



**From the SelectedWorks of Jayne Marie
Comstock**

January 1991

Interpersonal Deception: I. Deceivers' Reactions to Receivers' Suspicions and Probing.

Contact
Author

Start Your Own
SelectedWorks

Notify Me
of New Work

Available at: http://works.bepress.com/jamie_comstock/12

Final definitive version available at <http://www.beaweb.org/>

Interpersonal Interaction on Television: Family Conflict and Jealousy on Primetime

Jamie Comstock and Krystyna Strzyzewski

Researchers concerned with the influence of television content on the perceptions and ensuing interpersonal interaction patterns of television viewers seem to be vigilantly devoted to determining the magnitude and direction of television influence. More specifically, questions revolve around two major themes: (1) When and to what degree will television viewing serve as a source of influence? and (2) Will the television impact primarily be prosocial or antisocial? With these two issues in mind, we argue that television has the potential to influence interaction in close personal relationships. Additionally, we provide evidence indicating that, contrary to popular opinion, the quality of the television message may be predominantly prosocial.

Television as a Source of Influence

Direct experience, indirect experience, and observation of symbolic behavior constitute the three major influences on interpersonal behavior (Weaver & Wakshlag, 1986). As would be expected, Roloff and Greenberg (1980) found that television was a relatively weak source of influence on behavior. Weaver and Wakshlag (1986), however, suggested that when direct experience is lacking or ambiguous, social perceptions are formed and reinforced by lower-order influences such as television messages. Even though direct experience may be an individual's primary source of information about relational interaction, such information is supplemented by observing interactions on television (e.g., Dail & Way, 1985; Cerbner, Cross, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1980, 1986; Greenberg, Hines, Buerkel-Rothfuss, & Atkin, 1980).

Viewers may make use of information garnered through viewing entertainment television, particularly when the situations they experience are similar to those enacted by the television characters (Dail & Way, 1985; Doob & Macdonald, 1979; Cerbner et al., 1986; LoSciuto, 1972). In such cases, the behavior of the television characters may serve as "advice" and increase the viewers' repertoire of behaviors. Moreover, as Meyrowitz (1985) aptly explains, television exposes people to many "backstage" behaviors which they would not otherwise observe. Portrayal of this backstage behavior provides opportunities for viewers to learn about the possible private emotions and motivations of role occupants. This depiction provides a unique opportunity to increase understanding of others' perspectives and the ability to predict how others may behave in similar real-life situations. As such, observation of backstage behavior has a high potential for impact on interpersonal interaction.

Both social learning theory (Bandura, 1971) and cultivation theory (e.g.,

Cerbner et al., 1980,1986) support the premise that observation of interaction among television characters has the potential to influence viewers' stereotypes, role learning, aggression, and worldviews. Not surprisingly, there is considerable concern about the quality of the television portrayal of appropriate and effective behavior during interpersonal interaction (e.g., Abelman, 1986; Comstock & Haefner, 1989; Dail & Way, 1985; Cerbner et al., 1980, 1986; Cunter & Svennevig, 1987; Haefner & Comstock, 1988; Skill, Robinson, & Wallace, 1987).

Quality of the Television Message

Some research, especially studies of violence and aggression, indicates that television messages are primarily antisocial (e.g., Cerbner et al., 1980, 1986). Moreover, Potter and Ware (1987) reported that characters commit a great deal of antisocial behavior, and this behavior is portrayed as justified and rewarding. It has been suggested that the effects of these antisocial behaviors are minimal because viewers rarely are involved in situations similar to most antisocial scenarios on television (i.e., espionage, conspiracy, blackmail). The findings, however, are particularly alarming when considering Meyrowitz' (1985) argument that viewers "identify with those television characters who are successful and rewarded rather than those who are simply labeled similarly to them" (p. 214). Further, when the rewarding antisocial acts involve common experiences (i.e., family conflict or the experience of jealousy) the potential for identification is magnified (Cerbneretal., 1986).

Although many researchers assume that television messages do not vary across genre (Cerbner et al., 1980,1986; Hirsch, 1982), there is evidence to suggest otherwise. For example, Hawkins and Pingree (1981) report that action/adventures include more violence than situation comedies. Interestingly, Creenberg, Atkin, Edison, & Korzenny (1977) report differences in interpersonal interaction across genre. When studying conflict resolution behaviors, they found that situation comedies include many instances of verbally aggressive behavior which, although less extreme than the violent acts on action/adventure programs, are still considered antisocial. Situation comedies also included numerous forms of prosocial behavior, including self-disclosure, altruism, and expression of feelings. Unlike action/adventures and situation comedies, characters in family dramas primarily use prosocial behaviors to resolve conflict (Creenberg et al., 1977). Because there are many prosocial messages on television dramas, the reception of these messages may not be impeded by the presence of antisocial behaviors. Situation comedies and family dramas may have greater potential to affect viewers because the plotlines often reflect more common relational experiences.

The literature suggests that the quality of the interpersonal interaction portrayed on television may vary across program type. The purpose of this

project, therefore, is to systematically investigate the interpersonal interaction present in television programs. By simultaneously searching for the prosocial and antisocial messages, this analysis assesses the overall quality of interpersonal interaction depicted by television characters across genre. Specifically, this project focuses on two commonly experienced interpersonal predicaments: family conflict and the experience and expression of jealousy.

Conflict in Interpersonal Relationships

Conflict, an inevitable and necessary element in the development of family relationships (Straus, 1974), occurs among family members as a result of incompatible goals or violations of relational expectations. Numerous research efforts reveal that conflict affects relational satisfaction and distinguishes distressed families from non-distressed families (Galvin & Brommel, 1986; Kelley, 1987; Peterson, 1983; Sillars & Weisberg, 1987). It is not the potential for conflict or even the presence of conflict that characterizes family relationships as distressed. Rather, how family members interact during conflictual situations determines the quality of their relationship (Calvin & Brommel, 1986; Montemayor, 1986).

The style of conflictual interaction adopted by a family also affects the self-esteem of all family members. Gegas and Schwalbe (1986) reported that parental support, interest, participation, and respect (autonomy granting) were positively related to the self-esteem of their children. Demo, Small, and Savin-Williams (1987) reported similar findings for the effect of parental interaction on child's self-esteem as well as effects of child's interaction style on parent's self-esteem. Montemayor (1986) suggests that, in general, parents who adopt a flexible style of conflict management, which encourages independence yet demonstrates interest in the child, have children with high levels of self-esteem, moral development, autonomy, school success, and an absence of behavioral problems. However, parents' use of extreme styles — either too authoritarian or too permissive — leads to a broad spectrum of behavioral problems and family strife. Clearly, the manner in which families interact during conflict can affect how family members feel about themselves and their relationships with other family members. For this reason, all sources that may influence the use of conflict strategies within the family merit attention, including television.

Conflict Strategies

Galvin and Brommel (1986) described three types of family conflict that reflect distinct conflict outcomes. These outcomes can be linked to the use of different conflict strategies. First, constructive outcomes, those which facilitate relational growth and development, require the use of integrative strategies. Integrative strategies produce constructive outcomes because they illustrate cooperation and a willingness to disclose (Sillars, Coletti,

Parry, & Rogers, 1982). Often labeled prosocial, integrative strategies promote relational growth and maintenance (Roloff, 1976) and a neutral or positive climate (Sillars, 1980). Integrative strategies include: emphasizing commonalities, accepting responsibility, initiating problem solving, showing empathy or support, and soliciting and disclosing information relevant to the conflict (Sillars et al., 1982).

Second, destructive outcomes result from a power struggle and negatively affect the quality of the family relationship. This type of conflict involves the use of distributive strategies. Distributive strategies are destructive in that they "entail competition and reflect the primacy of personal over relational goals" (Canary & Cupach, 1988, p. 306). These strategies, which are considered antisocial (Roloff, 1976), involve blaming, negative evaluations of one's partner, and attempts to induce unilateral behavioral change from the partner (Sillars, 1980). Examples of distributive strategies include: hostile questioning, hostile joking, avoiding responsibility for the conflict, making prescriptions for the other's behavior, and personal rejection (Sillars et al., 1982).

Third, unresolved conflict usually results in psychological and/or physical estrangement. When issues are unresolvable or unimportant, it may be prudent for family members to avoid discussing them. Most conflict that is avoided, however, leaves nagging tensions unresolved, creates a climate ripe for future destructive conflict, and fosters separation among family members (Calvin & Brommel, 1986). The strategies associated with unresolved conflict are avoidance strategies. Avoidance strategies are attempts to minimize communication about the conflict by ignoring the conflict completely or by addressing the conflictual issue indirectly or ambiguously. When avoidance strategies are employed to avoid unresolvable or unimportant conflict, they could be considered prosocial. In most cases, however, avoidance strategies are considered antisocial. Examples of avoidance strategies include: pretending to be hurt by the other person, postponing the issue, shifting the topic, denying that the conflict is present, and focusing on the meaning or appropriateness of words used by the other person (Sillars et al., 1982).

Use of strategies. Due to the confounding nature of affect, the rules associated with role definitions, and the power structure inherent to family relationships, children will defer to their parents in conflict. Vuchinich (1984) suggested that when parents (especially fathers) use oppositional moves which challenge the children's self-image (distributive strategies), children are unlikely to respond with similar oppositional moves. Recent research involving older adolescents, however, suggests that as children grow older and more independent, the generational distinctions dissipates (Comstock & Buller, 1990). In contrast, when children (especially boys) interact with other children, they are likely to respond with distributive strategies. When parents respond to children, however, they are likely to

employ less direct oppositional moves such as integrative or avoidance strategies (Vuchinich, 1984). In marital relationships, all spouses are likely to reciprocate integrative strategies; however, reciprocating distributive strategies is a sign of marital distress (Pike & Sillars, 1985).

Conflict on Television

Previous research on conflictual interaction between television characters indicates that, although conflict on television occurred within all family relationships, it occurred most frequently between marital pairs or sibling relationships involving a brother (Greenberg, Beurkel-Rothfuss, Neuendorf, & Atkin, 1980). Greenberg et al. classified interaction according to one of three modes: (1) going toward someone; (2) going against someone; and, (3) going away from someone, which are akin to the integrative, distributive, and avoidance strategies mentioned above. They found that parents and spouses are likely to be supportive when interacting with each other and the children; but, they did not make specific observations regarding the use of these modes during conflictual interaction. This project was designed to make such observations and evaluate the nature of the conflictual interaction presented on primetime television.

Jealousy in Interpersonal Relationships

Jealousy occurs as "the result of a partner's extradyadic relationship that is real, imagined, or considered likely to occur" (Bringle & Buunk, 1985, p. 242). Jealousy is a blend of feelings that, depending on the situation, may include feeling hurt, aroused, excited, or angry (Duck, 1986). The underlying theme, however, is the perceived loss of influence over another person.

Envy and rivalry are similar psychological processes which should be distinguished from jealousy. Envy involves the desire to obtain something that someone else possesses, and rivalry is a competition for something that neither one possesses; jealousy involves a threat to an *existing* relationship. All three are motivational processes, which stimulate efforts to obtain goals (Brehm, 1985, p. 261). Ostensibly, expressing these emotions may lead to relational conflict, maintenance, or even enhancement.

Various factors shape the emotional experience that occurs during these predicaments. In jealousy, threats to the existing relationship may emerge from (1) friendly involvements, and (2) exclusion due to the partner's time away, work, or hobby. In envy, the object of one's desire (goal) may be a relationship, position/status, material possession, or another's personal characteristics, skills, or abilities. In rivalry, two individuals may be vying for a person, material possession, or position.

Regardless of the emotional stimulus, jealousy, envy, and rivalry potentially affect individuals and their interpersonal relationships. Constantine

(1977) found that the experience of such emotions can lead to: (1) loss of face, status, or ego-enhancement; (2) loss of need gratification; (3) loss of control over partner, one's life, or power in the relationship; (4) loss of faith in the predictability or dependability of the partner's behavior; (5) loss of privacy, territory, or exclusive access; and (6) loss of actual time with the partner. As with conflict, however, it is *how the* jealousy, envy, and rivalry are enacted that determines whether they will have a facilitative or debilitating affect on the individuals and relationships involved. By learning and following social norms for the appropriate expression of jealousy, envy, and rivalry, people may be able to minimize the aversive impact of these situations on their relationships.

Clanton and Smith (1977) reported that social norms for dealing with jealousy, envy, and rivalry vary according to gender. Specifically, they found that men were more likely to: (1) deny feelings; (2) express jealousy through rage and violence; (3) focus on the sexual activity of the partner; and (4) become competitive toward the third party. Women, on the other hand, were more likely to: (1) acknowledge jealous feelings; (2) focus on the emotional involvement of the partner; (3) internalize the cause of jealousy; and (4) cling to the partner (Clanton & Smith, 1977). Unfortunately, Clanton and Smith did not report how these modes of expression affected the relationship.

Although Strzyzewski and Comstock (1990) found considerable similarity between the way men and women experience and express jealousy, they reported that males were more likely to simply accept the threatening behavior from a male friend, while females experiencing jealousy over a male friend were more likely to discuss the situation with that friend. Nonetheless, they found that both males and females were likely to engage in one of four responses: (1) rational discussion; (2) increased independence; (3) ventilate feelings to someone other than partner; and, (4) acceptance. The subtle gender differences reported by Strzyzewski and Comstock may be indicative of changing sex-role expectations. Instead of sex-typed behavior, they found that norms for acceptable expression of jealousy vary across relationship type. Strzyzewski and Comstock (1990) reported that, even though friends and romantic partners experienced similar levels of jealousy at the same degree of intensity, social norms rendered the expression of jealousy more appropriate for romantic partners than friends. It seems that social norms associated with relational types and changing sex-role expectations may mediate the evaluations and attributions made of persons' emotional behavior, and hence, moderate relational outcomes during jealousy, envy, or rivalry predicaments.

Since entertainment television influences the establishment of such social norms, the latent messages laced within televised portrayals of these emotions warrants investigation. This project represents an initial attempt to explore and evaluate the emotional and behavioral responses to jealousy,

envy, and rivalry on primetime television.

Method

Data Set

During 2 consecutive weeks in the 1987-88 programming season, 23 primetime major network entertainment programs known to have family and close personal relationships as primary plot elements were videotaped and constitute the data set for this analysis. Because of network program schedule changes, only one episode was obtained for five of the programs. A total of 17 one-hour episodes and 24 half-hour episodes were obtained, yielding 41 programs or 29 total hours of televised interaction. Programs were classified by genre as either drama ($n = 4$), situation comedy ($n = 16$) or nighttime soap ($n = 4$). This data set represented 100% of the available major network programs of interest and constituted 23% of the total major network primetime programming during this 2-week period.

Units of Analysis

The use of conflict strategies, and the experience and expression of jealousy, envy, and rivalry were coded separately. The coding unit was any complete or incomplete verbalization or nonverbal expression which met the operational definitions of conflict, jealousy, envy, or rivalry and was initiated by any of the primary program characters. Coding units were classified as conflict strategies if they expressed the recognition of incompatible personal goals or violations of relational expectations. Coders were instructed to consider the first conflict strategy used in a scene as the initiation of a conflict situation and the last conflict strategy used in the same scene as the end of the conflict situation. Each conflict situation was coded for: (1) character initiating the conflict; (2) character responding to the conflict; (3) relationship between the characters; (4) number of strategies used by both characters; and (5) type of strategies used by both characters. Sillars et al.'s (1982) typology of conflict strategies was employed to identify the types of conflict strategies used by the characters.

Coding units were classified as: (1) jealousy, if they expressed the tension related to a perceived threat to an existing relationship; (2) envy, if they expressed the desire to obtain something that someone else possessed; and (3) rivalry, if two characters expressed the desire to obtain something that neither one possessed. Each jealousy situation was coded for: (1) character experiencing the jealousy; (2) the relational partner; (3) the nature of the threat to the relationship; (4) the emotions expressed by the jealous character; (5) the behavioral responses of the jealous character; and (6) the overall effect that jealousy had on the relationship. Each envy and rivalry situation was coded for: (1) characters involved in the situation; (2) the nature of the goal; (3) the emotions expressed by the envious or rivalrous characters; (4)

the behavioral responses of the envious or rivalrous characters; and (5) the overall effect that envy or rivalry had on the relationship. The typology of emotional experience and types of behavioral responses used in this analysis were derived from previous research (Strzyzewski, 1987).

Coder Training

A group of 36 undergraduate students served as coders for this project. The students were randomly assigned to one of six groups. Three groups coded conflict on ABC, CBS, or NBC. Three other groups coded jealousy, envy, and rivalry on the networks.

Coders were trained to apply the respective coding schemes using examples from primetime programming. Conflict coders were trained to recognize conflict strategies using examples from *Kate & Allie*. Jealousy, envy, and rivalry coders were trained using examples from *Knots Landing*. Coders viewed one episode of the programs and obtained intersubjective agreement for the elements in the coding schemes. The episodes were divided equally within the group and coded independently. In order to obtain reliability ratings, 20% of the programs were coded twice by separate coders. Intercoder reliability [agreements/(agreements + disagreements)] was .94 for number of conflict situations, .91 for type of conflict strategy used, and .83 for number of jealousy, envy, and rivalry situations. Coders were in complete agreement concerning the effect of jealousy, envy, and rivalry on the relationships involved.

Results

Conflict

Total sample. Primary characters were involved in a total of 255 conflict situations across 41 episodes of primetime television. The average number of conflict situations per hour of programming was 8.79. The majority of the instances of conflict occurred in situation comedies (141, 55.3%), rather than either nighttime soaps (65, 25.5%) or dramas (49, 19.2%), $\chi^2(2, N = 255) = 56.83, p < .05$. The average number of conflict situations per hour of programming in situation comedies was 11.75; nighttime soaps averaged 8.12 per hour; and family dramas averaged 5.44 per hour. A total of 833 conflict strategies were used by characters in these programs. Nearly half (388, 46.6%) were distributive strategies, 32.5% (271) were integrative strategies, and 20.9% (174) were avoidance strategies. Although genre differences for frequency of conflict situations were apparent, there were no significant differences in the type of strategies used across genre.

Length of conflictual interaction. Overall, 41% of the conflict situations involved more than one turn at talk per character. Conflictual interactions on nighttime soaps lasted longer than conflictual interactions on situation

comedies or family dramas, $\chi^2(6, N = 255) = 38.1, p < .05$. Of the 65 conflictual interactions on soaps, 64.0% lasted longer than one turn per character; of the 49 interactions on family drama, 37.0% lasted longer than one turn; of the 141 interactions on situation comedies, 24.0% lasted longer than one turn.

Overall, females were involved in more conflictual situations than males (272 females, 223 males). A nearly equal number of females and males took more than one turn during conflictual interaction on family dramas and nighttime soaps. However, on situation comedies, 39.0% of females took more than one turn, while only 14.0% of males took more than one turn.

Family role. The most frequently occurring televised conflict involved the parent-child role relationship. Thirty percent (30.0%) of the conflict situations involved parents and children, 19.0% involved husbands and wives, and 13.0% involved siblings. Of this 13.0%, half involved the brothersister relationship, 40.0% involved brother-to-brother interaction, and 10.0% involved sister-to-sister interaction. Stepfamily relationships accounted for only 7.0% of all conflictual interactions. Interaction with an ex-spouse accounted for 2.0%. The remaining 29.0% involved various other relationships such as grandparents, peers, and others.

Use of strategies by role. Moms initiating conflict with their children commonly used integrative strategies (45%), while dads most often used distributive strategies (50.0%). When responding to their parents, sons most often responded to both parents with integrative strategies (46.1% with moms and 50.0% with dads), while daughters most often responded to mothers with avoidance strategies (55.5%) and to fathers with distributive strategies (66.7%). Constructive integrative strategies were the least likely to be used by daughters responding to moms (16.7%) or dads (16.6%) (see Table 1).

The majority of the time when initiating conflict, both brothers and sisters employed distributive strategies (84.3% and 84.6%, respectively). When responding to their male siblings, however, brothers most often used avoidance strategies (76.9%), and used integrative strategies most often (50.0%) when responding to female siblings. Sisters, on the other hand, most often used distributive strategies with brothers (50.0%) and sisters (66.7%). Interestingly, sisters never used avoidance strategies with each other (see Table 1).

When wives initiated conflict with their husbands, they used distributive strategies 50.0% of the time. Husbands responded to their wives most often with avoidance strategies (50.0%), followed by distributive (27.3%) and integrative strategies (22.3%). Husbands also most often employed distributive strategies when initiating conflict (48.0%). Wives responded to their

Table 1
Strategies Used By Initiators and Responders in Conflict Situations

Initiator	Strategy	Responder						
		Mom	Dad	Son	Daughter	Brother	Sister	Spouse
Mom (32)	45.1 integrative			46.1	16.7			
	22.6 distributive			38.5	27.8			
	32.3 avoidance			15.4	55.5			
Dad (13)	33.3 integrative			50.0	16.6			
	50.0 distributive			16.7	66.7			
	16.7 avoidance			33.3	16.7			
Son (14)	57.2 integrative	40.0	33.3					
	21.4 distributive	60.0	66.7					
	21.4 avoidance	00.0	00.0					
Daughter (17)	33.3 integrative	00.0	50.0					
	40.0 distributive	83.3	20.0					
	26.7 avoidance	16.7	30.0					
Brother (19)	05.2 integrative					15.4	16.7	
	84.3 distributive					07.7	50.0	
	10.5 avoidance					76.9	33.3	
Sister (16)	07.7 integrative					50.0	33.3	
	84.6 distributive					40.0	66.7	
	07.7 avoidance					10.0	00.0	
Husband (25)	24.0 integrative							48.0
	48.0 distributive							40.0
	28.0 avoidance							12.0
Wife (23)	22.7 integrative							22.3
	50.0 distributive							27.3
	27.3 avoidance							50.0

Note. Numbers in parentheses are frequencies. All other numbers are percentages. All figures are based on first strategy used by both the initiator and responder in the conflict situations.

husbands most often with integrative strategies (48.0%), followed by distributive strategies (40.0%) and avoidance strategies (12.0%) (see Table 1).

Jealousy

Total sample. Situations involving jealousy, envy, or rivalry were less frequent than conflict yet still common during the 29 hours of programming coded. A total of 88 instances of these predicaments were depicted, including: 43 instances of jealousy (48.9%), 25 instances of envy (28.4%), and 20 instances of rivalry (22.7%). As with conflict, the frequency of these situations varied across genre. They were most common on nighttime soaps (38, 43.2%), followed by situation comedies (34, 38.6%) and dramas (16,

18.2%), $\chi^2(1, N = 88) = Q.77, p < .05$. The average number of instances per hour on situation comedies was 2.8; dramas depicted 1.7 per hour; and, nighttime soaps contained 4.2 per hour.

The overall effect of the emotional predicament on the characters' relationships was more often helpful or "facilitative" (48, 54.5%) rather than harmful or "debilitative" (38, 43.2%). The effect of these predicaments, however, varied depending on the type of situation involved.

Jealousy and envy often led to facilitative outcomes, whereas rivalry was typically depicted as debilitative and harmful to the relationship, $\chi^2(2, N = 86) = 5.81, p < .05$. Interestingly, the effect of these predicaments on the relationships of the characters was not significantly different across genre. Likewise, the cause (threat or goal) of the predicament did not differ significantly across program type.

Gender and relationship. Females were predominant as both the initiator or primary character expressing the emotion (52, 59.2%) and the relational partner involved (47, 54.7%). Males, on the other hand, represented 39.8% (35) of initiators and 45.3% (39) of partners. The nature of the relationship between characters was most often romantic (20, 22.7%), followed by same-sex friends (17, 19.3%), parent-child (17, 19.3%), acquaintance (13, 14.8%), and others (21, 23.9%).

Causes and response to the predicaments. The threat to the relationship in instances of jealousy was most often a romantic involvement (17, 39.5%) followed by situation (10, 23.3%), same-sex friendly involvement (9, 20.9%), and opposite-sex friendly involvement (7, 16.3%). In envy and rivalry situations, the goal was more likely to be a relationship (15, 33.3%), or a person (12, 26.7%), followed by a social, political, or work-related position (10, 22.2%), other's skills (4, 8.9%), and other's position (4, 8.9%). When controlling for the partner's gender and type of emotion experienced, chi-square analysis revealed a significant difference between the initiator's gender and the reason for emotion in jealousy situations. For male-male dyads, a same-sex friendly involvement was the most common threat (5, 62.5%), followed by romantic involvement (2, 25%), and opposite-sex friendly involvement (1, 12.5%). In contrast, for female-male dyads, the most common reasons for jealousy were romantic involvement (6, 40.0%) and situational threat (6, 40.0%), followed by opposite-sex friendly involvement (3, 20.0%), $\chi^2(6, N = 88) = 13.8, p < .05$. No other emotion by gender differences were found in this analysis.

Most of these aversive predicaments involved at least two sequential emotional responses (71, 80.0%). The first response was typically hurt (25, 28.6%) or shocked/surprised (15, 17.0%). Secondary responses were most often betrayed (12, 13.6%) or envious (10, 11.4%). Sixty-five percent of characters also displayed a third emotional response which, unlike the preceding self-directed emotions, revolves around the relationship. These

responses included feeling excluded (12,13.6%), possessive (9,10.2%), and competitive (see Table 2 for a complete array of these responses).

The first behavior displayed by the character experiencing the emotion was most often sarcasm (10, 11.4%), followed by rational discussion (9, 10.2%), and ventilate feelings (9, 10.2%). Secondary behavioral displays followed a similar pattern: sarcasm (13, 14.8%), ventilate feelings (9, 10.2%), and rational discussion (7, 8.0%). Although third behavioral displays varied considerably, the most common third responses were accep-

Table 2
Emotional Responses to Jealousy, Envy, and Rivalry

Emotional Response	Character and Emotional Response Sequence					
	Initiator			Partner		
	First	Second	Third	First	Second	Third
Hurt	28.6%	00.0%	01.1%	04.5%	00.0%	01.1%
Shocked	17.0	06.8	03.5	01.1	01.1	01.1
Betrayed	11.4	13.6	01.1	03.4	00.0	01.1
Angry	06.8	08.0	07.0	06.8	05.7	00.0
Happy	06.8	01.1	00.0	06.8	00.0	00.0
Competitive	06.8	04.5	10.2	01.1	05.7	06.8
Jealous	05.7	05.7	02.3	01.1	00.0	00.0
Depressed	03.4	08.0	00.0	01.1	02.3	00.0
Envious	03.4	11.4	03.4	04.5	02.3	00.0
Possessive	02.3	02.3	10.2	04.5	01.1	01.1
Guilty	02.3	01.1	01.1	03.4	01.1	00.0
Afraid	01.1	01.1	02.3	00.0	01.1	01.1
Empathetic	01.1	03.4	01.1	00.0	04.5	00.0
Inadequate	01.1	04.5	09.1	00.0	00.0	01.1
Excluded	01.1	04.5	13.6	00.0	00.0	01.1
Ashamed	01.1	03.4	00.0	00.0	01.1	01.1
No response	00.0	20.6	34.0	61.7	74.0	84.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

tance (6, 6.8%) and seek information (6, 6.8%) (see Table 3). It should be noted that 93.2% of all jealous, envy, and rivalry emotions were experienced and expressed. In fact, 83.0% involved two sequential behavioral responses to the emotion and 69.8% involved three sequential behavioral responses.

The witness for the responses was most frequently the opposite character or partner (56, 63.6%) rather than an uninvolved third party (21, 23.9%) or

Table 3
Behavioral Responses to Jealousy, Envy, and Rivalry

Behavioral Response	Character and Behavioral Response Sequence					
	Initiator			Partner		
	First	Second	Third	First	Second	Third
Sarcasm	11.4%	14.8%	04.5%	05.7%	02.3%	00.0%
Ventilate	10.2	10.2	03.4	01.1	03.4	03.4
Discussion	10.2	08.0	04.5	02.3	00.0	01.1
Acceptance	06.8	04.5	06.8	03.4	00.0	01.1
Seek info	06.8	03.4	06.8	00.0	02.3	01.1
Confront threat	06.8	04.5	03.4	02.3	03.4	02.3
Deny to other	04.5	00.0	00.0	00.0	01.1	01.1
Joking	03.4	06.8	03.4	02.3	02.3	00.0
Avoid issue	03.4	01.1	02.3	03.4	02.3	00.0
Deny to self	03.4	02.3	03.4	02.3	00.0	00.0
Badmouth threat	03.4	06.8	02.3	02.3	01.1	02.3
Drink	03.4	03.4	04.5	00.0	01.1	00.0
Avoid other	02.3	01.1	01.1	00.0	01.1	01.1
Independence	02.3	02.3	03.4	00.0	03.4	00.0
Make self appealing	02.3	01.1	03.4	00.0	01.1	01.1
End relationship	01.1	02.3	03.4	00.0	00.0	00.0
Make other jealous	01.1	00.0	01.1	00.0	00.0	00.0
Other	10.4	10.4	01.1	06.8	00.0	02.3
No expression	06.8	17.0	41.2	68.1	72.7	80.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

no one at all (11, 12.5%). The character involved in the instances of emotion was most likely to first respond as being either angry (6, 6.8%) or, interestingly, happy (6, 6.8%). The most common secondary responses involved anger (5, 5.7%) or competitiveness (5, 5.7%). The third response was primarily competitive (6, 6.8%) (see Table 4). Partners often displayed no overt behavioral response to the initiators' expression of jealousy, envy, or rivalry (see Table 3).

Discussion

The results of this content analysis suggest that family conflict and the expression of jealousy are quite common on primetime television. The overall portrayal of these predicaments, however, is not predominantly antisocial. So, if television advises viewers or increases their repertoire of behaviors, the cultivation effects could be prosocial. Although the number of these interpersonal predicaments varies across genre, there is no significant difference in the way they are depicted. The television message regarding interpersonal predicaments, therefore, is generally consistent across program type.

An analysis of the portrayal of conflict on primetime television reveals significant differences in the number of conflictual interactions and the length of these interactions across genre. Specifically, conflict is most prevalent on situation comedies and least prevalent on family dramas.

Conflict on situation comedies, however, is very brief, rarely lasting more than one turn per character. In contrast, most conflict portrayed on nighttime soaps involves several turns per character. Perhaps the limited number of turns on situation comedies is due to the time constraints of half-hour segments or to the comedic value of a "one-liner." Nonetheless, types of conflict strategies used did not significantly vary across genre. So, these findings do not support the common assumption that situation comedies present a more prosocial picture of family interaction than nighttime soaps or family dramas.

Interesting gender and role relationship differences were present in the data. Generally, female characters in all program types engaged in more conflict than male characters. On situation comedies, females were involved in more conflictual situations, and those conflicts lasted longer than conflicts involving males. Additionally, conflicts initiated by wives were most often portrayed as antisocial. Wives initiated the conflict using distributive strategies, and husbands responded with avoidance or distributive strategies which represent the pattern of behavior common to distressed, real-life couples (Pike & Sillars, 1985). On the other hand, conflict initiated by husbands is portrayed in a more prosocial manner. When initiating conflict with their wives, husbands used distributive strategies; yet, their wives responded with integrative strategies which show support and deescalate the conflict, resulting in constructive outcomes.

Taken in conjunction, these results actually reflect patterns of conflictual interaction consistent with sex-role stereotypes. Wives kindly attended to their husbands' concerns even though husbands generally raise these concerns in a distributive manner. Husbands, on the other hand, often assert their "authority" or simply avoid discussion of relational concerns initiated by wives. Since they are generally sheltered from marital conflict in real life, children and others with no direct experience of marriage may be especially vulnerable to cultivation effects of viewing this "backstage" marital conflict behavior (Weaver & Wakshlag, 1986). If so, the patterns associated with distressed couples and sex-role stereotypes may be perpetuated.

Stereotypical gender differences also were prevalent in parent-child interaction. Mothers initiated conflict in a prosocial manner and responded to their sons in a prosocial manner as well. Mothers' responses to their daughters, however, involved an overwhelming majority of competitive moves. Fathers, on the other hand, initiated conflict using distributive strategies indicative of the authority traditionally associated with the father role. Interestingly, fathers responded to their sons with distributive moves but used more supportive, integrative strategies when responding to their daughters. These findings are reflective of real-life familial interaction patterns (Youniss & Smollar, 1985).

Brothers and sisters both used an overwhelming majority of antisocial,

distributive strategies. Sisters frequently use distributive strategies in conflict with one another, whereas brothers commonly use avoidance strategies with their same-sex siblings. Similar to the findings of Greenberg, Buerkel-Rothfuss, Neuendorf, & Atkin (1980), sibling conflicts most often involved brothers. Again, the sex-role stereotypes of the emotionally disclosive female and non-disclosive male are evident in the manner that siblings manage conflict.

Our analysis of jealousy, envy, and rivalry on primetime television suggests that: (1) A romantic involvement is the greatest threat to the jealous person; (2) Envy was most often occasioned by another's relationship; and (3) Rivalry most frequently occurred to obtain a person's attention. These findings highlight the basic need for intimate relationships (Schutz, 1966; Weiss, 1969) that underscores emotional experiences and communicative behavior in televised and real interaction.

Consistent with Duck's (1986) conceptualization, jealousy and these related emotions were depicted as a blend of feelings that may be expressed in a variety of ways. Sarcasm, rational discussion, and ventilating feelings were the most frequent behavioral responses to the experience of the emotions. Congruent with sex-role expectations, more females than males were found to express their emotions, particularly those that indicate vulnerability (i.e., jealousy and envy). A recent investigation of jealousy in real life found few gender differences (Strzyzewski & Comstock, 1990), which indicates that television may not be representative of social behavior in real jealousy predicaments.

In opposite-sex dyads, both females and males expressed jealousy over their partners' romantic involvements. In same-sex female dyads, however, rivalry over a person was the most frequently occurring emotion. Contrary to real life, jealousy in male dyads over a same-sex friendly involvement was most predominant, followed by envy or rivalry over a position or possession. The overall effect of jealousy and envy on the relationship was portrayed as facilitative.

The portrayal of interpersonal predicaments on primetime could be linked to a mixed bag of potential effects. Abelman (1986) maintained that while there may be a "relatively equal amount of antisocial and prosocial behavior on television, prosocial fare is not as visually stimulating or identifiable in the context of a program as is antisocial fare" (p. 55). As a result, the prosocial supportive acts, which actually outnumbered the antisocial acts in this study and others (Cunter & Svennevig, 1987), may: (1) be overshadowed by the more explicit antisocial behaviors; (2) go unnoticed by viewers; and (3) thereby decrease the potential for learning prosocial interaction patterns through observation of the interaction portrayed by television characters.

Obviously, the next step in this research effort involves an attempt to actually correlate television content with real-life interaction. Although considering the potential effect of television messages interesting and important, researchers should keep in mind that the impact of television on the viewer is mediated by the viewer's motivation for watching (Carveth & Alexander, 1985), the similarity of the viewer's perceived reality to television content (Doob & Macdonald, 1979; Potter, 1986), whether the viewer considers the characters' behaviors as appropriate and effective, and whether the viewer actually perceives the prosocial messages laced within the content of televised interaction.

References

- Abelman, R. (1986). Children's awareness of television's prosocial fare: Parental discipline as an antecedent. *Journal of Family Issues*, 7, 51-66.
- Bandura, A. (1971). *Social learning theory*. New York: General Learning Press.
- Brehm, S. S. (1985). *Intimate relationships*. New York: Random House.
- Bringle, R. C., & Buunk, B. (1985). Jealousy and social behavior: A review of person, relationship, and situational determinants. In P. Shaver (Ed.), *Self, situations, and social behavior: Review of personality and social psychology* (pp. 241-264). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Canary, D. J., & Cupach, W. R. (1988). Relational and episodic characteristics associated with conflict tactics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 305-325.
- Carveth, R., & Alexander, A. (1985). Soap opera viewing motivations and the cultivation process. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 29, 259-273.
- Clanton, C., & Smith, L. C. (1977). *Jealousy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Comstock, J., & Buller, D. B. (1990, June). *Conflict strategies adolescents use with their parents: Testing the cognitive communicator characteristics model*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Dublin.
- Comstock, J., & Haefner, M. (1989). The use of compliance-gaining behaviors by television characters: A description of Kate & Allie. *Journal of the Illinois Speech and Theatre Association*, 60, 81-94.
- Constantine, L. L. (1977). Jealousy: Techniques for intervention. In C. Clanton & L. G. Smith (Eds.), *Jealousy* (pp. 190-198). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dail, P. W., & Way, W. L. (1985). What do parents observe about parenting from prime-time television? *Family Relations*, 34, 491-499.
- Demo, D. H., Small, S. A., & Savin-Williams, R. C. (1987). Family relations and the self-esteem of adolescents and their parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 705-715.
- Doob, A. N., & Macdonald, G. E. (1979). Television viewing and fear of victimization: Is the relationship causal? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 170-179.
- Duck, S. (1986). *Human relationships: An introduction to social psychology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Galvin, K. M., & Brommel, B. J. (1986). *Family communication: Cohesion and change*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Gegas, V., & Schwalbe, M. L. (1986). Parental behavior and adolescent self-esteem. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 37-46.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1980). The "mainstreaming" of America: Violence profile No. 1. *Journal of Communication*, 30 (3), 10-29.

- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1986). Living with television: The dynamics of the cultivation process. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Perspectives on media effects* (pp. 17-40). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Greenberg, B., Atkin, C., Edison, N., & Korzenny, F. (1977). *Pro-social and antisocial behaviors on commercial television in 1976-1977*. Report by the Dept. of Communication, Michigan State University. Washington, DC: US Office of Child Development.
- Greenberg, B. S., Buerkel-Rothfuss, N., Neuendorf, K., & Atkin, C. K. (1980). Three seasons of television family role interactions. In B. S. Greenberg (Ed.), *Life on television: Content analyses of U.S. TV drama* (pp. 161-172). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Greenberg, B. S., Hines, N., Buerkel-Rothfuss, N., & Atkin, C. K. (1980). Family role structures and interactions on commercial television. In B. S. Greenberg (Ed.), *Life on television: Content analyses of U.S. TV drama* (pp. 149-160). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gunter, B., & Svennevig, M. (1987). *Behind and in front of the screen: Television's involvement with family life*. London: John Libbey.
- Haefner, M., & Comstock, J. (1988, April). *The cultivation of norms and expectations for non-traditional families*. Paper presented at the Central States Communication Association Convention, Schaumburg, IL.
- Hirsch, P. (1982). The role of television and popular culture in contemporary society. In H. Newcomb (Ed.), *Television: The critical view*. (3rd ed., pp. 280-310). New York: Oxford.
- Kelley, H. H. (1987). Toward a taxonomy of interpersonal conflict processes. In S. Oskamp & S. Spacapan (Eds.), *Interpersonal processes: The Claremont symposium on applied social psychology* (pp. 122-147). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- LoSciuto, L. (1972). A national inventory of television viewing behavior. In E. Rubinstein, C. Comstock, & J. Murray (Eds.), *Television and social behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 33-86) (DHEW Publication No. HEM 72-9059). Washington, DC: US government Printing Office.
- McLeod, J. M., Fitzpatrick, M. A., Clynn, C. J., & Fallis, S. F. (1982). Television a social relations: Family influences and consequences for interpersonal behavior. In D. Pearl, L. Bouthilet, & J. Lazar (Eds.), *Television and behavior: Ten years of scientific progress and implications for the eighties*. Vol. II: Technical reviews (pp. 272-290). (DHHS Publication No. ADM 82-1196). Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Meyrowitz, J. (1985). *No sense of place: The impact of electronic media on social behavior*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Montemayor, R. (1983). Parents and adolescents in conflict: All families some of the time and some families most of the times. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 3, 83-103.
- Montemayor, R. (1986). Family variation in parent-adolescent storm and stress. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 1, 15-31.
- Patterson, M. L. (1983). *Nonverbal behavior: A functional perspective*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Peterson, D. R. (1983). Conflict. In H. H. Kelley et al. (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 360-396). New York: Freeman.
- Pike, C. R., & Sillars, A. L. (1985). Reciprocity of marital communication. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 2, 303-324.
- Potter, W. J. (1986). Perceived reality and the cultivation hypothesis. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 30, 159-174.
- Potter, W. J., & Ware, W. (1987). Analysis of the contexts: Antisocial acts on prime-time television. *Communication Research*, 14, 664-686.

- Roloff, M. E. (1976). Communication strategies, relationships and relational change. In C. R. Miller (Ed.), *Explorations in interpersonal communication* (pp. 173-195). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Roloff, M. E., & Greenberg, B. S. (1980). TV, peer, and parent models for pro- and antisocial conflict behaviors. *Human Communication Research*, 6, 340-351.
- Schutz, W. C. (1966). *The interpersonal underworld*. Palos Alto, CA: Science and Behavior.
- Sillars, A. L. (1980). Attributions and communication in roommate conflicts. *Communication Monographs*, 47, 180-200.
- Sillars, A. L., Coletti, S., Parry, D., & Rogers, M. (1982). Coding verbal conflict tactics: Nonverbal and perceptual correlates of the "avoidance-distributive-integrative" distinction. *Human Communication Research*, 9, 83-95.
- Sillars, A. L., & Weisberg, J. (1987). Conflict as a social skill. In M. E. Roloff & C. R. Miller (Eds.), *Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research* (pp. 140-171). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Skill, T., Robinson, J. D., & Wallace, S. P. (1987). Portrayal of families on prime-time TV: Structure, type and frequency. *Journalism Quarterly*, 84, 360-367.
- Straus, M. A. (1974). Leveling, civility and violence in the family. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 36, 13-29.
- Strzyzewski, K. (1987). *The experience and expression of Jealousy in relationships*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Arizona.
- Strzyzewski, K., & Comstock, J. (1990, February). *The experience and expression of Jealousy: A comparison between friends and romantics*. Paper presented at the Western States Communication Association Convention, Sacramento, CA.
- Vuchinich, S. (1984). Sequencing and social structure in family conflict. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47, 217-234.
- Vuchinich, S. (1987). Starting and stopping spontaneous family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 591 -601.
- Weaver, J., & Wakshlag, J. (1986). Perceived vulnerability to crime, criminal victimization experience, and television viewing. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 30, 141 -158.
- Weiss, R. S. (1969). The fund of sociability. *Transaction*, 7, 36-43.
- Youniss, j . , & Smollar, J. (1985). *Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.