.06	-.05	-.02	.05	-.08	-.01	.06	-.04	.03
17.Age of Wife	-.08	-.06	-.06	-.02	-.12	-.03	-.04	-.02	.10	-.11
18.Age of Husband	-.12	-.08	-.07	-.05	-.11	-.04	.03	.03	.08	-.10
19.Wife Education	-.13*	-.01	-.12	-.04	-.24***	-.07	.02	.03	-.04	-.11
20.Husband Education	.01	-.01	-.09	-.23**	-.24***	-.24**	.11	.07	-.14*	-.06
21.Household Income	-.06	-.15*	-.07	-.04	-.12	-.09	.06	.06	.00	-.07
Mean	1.79	1.71	2.74	2.38	1.50	1.39	3.67	3.50	2.74	2.37
Standard Deviation	.73	.63	1.17	1.26	.75	.81	.73	.60	1.25	1.27

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 1. Continued.


Variables	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1.Wife Shame T4											
2.Husband Shame T4											
3.Wife Love Withdrawal T5											
4.Husband Love Withdrawal T5											
5.Wife Social Sabotage T5											
6.Husband Social Sabotage T5											
7.Wife Sexual Satisfaction T5											
8.Husband Sexual Satisfaction T5											
Control Variables											
9.Wife Love Withdrawal T4											
10.Husband Love Withdrawal T4											
11.Wife Social Sabotage T4	1.0										
12.Husband Social Sabotage T4	.46***	1.0									
13.Wife Marital Quality T4	-.45***	-.36	1.0								
14.Husband Marital Quality T4	-.48***	-.46***	.62***	1.0							
15.Length of Relationship	-.05	-.09	-.01	.01	1.0						
16.# of Children	-.07	.09	.04	.05	-.01	1.0					
17.Age of Wife	.01	-.20**	-.07	-.04	.46***	.22*	1.0				
18.Age of Husband	-.01	-.11	-.04	-.01	.37***	.16*	.75***	1.0			
19.Wife Education	-.12	-.21**	.01	.02	.13*	.12	.30***	.24**	1.0		
20.Husband Education	-.16*	-.20**	.06	.06	.19**	.03	.25***	.26***	.42***	1.0	
21.Household Income	-.10	-.08	.05	.09	.13*	-.03	.21**	.15*	.28***	.33***	1.0
Mean	1.54	1.38	5.22	5.35	23.37	2.45	46.36	48.24	N/A	N/A	N/A
Standard Deviation	.86	.74	1.14	1.01	5.76	1.04	5.43	5.89	N/A	N/A	N/A


* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Figure 1. Measurement and Conceptual Model with Wife and Husband Shame Predicting Wife and Husband Sexual Satisfaction one Year Later with Wife and Husband Love Withdrawal and Social Sabotage as Potential Mediators.

Figure 2. Structural Equation Model Results with Wife and Husband Shame Predicting Wife and Husband Sexual Satisfaction one Year Later with Wife and Husband Love Withdrawal as Mediators.


Figure 3. Structural Equation Model Results with Wife and Husband Shame Predicting Wife and Husband Sexual Satisfaction one Year Later with Wife and Husband Social Sabotage as Mediators.





* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Note: Observed indicators with their error terms have not been included in the figure for the sake of simplicity



* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Note: Observed indicators and their error terms have not been included in the figure for the sake of simplicity.