

Hurt and Anger in Romantic Relationships: A Derived-Etic Approach of Situational Categories Eliciting Emotions in Romania and Spain

Andreea Ursu, Maria Nicoleta Turliuc and Vassilis Pavlopoulos*

Abstract: In this study we propose typologies of situational categories on eliciting hurt and anger from the perspective of the emotion's receptor and source. Using two samples from two European countries, we present a derived-etic approach. One hundred and thirty-five young Romanians (n = 87) and Spaniards (n = 48), aged between 18 and 30, involved in a romantic relationship, has described the recalled affective events in which they experienced the two emotions from both perspectives (receptor and source of emotions). We used a mixed approach to data analysis. The results are presented from both etic and emic perspective. Specifically, we aimed to present similarities and differences on categories' frequencies, categories' ranks, categories' meanings, and categories' specificity. The results revealed nine versus twelve typologies of situational categories that elicit hurt; and nine versus seven typologies of situational categories, which elicit anger. Clinical implications and futures directions are discussed.

Keywords: anger, hurt, romantic relationships, cross-cultural comparison, typologies of emotions

INTRODUCTION

Romantic relationships offer a unique context for eliciting and experiencing not only positive but also negative emotions. Being criticized, rejected, being incorrectly treated by the partner are

* Andreea Ursu (✉)

Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Romania

Maria Nicoleta Turliuc (✉)

Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Romania

Vassilis Pavlopoulos (✉)

Department of Psychology, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece
e-mail: ursu.andreea@gmail.com (corresponding author), turliuc@uaic.ro, vpavlop@psych.uoa.gr

situations that seem to occur in almost every romantic relationship. In these unpleasant moments, partners experience different negative emotions, such as hurt or anger. In one study, Ursu, Turliuc and Fernandez-Gonzalez (2019) found that the most frequent emotions experienced in the last three months by Romanians and Spaniards were anger and sadness. Moreover, they found that Romanians experienced more disappointment and anger, while Spaniards reported more hurt. Experiencing powerful negative emotions (as hurt or anger) can profoundly influence relationships dynamics. For example, people experiencing more frequent and intentional hurt avoid the source of hurt, and they have less dyadic satisfaction (Vangelisti & Young 2000). On the other hand, protecting themselves against the partner perceived as being harmful and neglectful (Sanford, 2007), and coercing partner behaviors (Lemay Jr, Overall, & Clark 2012) are certain effects of anger.

Empirical qualitative studies on romantic partners' perspectives on perceived situations which elicit negative emotions in their couple are missing from the literature. Hence, the aim of this study is to identify situations in which people are experiencing romantic relational hurt and romantic relational anger using a derived-etic approach. Moreover, we aim to categorize the situations and to offer a typology of those situations for both emotions using a derived-etic approach and a bi-directional approach (receptor and source of emotions).

CULTURE AND EMOTION EXPRESSION IN ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Emotional experience varies across social and cultural context. More precisely, on one side, culture shapes emotions' experience, recognition and expression in social contexts. On the other side, the majority of individuals' emotions occur in interpersonal contexts. Thus, values, meanings and practices of cultural context influence the way in which emotions construct and are being constructed by relationships norms, rules (Boiger & Mesquita 2012; Mesquita & Boiger 2014). Moreover, emotions that are functional, acceptable in one culture and in one social context, are promoted by its members, while emotions which are not functional or not helpful are being suppressed (Mesquita & Walker 2003). For example, expressing emotions as sadness is acceptable and functional, if two persons are involved in a romantic relationship (Clark & Taraban 1991).

Generally, among different approaches to study emotions and romantic relationships in relation to culture universalism versus relativism, etic versus emic perspective, and the cultural variation dimensions model are the most important frameworks.

While researchers with a universalist orientation seek for similar patterns within different cultures, with the aim of presenting a deeper reality than the subjective reality of the researchers, the relativists seek for the individuals' own meanings, the individuals' own ways of interpreting the situations within one culture (Berry, Poortinga, Breugelmans, Chasiotis, & Sam 2011; Adamopoulos & Lonner 1994).

Furthermore, the researchers with an etic orientation focus on universal concepts, while the researchers with an emic orientation attempt to see the specificity of these concepts in each culture. More precisely, the etic approach attempts to describe systems, which are equally valid across cultures, highlighting the similarities and differences across cultures, while the emic approach is interested in understanding the psychological experience through the participants' eyes within their own culture (Berry et al. 2011; Helfrich 1999; Niblo & Jackson 2004).

Niblo & Jackson (2004) reviewed the cross-cultural research over the 20 years of two Australian journals. Their results suggest a higher number of imposed etic studies over the emic and derived etic studies. The concern is that the researchers using the imposed etic approach take the assessments, which have been constructed, validated and standardized in some cultures (which are the results of emic measures), and directly apply them to other cultures (assuming the etic character of concepts) without evaluating the equivalence of scales (Davidson, Jaccard, Triandis, Morales, & Diaz-Guerrero 1976), thus imposing Western standards to non-Western contexts (Niblo & Jackson 2004). As well, the number of studies in which researchers used derived etic measures is higher comparing to emic measures. This suggests the researchers' concern to develop and apply scales, which are consistent across different cultural contexts, but still it is insufficient. The aim of these studies is to make cross-cultural comparisons. The emic approach focuses on developing scales within specific cultures for those specific cultures. The aim of these studies is to deeply understand the psychological experience through the eyes of individuals under investigation.

Some decades ago, in a major intent, Hofstede (1983) proposed a model of four cultural variation dimensions: power distance,

individualism, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity, measured on a scale ranging from 0 (i.e. small power distance) to 100 (large power distance). Based on these dimensions, he has proposed country cultural profiles. Therefore, we can observe that in time, researchers have contrasted different approaches to study culture. But all these can be grouped in approaches, which analyzed culture as an external factor (factor of influence) or as an internal factor (individuals cannot be separated from their cultural context).

EMOTIONS TYPOLOGY AND ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Hurt: definition, causes and typology

Initially, hurt was seen as an emotion from sadness family, being specific to the suffering theme (Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, & O'Connor 1987). More recently, Feeney (2005) defined hurt as being an emotion elicited by relational transgression which evokes a sense of personal injury, affects the victim's beliefs about her/himself and others, while Vangelesti, Young, Carpenter-Theune and Alexander (2005) presented hurt as a mixture between sadness and fear. In this case, sadness implies emotional injury caused by the significant other's behaviors, values, attitudes, while fear evokes the vulnerability of being hurt.

The preliminary studies on hurt aimed to examine the events (Leary, Springer, Negel, Ansell, & Evans 1998) associated with it and proposed a five types of events typology: *Active disassociation*-defined by explicit rejection, abandonment and ostracism; *passive disassociation* defined by implicit rejection – being ignored, criticism; *betrayal*-defined as infidelity, breaking confidences and agreements; *teasing and feeling unappreciated, used or taken for granted*. More recently, Feeney (2004) adapted this typology to romantic relationships. She presented the following typology: *active disassociation*-consisting of behaviors which explicitly signal disinterest in partner, aspects related to relationship termination, denial, retraction of feelings of love and commitment; *passive disassociation*-consisting of being ignored, excluded from the partner's plans, activities, conversations, important disclosures; *criticism*-consisting of negative verbal comments about one's behavior, appearance, personal characteristics; *infidelity*-consisting of extra-relationship sexual involvement and *deception*-consisting of misleading acts as lying, breaking the promises and confidences.

In addition, Vangelesti et al. (2005) studied the perceived causes of hurt feelings. Specifically, they identified fourteen perceived causes, as

follows: *rejection*, defined as termination of a relationship, refusal to engage in future interaction, social ostracism; *behavioral criticism*, defined as critique or denunciation of an individual's direct behavior or performance; *betrayal*, defined as deception or disloyalty; exploitation or manipulation of relationship for personal benefit; *moral affront*, seen as challenge to the individual's character; insult to the individual's integrity or decency; *ill-conceived humor*, defined as excessive or spiteful teasing; inappropriate or poorly executed or joking; *mistaken intent*, defined as misunderstanding or miscommunication, unforeseen or undesired relational consequences; *relational depreciation*, defined as the revelation that the other person does not view his or her relationship with the individual to be as closed, committed, or stable as the individual thought; *indifference*, defined as a lack of concern for the individual or the individual's feelings; *personal attack*, seen as disparagement of some unchangeable characteristic or quality of the individual; *undermining of self-concept*, defined as provocation of feelings of inferiority or self-doubt; *shattering of hopes*, defined discouragement or obstruction of the individual's hopes, efforts, or dreams; *truth-telling*, defined as accurate reference to a sensitive issue or an undeniable fact; *humiliation*, defined as public embarrassment or degradation of the individual; *inappropriate communication*, defined as being unfit or uncalled for verbal or nonverbal behavior.

Anger: definition and causes

It is generally accepted that anger is a basic emotion (Ekman & Cordaro 2011), with a high intensity level, induced by displeasure. According to appraisal theory, anger is the response to an appraisal of a blocked goal (Harmon-Jones & Harmon-Jones 2016). Moreover, anger has been seen as an emotion resulting from losses, threats and harms along with fear, guilt, shame and sadness, because they occur based on thwarting (Lazarus 1991). In addition, it has also been argued that anger implies the blame of other and a direct attack to someone's ego identities, which leads the person to appraise the event as an insult or as a personal slight. One of the most important causes of anger is the appraisal of one's situation (or a situation) as being unpleasant. That situation was wrongly caused by another person (Ibid.), and this means the person who caused the emotion acted in a way seen as improper or unfair (Shaver et al. 1987) and anger gives the person the impulse to correct the perceived wrong (Strongman 2003).

More recently, Lemay Jr., Overall and Clark (2012) presented a typology of anger in romantic relationships, using the victim-perpetrator model. In their opinion, anger arises when victim is dissatisfied with the perpetrator's behavior and the victim's goal is to change perpetrators' behavior by punishing them. Thus, the victims' anger suggests dissatisfaction toward their partners, victims' low level or lack of dependency, low level of vulnerability and low level of commitment. Other researchers suggested that anger impulses the individual to act in a destructive or defensive manner toward their partner (Sanford & Rowatt 2004). In addition, due to anger, the victim asserts the power and the control over the partner. Thus, the persons modify a harmful or threatening person-environment relationship because of anger's impulse.

Previous research suggested that in romantic relationship context anger is elicited by *betrayal of trust*, *criticism*, *rebuff*, defined as the failure to satisfy the desires expressed, *negligence/ lack of consideration*, *cumulative annoyance*, defined as a repeated engagement in annoying acts, and *illegitimate demand*. Moreover, Fehr, Baldwin, Collins, Patterson & Benditt (1999) emphasized that betrayal of trust is the category which elicited the highest level of anger intensity, while cumulative annoyance is the category with the lesser level of anger's intensity.

Thus, experiencing anger gives the individual the impulse to urgently do something for removing or harming the anger's source (Fridja 1988) and for restoring the order.

THE PRESENT STUDY

The aim of the present study was to create and present a typology of situational categories which elicit the following emotions: romantic relational hurt and romantic relational anger. In doing so, we took into account two social conditions: the receptor of emotion but also the source of it. We included two European samples, i.e. Romania and Spain, using a derived-etic approach.

Romania and Spain are two European countries with similarities and differences. They both have Latin-origin official languages, but geopolitically and historically speaking, they have taken different paths. Romania is an East-European country with a history of communism while Spain is a South-Western European (Mediterranean) country with a history of fascism. These two political regimes had different impact on people's daily life. In addition, social-

economics aspects (average salary, daily stress, life satisfaction) of these two countries affect differently the dynamic of romantic relationships. For example, The Human Development Report HDR (2011) found differences in life satisfaction between Romania ($M = 4.9$) and Spain ($M = 6.2$).

Moreover, Romania and Spain are different in the individualism–collectivism and power distance dimensions, while they are similar in the uncertainty avoidance and masculinity-femininity dimensions (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov 2010). Romania is a more collectivist culture (90) compared to Spain, which is a more individualist culture (51). Although both countries belong to the same group in terms of power distance, we also suspect some differences on this dimension because of the high discrepancy in their scores (90 and 57 out of 100 for Romania and Spain, respectively). On the other hand, both countries are high on uncertainty avoidance (90 and 85 out of 100 for Romania and Spain, respectively) and both cultures are relative feminine, having the same score (42) on this dimension.

While many quantitative studies have been conducted on emotions and romantic relationships, we wanted to gain the kind of in-depth knowledge of the situations eliciting negative emotions within romantic relationships that come from both partners in two different conditions, i.e., receptor and source of emotions.

The majority of studies in this area are based on samples from the U.S. and Australia, limiting the generalization of the findings to other regions and cultures. Western researchers are dominating cross-cultural studies, assuming the etic (universal) character of their emic concepts based on (student) samples results (Davidson, Jaccard, Triandis, Morales, & Diaz-Guerrero 1976; Berry et al. 2011). There is a need to know more about the influence of other (non-Western) socio-cultural contexts in order to verify the universal character of the psychological experience (Berry et al. 2011).

Using samples of Romanian and Spanish romantic relationships in our study represents an opportunity to study populations, which are underrepresented in the area of couple and family psychology. The present study uses a derived-etic approach. We identified universal etic concepts (negative emotions) by adopting an emic approach (qualitative methods, presenting situations in the participants' own language, their own meanings of situations which elicit negative emotions, using specific concepts to their culture). Based on the emerging similarities of situational categories, which are eliciting

negative emotions across countries, we proposed a derived-etic typology of romantic relational hurt and romantic relationship hurt. The methodology used in this study allows for cross-cultural comparisons, but also for examining country specificity in terms of situational categories, which are eliciting specific negative emotions.

Although previous research has analyzed different issues related to romantic relational hurt and romantic relational anger, the present study extends the existing literature by: (a) the within-subjects design used – the participants were in both conditions – source and receptor of emotion, while the previous studies have used a between subjects design, having participants in victim or perpetrator condition (Lemay, Overall, & Clark 2012; Leary, Springer, Negel, Ansell, & Evans 1998); (b) the nationality of participants (Romania and Spain), while the majority of studies are based on American or Australian samples (Vangelisti et al. 2005; Fehr et al. 1999; Harasymchuk & Fehr 2012); (c) non-student samples, while the majority of studies have used student sample which received extra-course credit (Vangelisti et al. 2005); (d) participants aged between 18-30 years old, involved in a committed relationship for at least 3 months; (e) the methodology used offers the opportunity for cross-cultural comparisons, but in the same time the chance of observing the specificity of each culture.

METHOD

Participants

The participants of this study consist of two sample groups, 148 Romanian and Spanish living in their culture of origin. The first initial sample is represented by 95 Romanians. The second initial sample is represented by 53 Spaniards.

Criteria for study inclusion were as follows: (1) involved in one dating relationship for at least 3 months length, (2) aged between 18-30 years old. We decided to use these criteria because we wanted to make sure that all participants had experiences with romantic relationships and with specific emotions, which may be experienced within them.

Based on the exclusion criteria (1) not completing all the study requests or (2) completing in an unsatisfactory way, 8 Romanian and 5 Spanish participants have been eliminated. Thus, the final Romanian sample comprised a total of 87 Romanian participants (85.1% females) with an average of the relationship length 34.20 months and 48 Spanish participants (89.6% females), with an average of 50.48 months.

For a more detailed description of the sample characteristics, see Table 1.

Variables	Romanian (n=87)	Spanish (n=48)
Sex		
Male	13 (14.9%)	5 (10.4%)
Female	74 (85.1%)	43 (89.6%)
Age years <i>M(SD)</i>	23.32 (3.13)	25.13 (3.16)
Education		
Obligatory studies	0 (0%)	1 (2.1%)
High school	30 (34.5%)	6 (12.5%)
Bachelor	31 (35.6%)	27 (56.3%)
Master	24 (27.6%)	12 (25%)
PhD	2 (2.3%)	2 (4.2%)
Length (months) <i>M(SD)</i>	34.20 (27.46)	50.48 (35.49)
Marital status		
Involved in a committed relationship	62 (71.3%)	42 (87.5%)
Engaged	18 (20.7%)	2 (4.2%)
Married	7 (8%)	4 (8.3%)

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of participants

PROCEDURE

Participants were recruited through social media channel and asked to complete questionnaire about emotions in couples, in their mother tongue. To reach young adults who are involved in dating relationships, we asked for permission to join all groups found on Facebook with the name of cities and of universities from Romania and Spain. When we received the permission, we posted the link with the announcement for the study, where the questionnaire could be filled in. A reminder has been posted after 2-3 weeks. The participants provided informed consent.

QUESTIONNAIRES

Emotions in Couples Questionnaire

This questionnaire was developed by Ursu, Turliuc, and Fernandez-Gonzalez (2019). The online survey included a series of open questions, a measure of emotions' intensity and basic demographics items. The questionnaire assessed negative emotions experienced within the subjects' romantic relationships in the last 3 months, description of

situations in which they felt negative emotions within their actual romantic relationships, in two conditions: receptor of emotion and source of it. More specifically, we asked the participants (a) to describe situations in which the participant's partner behavior, attitude, values (the receptor condition) elicited each of the two emotions, and (b) to describe situations in which the participant's behavior, attitudes or values elicited each emotion to their partner (source condition). The results related to the negative emotions experienced within romantic relationships and their intensity are presented in another paper (Ursu, Turliuc & Fernandez-Gonzalez 2019). In this paper, we will present the results related to the situations, which are eliciting hurt and anger in romantic relationships contexts.

The demographic questions were related to the participants' gender, age, education level, partner relationships status and length of relationship.

APPROACH FOR DATA ANALYSIS

The aim of the present study was to present situational categories typology for romantic relationship hurt and romantic relationship anger based on derived-etic principals. Thus, we were more interested in observing similar and different patterns (analyzing and understanding the meanings presented by participants) and less in testing (search for significant) differences between the two countries (Romania and Spain) or between the two social conditions (receptor versus source of emotions). As Onwuegbuzie and Leench (2004, 775) suggested, in qualitative research, "significance is extracted from its reading", because a qualitative study carries the meaning throughout the whole text and not primarily in tables or figures.

The inductive analysis (Bulmer 1979) was used to analyze the content of participants' responses. More specifically, the thematic approach was used for identifying, analyzing and reporting themes within the two emotions – romantic relational anger and romantic relational hurt. For the open-ended questions, the first author has prepared a list of categories based on participants' responses. We have decided to analyze inductively the data because this method informs us on the participants' experiences, practices, views and meanings. Using the deductive approach in the first step of coding process would have made us just to conform the participants' experiences to preexisting theories (Koch, Tricia, & McCarthy 2014), to preexisting coding frame or to the researchers' analytical preconceptions (Braun & Clarke

2006). The first categories (based on inductive approach) were grouped into supra-categories and then they were compared with the categories existing already in the literature (deductive approach). The definition of each category was developed by the first author, but this set of descriptions was discussed with all authors. The coding scheme that emerged from this process was then employed by each of the two coders (the first author and a blinded-coder, native Romanian for the Romanian sample and native Spanish for the Spanish sample) to independently categorize the data. All data was checked for coding reliability. For the Romanian sample inter-rater reliability, Cohen's kappa ranged between .55 and .64 (for hurt in receptor condition, respectively anger in source condition). According to Cohen (1960) the inter-rater agreement is moderate. On the other side, for Spanish sample inter-rater reliability, Cohen's kappa ranged between .65 and .89 (for hurt in source condition, respectively anger in source condition). In this case, the inter-rater agreement varies from moderate agreement to almost perfect agreement (Cohen 1960). Moreover, in cases of disagreements related to categories, these were discussed and consensus was found.

RESULTS

First, we will present the coding scheme used for each emotion (hurt and anger) in the two conditions (receptor and source of emotion), separately. This general overview of the emerging categories of situations that elicit each emotion, including responses coded as 'other situations' and 'don't know' or 'irrelevant', informs us of the validity of the coding scheme, i.e., the extent to which the categories were comprehensive enough to adequately capture the range of participants' responses in the two countries. Then we will compare the percentages and ranks of categories between the two countries, which will allow the identification of cross-national similarities and differences in terms of quantitative representation of categories. Finally, we will focus on the content of responses within categories, in order to analyze the shared and country specific meanings in qualitative terms.

HURT – RECEPTOR CONDITION

Validity of the coding scheme

The open-data items assessing situations in which participants felt hurt because of their partner were coded into 11 categories. Of them, 10 are common for the two countries, while one is specific for the Romanian sample. Over 72% of responses (80.6% and 56.3% for Romanian and

Spanish participants, respectively) were codable into one of the nine categories presented in Table 2. Approximately 4% of data (2.3% and 8.3% for Romanian and Spanish participants, respectively) was coded into the category ‘other’. Responses such as ‘don’t know’, ‘it’s not the case’, ‘I did not feel this emotion’ represented 24% of data (17.2% and 35.4% for Romanian and Spanish participants, respectively), and they were grouped into a ‘no answer’ category.

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	%SP
<i>Retraction of feelings of love, commitment, care and understanding</i>	“When I was not understood”/ “When he did not care about what I have told him” (“Cand nu am fost inteleasa”/ “Cand lui nu i-a pasat de ceea ce eu i-am spus.”)	“When my partner told me that is not feeling the same anymore”/ “When my partner did not know if wants to still be together after a beautiful year” (“Me dijo que ya no sentia lo mismo”/ “Cuando no sabia si queria estar conmigo despues de un bonito ano”)	17.2 (1)	12.5(1)
<i>Inappropriate communication: unfit or uncalled for verbal or nonverbal behavior; fighting; lack of communication</i>	“When my partner talks disrespectful to me”/ “When we fight and we say bad things to each other” (“Cand mi-a vorbit urat”/ “Cand ne certam si spunem lucruri urate.”)	“When we fight”/ “When he treats me in an authoritarian way, he is screaming, he is upset without reason”/ (“Al discutir verbalmente”/ “Cuando me trata fuerte, me alza la voz o esta enojado sin razon.”)	13.8 (2)	10.4(2)
<i>Undermining of self-concept: provocation of feelings of inferiority and self-doubts</i>	“When she offended me related my weight”/ “paying my studies’ fees was a waste of money” (“Cand am fost jignit cu privire la greutatea mea”/ “finantarea unor noi studii era o risipa”)	“He told me that I am overreacting and insisting with things”/ “what I am doing does not have importance for him” (“me ha llamado eres una exagerada/ eres una pesada”/ “que no valorelo que hago”)	13.8 (2)	8.3(3)
<i>Deception/ disappointment: misleading acts, such as lying and the breaking of promises and confidences; lack of trust</i>	“When my partner did not tell me the truth”/ “When my partner is lying to me”/ “after repeated disappointments” (“Cand nu mi s-a spus adevarul”/ “Când mă minte”/ “după dezamagiri repetate”)	“When my partner lied to me”/ “When I was thinking that my partner will behave in a specific way, or will say something, but in the end my partner did not do it” (“Cuando me ha mentido”/ “Cuando he creído que mi pareja actuaría o diria algo que no hizo, o cuando pensé	11.5 (3)	8.3(3)

Hurt and Anger in Romantic Relationships

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	%SP
		que no lo haría y lo hizo”)		
<i>Criticism:</i> negative verbal comments about one’s/ closed persons behavior, reproaches;	“When my partner blamed me for hurtful events” (“Reprosarea unor lucruri dureroase”)	“Reproaching that I am not going to see her” (“Recibir comentarios desaprensivos sobre mis seres queridos.”/ “Al echarme en cara que no la iba a ver”)	5.7 (4)	6.3 (4)
<i>Infidelity/flirting:</i> extra-sexually and emotionally involvement; speaking, flirting with ex-partners;	“ When he cheated me”/ “A possible situation of my partner being unfaithful” („Atunci cand am fost inselata”/ “o posibila situatie de infidelitate”)	“Cheating me with a person of the partner same gender” (“Engañó con uno de su mismo sexo”)	3.4 (5)	2.1 (6)
<i>Injustice:</i> actions attributed in an inadequate way or at a higher intensity; guilt, higher and inadequate expectations	“When my partner told me that I did something that I did not or at an exaggerated gravity” (“Cand mi s-au atribuit fapte pe care nu le-am facut sau de o gravitate mult exagerata”)	“When my partner is trying to blame me for everything that happens in his life ” (“Cuando intent culparme de todo lo que le sucede en su vida”)	2.3 (6)	4.2 (5)
<i>Truth telling:</i> accurate reference to a sensitive issue	“Constructive criticism may hurt sometimes” (“Critica constructiva poate rani uneori.”)	“When he is telling hurtful truths” (“Cuando dice verdades demasiado crudas”)	1.1 (7)	4.2 (5)
<i>Rejection/exclusio n:</i> termination of the relationship; open-relationship; refusal to engage in future interactions; activities in which just one partner is involved; being ignored by partner;	“He was spending time with a female friend and not with me ”/ “When I am feeling that my partner is ignoring me” (“In loc sa isi petreaca timpul cu mine, si l-a petrecut cu o prietena”/ “Cand simt ca ma ignora”.)		11.5	

Table 2: Coding Scheme of Situations Eliciting Hurt (Receptor Condition): Category Definitions, Examples, Percentages (and Ranks) by Country

Note: Numbers in parenthesis are categories ranks; RO: Romanian; SP: Spanish.

Quantitative analysis: Percentages and ranks of categories by country.
As depicted in Table 2, four of the most frequent noted categories by both Romanian and Spanish participants were retraction of feelings of love, commitment, understanding, and care; inappropriate

communication; undermining of self-concept and deception/disappointment. All of these categories have higher frequencies within the Romanian sample compared to the Spanish sample. The least frequent category for the Romanian sample is truth telling, while for the Spanish sample it is infidelity/flirting category.

The categories for Romanian participants have been organized in seven ranks while those of Spanish participants in six ranks. Moreover, the ranks results are in line with those obtained for categories frequencies. It worth mentioning that retraction of feelings of love, commitment, care and understanding and inappropriate communication are the categories with the first two ranks across both samples, having similar importance in provoking hurt, but infidelity/flirting is eliciting more hurt to Romanians while injustice is making Spaniards feel more hurt compared to Romanians.

Qualitative analysis: Shared and country specific meanings

Beside NA and other categories, eight out of nine categories are common across the two samples. Inappropriate communication category and some situations from retraction of feelings of love, commitment, understanding, and care category are the perceived behaviors of partners during their interactions. The participants were assuming that the relationship and, implicitly, themselves are important and valuable to their partners and they discovered that maybe they are not as important as they thought. Moreover, perceived behaviors as not believing in the participants' feelings or the partners telling to the participants that they are not feeling the same anymore are aspects which attack the main characteristics of romantic relationships. Inappropriate communication is related to relational conflict, their interactions during conflicts or their interactions when they are trying to solve the conflict. Undermining of the participants' self-concept is the category which reports that interactions between partners made the participants to doubt their competence and self-worth, in other words affects participants beliefs about self (Feeney, 2005). In addition, the participants also described situations in which they felt inferior to their partner, which made them feel hurt. Rejection/exclusion is the category, which presents aspects related to the end, the status, or type of relationship. As well, being ignored by partners, partners' refuse to engage in future activities with participants evoke romantic relational hurt because they suggest lack of commitment and involvement. Another category, which suggests lack of commitment and involvement, is deception/disappointment. This

category brings to attention the perceived partner's behaviors as lying, breaking confidences and promises.

When analyzing the situations within each category by country, some differences and similarities emerged. Specifically, for retraction of feelings of love, commitment, care and understanding, the Romanian participants mentioned situations as not feeling important for partner, the partner is not caring about the relationship or participant, while the Spanish participants described situations as not feeling the same or their partners having doubts if they still want to be involved in the relationship. Next, in inappropriate communication were coded situations, which suggest the intentionality of behaviors with the goal to hurt the participants. The intentionality of hurt could make participants to distance themselves in order to protect against their partner (Vangelisti & Young 2000; Sanford 2007). Both Romanian and Spanish people are describing conflict interactions in which participants' partner or both partners are using maladaptive communication ways just to punish each other's behavior.

Situations categorized into deception/ disappointment category seem to be very similar across the two samples. Both groups of participants (Romanians and Spaniards) have presented situations in which their partner lied to them, their actions, behaviors disappointed them or their partner did not meet their expectations. Feeling disappointed may provoke an emotional injury caused by their significant other (Vangelisti et al. 2005). Similar to deception/ disappointment category, criticism category is comprised by situations, which are similar across the two samples. Specifically, the partners' participants criticized the participants' parents or closed persons and made reproaches and these behaviors made them feel hurt. Criticism is one of the four horsemen of the couples' apocalypse (Gottman & Silver 2004) which has negative effects as the participant's withdrawal and disengagement (emotional or physical) from the interaction (Gottman 1993).

Contrary to deception/ disappointment category and criticism category, where the situations presented were very similar across the samples, infidelity/ flirting category presents an interesting particularity. Both groups of participants have described situations in which their partner cheated them, but one Spanish participant presented one situation in which her partner cheated her with a person of the same gender. This, along with the rank of infidelity/flirting category, may suggest the availability of the Spanish couples to have

more open relationships and to be more available to try new things within or outside their relationships, while for the Romanians, sexual and emotional exclusivity is more important.

Country specific categories

Results presented in Table 2 suggest that rejection/ exclusion is a frequent category within Romanian participants, but lacks in the Spanish sample. It seems that situations as: spending time with other persons and not with the partner, having activities with other persons or the partner being not involved in those activities are more specific for the Romanian cultural context or maybe the Spanish participants do not see these activities as being hurtful because of the more individualist culture (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov 2010).

HURT – SOURCE CONDITION

Validity of the coding scheme

To examine the distinctions in peoples' perceptions of situations in which they hurt their partner, thus, they are the emotion's source and their partner is the emotion's receptor, we have used the same categories as for the receptor condition, but we have created new categories for the situations, which could not have been included in the pre-established list of categories.

Comparing with the receptor condition, for the source condition, we created three new categories: mistaken intent, indifference and transgression.

Thus, the data reported for hurt in source condition was coded in thirteen categories. Eleven out of the thirteen categories are common and there is one category specific for each sample. Over 65% of participants responses (65.3% and 64.9% for Romanian and Spanish participants respectively) were codable into one of these categories. Over 7% of data (8% and 4.2% for Romanian and Spanish participants respectively) was coded in other category, while 28% of data (26.4% and 31.3% for Romanian and Spanish participants) was coded in the "no answer" category. The final categories, as well as examples from each country and their relative percent and categories ranks are presented in Table 3.

Hurt and Anger in Romantic Relationships

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	% SP
<i>Inappropriate communication:</i> unfit or uncalled for verbal or nonverbal behavior; fighting; lack of communication;	<p>“When we talk disrespectful to each other”/</p> <p>“When we fight because of unimportant things” (,Cand vorbim urat unul altaia”/</p> <p>“Cand ne certam din nimicuri”</p>	<p>“When I am answering him in a bad way”/</p> <p>“When I am speaking to him in a bad way”</p> <p>(“Cuando le he respondido mal”/</p> <p>“Cuando le hablo de mala forma”)</p>	10.3 (2)	20.8 (1)
<i>Rejection/exclusion:</i> termination of the relationship; open-relationship; refusal to engage in future interactions; activities in which just one partner is involved; ignoring the partner;	<p>“When I am ignoring him”/</p> <p>“When I told him that it is better to take a break”/</p> <p>“When we broke up”/</p> <p>(“Când este ignorat”/</p> <p>“când i-am spus că ar fi mai bine să luăm o pauza”/</p> <p>“atunci cand ne-am despartit”)</p>	<p>“Not practicing sport with him”/ “Possible breaking up” (“no hacer deporte con el”/ “Posible ruptura de pareja”)</p>	13.8 (1)	6.3 (2)
<i>Deception/disappointment:</i> misleading acts, such as lying and the breaking of promises and confidences; lack of trust	<p>“Changing of plans”/</p> <p>“when I lied him”</p> <p>(“Schimbare de planuri”/</p> <p>“Cand l-am mintit”)</p>	<p>“He was expecting me to pay more attention”/“When I don’t trust him” (“Se esperaba que yo estuviera mas atenta”/“Cuando no confio en el”.)</p>	5.7 (4)	6.3 (2)
<i>Criticism:</i> negative verbal comments about one’s/ closed persons behavior, reproaches;	<p>“When I reproached certain things”/</p> <p>“When I am joking about his family”</p> <p>(“I-am reprosat anumite lucruri”/</p> <p>“cand fac glume care tin de familia lui”.)</p>	<p>“When I am criticizing something which is important for him”/</p> <p>“When I am criticizing his work”</p> <p>(“cuando he criticado algo importante para el”/</p> <p>“Cuando me meto con su trabajo”.)</p>	8 (3)	4.2 (3)
<i>Truth telling:</i> accurate reference to a sensitive issue	<p>“When I don’t let him to dream”/</p> <p>(“Când nu îl las sa viseze”)</p>	<p>“After telling him some hurtful true”/</p> <p>“Telling him that I am feeling not knowing him anymore”</p> <p>(“Después de decirle alguna verdad”/</p> <p>“Al decirle que sentia que no la conocia”)</p>	3.4 (6)	6.3 (2)
<i>Undermining of partner self-concept:</i> provocation of feelings of inferiority and self-doubts	<p>“I told him that he is weak and unprepared for a relationship”</p> <p>(“I-am facut slab sine pregatit pentru o relatie”)</p>	<p>“When I am making him feeling inferior concerning knowledge”</p> <p>(“Cuando le hago sentir inferior en</p>	3.4 (6)	4.2 (3)

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	% SP
		conocimientos”)		
<i>Retraction of feelings of love, commitment, care and understanding</i>	“When I am not giving attention to my partner” (“Când nu-i acord atenție”)	“When I am telling to my partner that does not love me anymore” (“cuando le digo que no me quiere”)	4.6 (5)	2.1 (4)
<i>Mistaken intent: misunderstanding or miscommunication; unforeseen or undesired relational consequences</i>	“When he found about a gossip”/ “When he misunderstood a conversation with a friend of mine” (“Când a aflat o barfa, care nu era adevarat”/ “Când a inteles gresit conversatia cu un prieten”.)	“Because of one misunderstanding” (“Por algún malentendido”)	3.4 (6)	2.1 (4)
<i>Indifference: lack of concern or the individual or for the individual’s feeling</i>	“When I am indifferent” (“Când m-am purtat indiferenta”)	“When I was behaving in an indifferent way” (“Las veces que me he mostrado indiferente”)	2.3 (7)	2.1 (4)
<i>Transgression: emotionally injured</i>	“When he realized that he hurts me” (“când a realizat ca m-a ranit pe mine”)	“When I hurt my partner” (“Cuando le he hecho daño”)	1.1 (8)	4.2 (3)
<i>Infidelity/flirting: extra-sexually and emotionally involvement; speaking, flirting with ex-partners; or other persons;</i>	“When I was flirting with another boy”/ “When I cheated her” („Când am flirtat cu un alt baiat”/ “când am inselat-o”)		9.2	
<i>Injustice: actions attributed in an inadequate way or at a higher intensity; guilt, higher and inadequate expectations</i>		“When I am doubting about his feelings or his love, like I am feeling more than him” (“Al poner en duda sus sentimientos, su dolor o su amor hacia mí, como si yo sintieramás que él.”)		4.2

Table 3: Coding Scheme of Situations Eliciting Hurt (Source Condition)

Quantitative analysis: Percentages and ranks of categories by country

The most frequent category for Romanians and for Spaniards respectively is rejection/ exclusion, respectively inappropriate communication (see Table 3). It seems that the Romanian participants’ partners are more hurt by situations in which the participants have rejected or excluded them, while the Spaniard participants’ partners are more hurt by situations in which they fight and they do not find

solutions. Maybe the Romanians feel more hurt because of the participants' rejection or exclusion due to their less individualist culture. In collectivist cultures, people are valuing relationships over the personal benefits (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov 2010). The second most frequent category for Romanians is inappropriate communication, while for Spanish participants there are three different categories with the same percentage – rejection/ exclusion, deception and truth telling. Criticism category is the third most frequent category for Romanians and criticism, undermining of the partner's self-concept and transgression are the third most frequent categories for Spaniards. On the opposite side, the least frequent categories are transgression for Romanians and infidelity, retraction of feelings of love, commitment, care and understanding, and indifference categories for Spaniards respectively.

The categories for Romanians participants were organized in eight ranks, from rejection/ exclusion category having the first category rank to transgression being the eighth rank category. Contrary to Romanians participants, the categories of Spanish participants were organized in four ranks because many categories had the same frequency. Concerning the ranks categories there are more differences than similarities across the two samples. There is only one category, which has the same rank across the cultures – criticism- third rank. In addition, the first category rank for Spanish participants is inappropriate communication while the fourth one is represented by infidelity, retraction of feelings of love, commitment, care and understanding, and indifference categories. Although, the same two categories have the first two ranks for both samples, their ranks differ. Inappropriate communication had the first rank category for Spaniards but the second rank category for Romanians while rejection/ exclusion had the first rank category for Romanians and the second rank category for Spaniards respectively. Moreover, transgression, a new category of hurt in source of emotion, has the eighth rank for Romanians and the third one for Spaniards.

Qualitative analysis: Shared and country specific meanings. The same similarities and differences across the two samples can be emerged within the ten commune categories. For example, within rejection/ exclusion category there are more similarities than differences across the two cultures. Both Romanian and Spanish participants described situations as not answering to calls, taking relationships pauses, breaking-ups or not being involved in the same activities as partner'

hurt experience. Also, for inappropriate communication category, the participants' meanings are similar. They describe situations in which they fight, yell to each other, in which they are less focused on finding solutions and more on saying words which may hurt. Unfit or uncalled behaviors or lack of communication are behaviors which in romantic relationship contexts are making individuals feeling hurt because they affect the self-concept of the participants' partners. In addition, the situations categorized within mistake intent category vary less across the two cultures. Both participants recalled events in which their partners found out gossips that were not true or understood wrongly the participants' conversations with other people. For the other two new categories, indifference and transgression, Romanians and Spaniards present situations with the same meaning. More precisely, for the indifference category are recalling situations in which they were indifferent towards their partner and relationship. Deception and infidelity categories comprised similar situations across the two cultures. They are suggesting the failure to respect main principals of one romantic relationship: satisfying each other needs, express the general concern about their partner needs, commitment, sharing time together and exclusive emotional and sexual involvement (Clark & Mills 1979; Clark, Mills, & Powell 1986; Clark & Mills 1993).

Contrary to the categories presented above, for criticism the Romanian and the Spanish participants give different meanings. For example, the Romanians describe situations in which participants had made some reproaches or they criticized the partners' parents while the Spanish participants present situations in which they criticized something important for their partner and this in turn made their partner feel hurt. This might be explained also by the collectivist vs. individualist characteristics of the Romanians and the Spanish participants respectively (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov 2010).

Country specific categories

In source condition, infidelity is a specific category for Romanian context while injustice is a specific category for the Spanish one. It seems that the situations in which participants were unfaithful or they were flirting with other people are making the Romanian partner to feel hurt, while the situations in which the participants treat their partner in an unjust way make the Spanish participants' partner feel hurt. Maybe Romanians have more traditional values, sexual exclusivity being a main principle of their romantic relationships,

while Spaniards have more egalitarian values, in which they want to be treated in a correct way.

ANGER – RECEPTOR CONDITION

Validity of the coding scheme

The data could be coded in 9 categories. Over 65% of participants responses (63% and 67% of Romanian and Spanish participants, respectively) were codable into one of these categories, around 10% of data (11.5% and 8.3% Romanian and Spanish participants respectively) was coded in other category, while around 25% of data (25.3% and 25% Romanian and Spanish participants respectively) was coded in the “no answer” category. The final categories, as well as examples for each country and their relative percent and ranks are presented in Table 4.

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	% SP
<i>Inappropriate communication:</i> unfit behavior, fighting without finding solutions; fighting without reasons; lack of active listening; offenses, reproaches	“We can’t agree on a mutual compromise”/ “Fighting without finding solution and these become anger when I see that my partner does not want to listen my point of view” („Nu reuseam sa ajungem la un consens”/ “Certurile care nu au nici o rezolvare si se transforma in furie cand vad ca celalalt nu vrea deloc sa asculte punctual meu”.)	“When we scream to each other”/ “When we are fighting and my partner is using arguments which are not applicable to the current situation”/ “Lack of arguments” (“Cuando nos gritamos”/ “Cuando estamos discutiendo y utilize argumentos que no tienen nada que ver con la situación”/ “Falta de argumentos”).	16.1 (2)	31.3 (1)
<i>Treated incorrectly:</i> lack of consideration for partner’s advices, lack of understanding; not accepting that the other one is right;	“When he is neglecting important things, which have priority”/ “When he knows that I am right, but he doesn’t want to accept it” (“momentul in care neglijeaza lucruri importante de facut, care au prioritate”/ “Cand stie ca am dreptate, dar o tine pe a lui”.)	“When he is not listening my opinion if it is different” (“cuando no escucha mi opinion cuando es diferente”)	17.2 (1)	10.4 (2)
<i>Control:</i> behaviors by which partners are trying to control each other, insistences; violence	“When my partner is trying to control me”/ “When my partner is not doing what I am asking for” (“cand incearca sa ma controleze”/	“When he is asking me to do something that he knows that I do not want it, but he still insists and at the end, he is upset because I am not do it ”/ (“Cuando me pide algo y	8 (3)	4.2 (4)

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	% SP
	“Cand nu face ce ii spun”.)	sabe que no quiero, pero sigue insistiendo y al final se cabrea él porque yo no cedo”		
<i>Exclusion:</i> ending the relationship, spending time with other people and not with the partner; doing activities without involving the partner; relationship stagnation; hypothetical ending	“My partner proposed me to break up temporarily before going abroad”/ “My partner does not have time for me” (“Mi-a propus sa ne despartim temporar inaintea unei plecari din tara”/ “Cand nu are timp pentru mine”)	“When he prefers staying home to watch TV or playing video games and not spend time with me” (“Cuando prefiere quedarse a ver tv o jugar que pasar tiempo conmigo”)	5.7 (4)	4.2 (4)
<i>Daily/house activities</i>	“When my partner is not cooking” (“Cand nu gateste”)	“When working both of us, he is not doing any activities related to house”/ “He is not helping with domestic activities” (“Cuando trabajando los dos el no hace nada en casa”/ “Cuando no ayuda nada en casa”)	1.1 (7)	8.3 (3)
<i>Deception:</i> lying, lack of support, lack of understanding; breaking promises;	“My partner promised me something and did keep her word”/ “When I found out about the lack of honesty in some conversations” (“Mi-a promis ceva si nu s-a tinut de cuvant”/ “Cand am aflat de lipsa de sinceritate in anumite conversatii ”)	“When you are planning something and after that my partner cancel it” (“Cuando quedas en algo y al final cancela”)	4.6 (5)	2.1(5)
<i>Partner unfaithful:</i> conversations with ex-partners or other persons;	“He was speaking with his ex-girlfriend when I was present” (“vorbea la telefon cu fosta de fata cu mine”)	“When I saw him speaking with other girl on Whatsapp” (“Cuando la vi hablando con otra por whatsapp”)	1.1 (7)	4.2 (4)
<i>Inappropriate humor:</i> bad jokes, joking in inappropriate moments	“When my partner keeps joking in bad moments” (“Cand continua cu gluma cand nu e cazul”)	“When I need his affection and he is not stopping joking” (“cuando estoy en un momento que necesito cariño y él no para de hacer bromas”)	2.3 (6)	2.1 (5)
<i>Unfairness:</i> no intervention to protect the partner; decisions taken just by one partner; not assuming the mistakes; accusing without real reason;	“He is not assuming his mistakes in front of his parents”/ “Decisions made in short time”/ “When he is not talking to me before taking a decision” (“Nu si-a asumat greşelile de fata cu părinții lui”/ “Decizii luate in graba”/		6.9 (6)	

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	% SP
	“Cand nu discuta cu mine inainte de a lua o decizie”.)			

Table 4: Coding Scheme of Situations Eliciting Anger (Receptor Condition)

Quantitative analysis: Percentages and ranks of categories by country

Even if the highest frequent categories for romantic relational anger across both samples are inappropriate communication and being treated incorrectly by the partner, their frequency varies across country (see Table 4). Specifically, the Spanish participants recalled more affective events categorized in inappropriate communication compared to Romanians, while the Romanians recalled more affective events categorized in being treated incorrectly by the partner compared to the Spanish participants. Recalling situations in which Romanians were treated in an unjust way made them to feel anger because it may imply loss of self-esteem or personal pride (Power & Dalgleish 1997) while situations categorized in inappropriate communication made the Spanish participants feel anger because it implies that the other one caused wrongly the situation (Lazarus 1991). The third more frequent category within the Romanian sample is control while within the Spanish sample is daily house activities. The categories with the lowest frequencies, for Romanian respectively Spanish participants are partner unfaithful category respectively inappropriate humor category.

For the Romanian participants the categories were organized in seven ranks while for the Spanish participants they were organized in five ranks. When analyzing the ranks same similarities and differences can be inferred. First, inappropriate communication, being treated incorrectly by the partner, exclusion and deception categories had the same ranks across the two cultures. Moreover, inappropriate communication and being treated incorrectly by the partner are the categories with the first two ranks across the two cultures, suggesting that the ranks results are in line with the frequency results. Also the ranks categories revealed some differences across the two cultures. For example, the third category rank was different across the two samples, control and daily house categories for Romanians and for Spaniards respectively. Even if the data was organized in a different number of ranks across the cultures (seven versus five), for both Romanian and Spanish participants, there are two different categories which had the last rank. More precisely, for the Romanians, daily house activities and the partner being unfaithful had the last rank (the seventh) while for

the Spaniards, deception and inappropriate humor had the last rank (fifth rank).

The results reveal that the categories ranks, which are the most important in eliciting romantic relational anger across the two cultures, are inappropriate communication and being treated incorrectly by the partner.

Qualitative analysis: Shared and country specific meanings

The results revealed same similarities and differences across the two samples within the eight common categories. For example, the situations coded in inappropriate communication category revealed that events in which the participants' partners do not pay attention to participants; they are not agreeing on different topics, or they don't find a consensus are presented by both Romanians and Spaniards. These behaviors elicit because they violate important personal expectations (Power & Dagleish 1997). By way of contrast, events in which the partners insult each other, and they still continue to fight because they don't find solutions to their problems are more specific to the Romanian cultural context. On the other hand, situations in which the participants' partners insist in continuing the fight even their arguments for what they are supporting lack and situations in which they scream to each other are more specific to the Spanish cultural context.

As well as the inappropriate communication, exclusion is a category within which we can find similarities, but also differences across cultures. For example, both participants recalled events in which their partners preferred to spend time having activities with other persons, but the Romanians also presented situations in which their partner wanted to break up before going abroad or situations in which their relationship is not evolving to the next level. Spending time with other people and not with the partner suggests a personal offence (Power & Dagleish 1997) because the partner's participant is violating the socially accepted rules of romantic relationships and also because the behavior of the partner's participant is perceived as improper or unfair (Shaver et al. 1987).

Also, there are more similarities than differences across the two cultures within being treated incorrectly by the partner category. For example, both groups of participants presented situations in which the partner is perceived as being harmful, incorrect, worthy to blame, in which the participants' partners do not take into account the participant's advices, they do not accept that the participant is right,

lack of consideration for the participant needs. Further, the partner's participant behavior is perceived as unjustified, they do not have the right to do so because it violates important personal desires or expectations by having an effect on the participant's self-esteem. Secondly, being treated incorrectly might cause a loss of personal pride and violate public or social aspects of the participants' self. In addition, the perceived incorrectness of the partner's behavior causes anger, as a response to the personal offence (Power & Dalglish 1997).

Inappropriate humor is another category in which the meanings of Romanians and Spaniards participants are similar. Both of the groups recalled and presented events in which their partners continued to joke or make bad jokes in bad times.

There are categories in which there are differences within the meanings across the two cultures. Daily house activities category is one of them. The Spaniards present situations in which their male partners do not take the responsibility for the housekeeping activities, while the Romanians recalled events in which their partner does not cook. There are also differences related to the frequencies and ranks of this category. It seems that this category has a highest importance in eliciting romantic relational anger for the Spaniards compared to the Romanians (see Table 4). This may be due to the fact that the Spanish society has more egalitarian values in which the gender roles models are less traditional than in the Romanian society.

In short, in receptor condition, romantic relational anger is a directed response to a personal offence caused by the participants' partner.

Country specific categories

This is the case of unfairness category, specific to Romanian participants, in which the participants described episodes, in which their partner did not intervene to protect them or to support them or episodes in which the partners accused the participants without real reasons, or they took decisions without taking into account the participants' opinions. These behaviors are eliciting anger because the partner of the participants did not respect the accepted social rules of romantic relationships (Clark & Mills 1993).

ANGER – SOURCE CONDITION

Validity of the coding scheme

Comparing with the list of anger's categories in receptor condition, the list of situations for anger in source condition comprises only 7

categories. Inappropriate humor and daily/ house activities are missing from this list. Over 61% (62% and 64.8% of Romanian and Spanish participants respectively) of the participants' responses were codable into one of the categories. Moreover, over 9% of data was coded into other category, while 30% of data (29.9% and 29.2% of Romanian and Spanish participants, respectively) was coded into the "no answer category". The final categories, as well as examples from each country and their relative percent and categories ranks are presented in Table 5.

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	% SP
<i>Inappropriate communication:</i> unfit behavior, fighting without finding solutions; fighting without reasons lack of active listening; offenses, reproaches	"When we are fighting and we are not ending the fight"/ "when I am screaming"/ ("Când ne certam și nu încetăm discutia"/ "cand tip")	"When we are upset and I am refusing talk about it"/ "fighting for stupid things" ("Cuando nos enfadamos y yo rehuyo hablar sobre ello"/ "discutimos por tonterias")	29.9 (1)	27.1(1)
<i>Treating incorrectly:</i> lack of consideration for partner's advices, lack of understanding; not accepting that the other one is right;	"I am not taking into account her advices and the things are working in a wrong way"/ "when I am not listening to him" / ("Nu ii ascult sfaturile si lucrurile merg prost"/ "cand nu este ascultat")	"If I am doing what I want without consulting with him" ("Si hago lo que quiero sin preguntar")	10.3 (2)	16.7(2)
<i>Exclusion:</i> ending the relationship, spending time with other people and not with the partner; doing activities without involving the partner; relationship stagnation; hypothetical ending	"I told him that we will not be long time together" ("i-am zis ca nu cred ca vom fi mult timp impreuna")	"Spending too much time for my job" ("Tener que dedicar demasiado tiempo a mi profesion")	6.9 (3)	2.1(4)
<i>Being unfaithful:</i> conversations with ex-partners or other persons;	"When I was offering my respects/ I was complimenting my ex-girlfriend or other girls" ("Cand am complimentat fosta iubita sau alte fete")	"Speaking with other guys" ("hablar con otros chicos")	4.6 (4)	4.2(3)

Definition	Example RO	Example SP	%RO	% SP
<i>Control</i> : behaviors by which partner is trying to control the other one, insinuations; violence;	“When I hit him” (“Cand l-am lovit”)	“When I don’t have the same perspectives on the things as him” (“cuando no veo las cosas como él.”)	3.4 (5)	4.2(3)
<i>Deception</i> : lying, lack of support, lack of understanding; breaking promises;	“When I preferred to stay home with my family and I did not want to go out with friends” (“Ca am preferat sa stau acasa cu familia mea si nu am vrut sa ies cu prietenii”)	“When sometimes I am not keeping my words” (“Cuando a veces no puedo cumplir con lo que digo”)	4.6 (4)	2.1(4)
<i>Unfairness</i> : no intervention to protect the partner; decisions taking just by one partner; not assuming the mistakes; accusing without real reason;	“When I fought with his best friend and after that with him also, because he did not stop him” (“cand m-am certat rau cu prietenul lui cel mai bun si apoi si cu el, ca nu l-a oprit”)	“When I am unfairly blaming him” (“cuando le eche las culpas de forma injusta”)	2.3 (6)	4.2(3)

Table 5: Coding Scheme of Situations Eliciting Anger (Source Condition)

Quantitative analysis: Percentages and ranks of categories by country
 Inappropriate communication during the partners’ interactions and treating incorrectly the partner are also the most frequent categories for romantic relational anger, when the participant is seen as perpetrator (source of emotion). The participants’ behaviors are seeing as wrongdoing, carelessness and deliberate. Despite the fact that these two categories are the most frequent, their frequencies vary across samples. Inappropriate communication was the category with the higher frequency within the Romanian sample and treating incorrectly the partner had higher frequency within the Spaniards respectively. The third most frequent category varies also across the two cultures. More precisely, exclusion is the third most frequent category within the Romanian sample while being unfaithful, control and unfairness are the third most frequent categories for the Spaniards.

The least frequent category within the Romanian participants is exclusion, and exclusion and deception are the least frequent categories within the Spanish sample.

The results related to the categories ranks are in line with those of the categories frequencies, but there are differences related to the number of ranks across cultures. These differences consist in that the

data of the Romanian participants was organized in six ranks while for the Spaniards, only four ranks were necessary. Even the frequencies across cultures differ, inappropriate communication and treating incorrectly the partner had the highest two ranks across the cultures. Along with these two categories, there is the deception category, which had the fourth rank across the cultures. While control and unfairness are the last two ranks (fifth and sixth) categories within the Romanian participants, these categories within the Spanish participants had the third rank together with the being unfaithful category.

The ranks categories suggest that in experiencing romantic relational anger, in source condition, there are similarities and differences. For example, for both participants groups, inappropriate communication and treating incorrectly the partner are the categories with the highest importance in experiencing this unpleasant emotion. In addition, the Romanians recall the situations from the unfairness category as being the least important in eliciting romantic relational anger to the participants' partner, while the situations from deception and exclusion had the lowest importance in eliciting romantic relational anger within the Spanish participants' ranks.

Qualitative analysis: Shared and country specific meanings

Within the common categories across the two cultures, there are some similarities and differences, which can be mentioned. There are some similar meanings within the two most frequent categories (inappropriate communication and treating incorrectly the partner). For example, within inappropriate communication, Romanian and Spanish participants recalled events in which during one relational conflict they are screaming to their partner, they are saying things without thinking to the consequences, they are offending and criticizing their partner and all of these made their partner feel anger. Moreover, both groups are presenting situations in which they continue to fight reasonless or situations in which they refuse to talk to their partners. Besides these, Romanian participants recalled also events in which they were fighting without reaching a common point where the conflict would be resolved or moments in which they do not listen to what their partner is saying to them as situations in which their partner is feeling angry. Next, the results of treating incorrectly the partner category reveal more similarities than differences across the two cultures. Both groups of participants described situations in which they insisted or they did not take into account their partners' advices, while the Spanish participants also recalled situations in which they were not on time for their

meetings. These results are consistent with the existing literature, which suggests that anger is elicited by losing personal pride, by appraisal of one's blocked goal, situations in which a significant other was acting in an improper way or by postponed events (Harmon-Jones & Harmon-Jones 2016).

Within control category, as in inappropriate communication category, more similarities than differences can be seen. More precisely, both groups of participants recalled situations in which they failed to satisfy the partners' expressed desires and the partner's anger gave them the impulse to correct the perceived wrong (Strongman 2003) and to assert their control over their partner (Sanford 2007). Further, deception is a category in which the Romanians recalled events as making mistakes or lying. These behaviors suggest that betrayal of trust elicits anger in romantic relational contexts as previously suggested by Fehr and her colleagues (1999). Like Romanians, Spaniards also recalled events as not keeping their word as situations in which their partners felt anger. Not keeping their words can be seen as a situation in which the participants block different goals of the participants' partners.

Country specific categories

There is no specific country category.

DISCUSSION

The aim of the present study was to create a derived-etic typology of situational categories of eliciting romantic relational hurt and romantic relational anger using two European samples (Romania and Spain) in two different social contexts (receptor and source of emotions). The derived-etic approach and the social contexts enabled us to proceed to cross-cultural comparisons but also to see the specificity of situational categories in eliciting the specific negative emotions in each culture.

The present study was not aiming to check whatever the pre-existing categories were valid across the European cultures. We wanted to avoid assuming the etic character of the Western emic concepts. Moreover, we did not want the study data to conform to preexisting theories or to a preexisting coding frame. Indeed, firstly, we wanted to understand the specific situational categories meanings given by participants across the two cultures (emic and inductive approach) and two conditions and to proceed to the cross-cultural comparisons (similarities and differences). Secondly, we compared study categories with pre-existing categories and where we found

similar matching we agreed with the pre-existing categories in order to present the etic (universal) character of situational categories in eliciting specific negative emotions. In the following we will present a short overview of the study results, and afterwards we will present the comparisons between the study results and the pre-existing categories.

Hurt – Cultures and Contexts

The results depicted in Tables 2 and 3 suggest some similarities and differences related to romantic relational hurt. Data collected for romantic relational hurt in receptor condition was coded in nine categories, eight of them being common across the two cultures and one specific to the Romanian participants. On the other side, data of romantic relational hurt in source condition was coded in twelve categories and ten out of them are common while one category was specific to each of the cultural contexts. The findings concerning the categories across the two conditions revealed more similarities: all nine categories in receptor condition are common across source condition; inappropriate communication is one of the categories with the highest frequency across the two conditions and samples. The results revealed also some differences across the two conditions. For source conditions, we created three new categories to categorize the data in. Even if the most frequent categories are present across both samples and conditions, their frequencies vary across culture and condition (see Tables 2 and 3). The results presented based on ranks revealed that the data of the Romanian participants respectively the Spanish participants in receptor condition were organized in seven respectively six ranks, while in source condition data was organized in eight ranks for the Romanian participants and four ranks for the Spanish participants respectively.

Concerning the specific categories for each condition, the findings highlighted that in receptor condition there is only one specific category for the Romanian participants while in source condition there is one specific category for each culture. Even if in receptor condition, rejection/ exclusion was mentioned only by the Romanians as being a category which elicits romantic relational hurt, for the source condition, the Spanish participants mentioned it also. In the Spanish case, it seems that the participants' partners do not reject them, while the participants do reject their partners and this behavior hurts the partners' feelings. In addition, for the source condition, we have three specific categories: mistaken intent, injustice and transgression. While two are common across the cultures (mistaken intent and

transgression), one (injustice) category is specific to the Spanish cultural context. Thus, in source condition, injustice category is specific to the Spanish participants and infidelity/flirting category is specific to the Romanian sample (even if in receptor condition, we found events described related to it across both samples). Mistaken intent is an interesting category because it suggests that the participants were aware of the facts or the events' misunderstanding, but they did not present similar situations in which they understood wrongly some aspects of their partners' interactions with other persons.

Results suggest that the events categorized into inappropriate communication, retraction of feeling of love, care, commitment and understanding, rejection/ exclusion, deception and truth telling are the ones which elicit the strongest romantic relational hurt in contexts, receptor and source of it.

Anger – Culture and Contexts

The results depicted in Tables 4 and 5 enable us to make some comparisons concerning the romantic relational anger across two conditions – receptor and source of emotion in two European samples (Romanian and Spanish). For the receptor condition, the data of anger was categorized in nine categories while for the source conditions in seven. Daily house activities and inappropriate humor categories are missing from the source condition categories list. An explanation for the reason why the daily house activities category is missing in source condition it may be related to sample's composition. Across the two cultures, the number of women is higher than the number of men. However, seven out of nine categories are common across the two conditions. While, in receptor condition there is one specific category for the Romanian participants, in source condition, there is no specific category across the two cultures. Next, in both the conditions, inappropriate communication and being treated incorrectly by the partner, respectively, treating incorrectly the partner are the most frequent categories, which had also the first two ranks. Despite this similarity, it should be noted that for Romanians, the inappropriate communication category frequency increased in source condition, while for Spaniards it decreased. Moreover, if we analyze being treated, respectively, treating incorrectly in the case of Romanians, the percent is decreasing in the source condition, comparing to the percent of this category across the Spanish sample, where it increased. In other words, for the Romanians, situations coded in inappropriate communication seem to elicit romantic relational anger more frequent

when the participant is in the source of emotion condition, while in the Spanish case, when the participant is in the receptor of emotion condition. This may be explained by the fact that during the conflicts, intimate partners are exposing their expectations which were not met and anger gives them the impulse to restore the order, to correct the wrong previously perceived (Strongman 2003). Next, for Romanians, in the receptor condition, being treated incorrectly by their partners is an important source of eliciting romantic relational anger. We supposed that the decreasing of percentage for treating incorrectly the partner, in the source condition, may suggest that the participants' awareness of treating incorrectly effects and they wish to avoid this behavior. The Spanish participants seem to treat more frequently incorrectly their partners than their partners treat them incorrectly.

As opposite to situations which elicit anger in the receptor condition, being unfaithful is one of most frequent categories in the source condition. Being unfaithful elicits anger because it violates specific rules of romantic relationships as sexual and emotional exclusivity (Hazan & Shaver 1994). The participant is seen as an agent of interruption of the partner's goal of being happy, secure and satisfied with their relationship.

Overall, there are more similarities for anger across the both conditions and samples than differences. This leads us to emphasize that romantic relational anger is an emotion caused by violation of norms, rules and specific characteristics of romantic relationships.

For the purpose of presenting an overview of typologies of romantic relational hurt and romantic relational anger in the following we will proceed also to certain comparisons of pre-existing categories and the study's categories.

Hurt

In the literature of hurt and romantic relationships researchers focused on events typology of it (Feeney 2004) and perceived causes of it (Vangelisti et al. 2005). There are some similarities and differences between the present study's categories and the previous categories. Retraction of feelings of love, commitment, care and understanding is part of Feeney's definition of active disassociation, but we decided to keep it as one category because of the relevance of the participants' responses categorized in it. Inappropriate communication is the category from Vangelisti's study adapted to the cultural contexts. Also, for criticism category (Feeney's study) we added new features to the definition. Undermining of self-concept and truth telling are the

category from Vangelisti's study. Deception/ disappointment and infidelity/ flirting categories are new categories, but deception and infidelity were part of Feeney's typology. Rejection/ exclusion is a new category, based on the rejection category of Vangelisti's study adapted to the cultural contexts, and injustice is a new category. This category did not exist in the previous categories. For the source condition, 3 new categories have been added: mistaken intent, indifference and transgression. Mistaken intent and indifference categories are retrieved from Vangelisti's study, while transgression is the new category for this condition.

Anger

There are no similar categories between Fehr and her colleagues' typology (1999) and the present study's categories on romantic relational anger. However, there are similar categories for romantic relational hurt and romantic relational anger. This is consistent with the literature which suggests that the same situation (Lemay, Overall, & Clark 2012) can elicit either anger or hurt because anger sometimes is seen as "unresolved and unexpressed pain and fear of further hurt" (L'Abate 1977, 13). Moreover, Greenberg (2010) suggests that people feel angry in response to feeling hurt because anger is the result of repetitive cycles of unresolved feelings of hurt and fear.

LIMITATIONS, CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Our work clearly has some limitations. Moreover, it will be interesting to have participants from other European cultures with different historical and social background for cross-cultural comparisons. Consequently, given that the majority of participants are women, caution in generalization of study's results must be considered. It is recommendable to explore the specific emotional dynamics of romantic relationships members with a more equivalent group.

Despite the fact that the participants' auto-selection is another limitation, the present study extends the existing literature by adding new knowledge in the area of emotions and romantic relationships. Specifically, it suggests new typologies for two important emotions based on the derived-etic approach for romantic relational hurt and romantic relational anger having: (a) within subjects design – participants were in both conditions – source and receptor of emotion; (b) European samples (Romania and Spain); (c) non-student samples;

and (d) participants aged between 18-30 years, involved in a committed relationship for at least 3 months.

Overall, on one hand, the results of this study are in concordance with the existing literature on romantic relational hurt and romantic relational anger; on the other hand, they make some important contributions by adding new perspectives on the situational categories which elicit these two negative emotions with important impacts on the romantic relationships' outcomes. Our research has highlighted that romantic relational hurt and romantic relational anger generally reflect a complex set of perceptions about the self-concept, the partner and their relationship and also a complex set of interactions between the two partners. Unpacking the complex experience of these two emotions has clinical implications. For example, knowing which situations these emotions elicit may help Emotionally Focused Couple Therapy (EFT) (Johnson & Greenberg 1987) therapists to make romantic relational hurt and romantic relational anger more accessible during the therapy sessions in order to transform them in more adaptive emotions.

Further work needs to be done in understanding the specificity of these two types of negative emotions (anger – hard emotion, hurt – soft emotion) within the romantic relational contexts. Our results are encouraged and should be validated by an actor–partner model for analyzing the situations in which the intimate partners are experiencing these emotions. Moreover, it will be interesting to see the effects of each category on relationship outcomes as satisfaction, positive and negative affectivity. In addition, future work should concentrate on the effects of categories on the receptor of emotion and the source of it, on perception about the self, the partner and the relationship's level.

REFERENCES:

- Adamopoulos, J., & Lonner, W. J. 1994. Absolutism, relativism, and universalism in the study of human behavior. *Psychology and Culture*: 129-134.
- Berry, J., Y. H. Poortinga, S. Breugelmans, A. Chasiotis, & D. Sam. 2011. *Cross-Cultural Psychology: Research and Applications* (3rd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boiger, M., & Mesquita, B. 2012. The construction of emotion in interactions, relationships, and cultures. *Emotion Review*, 4(3): 221-229.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2): 77-101.
- Bulmer, M. 1979. Concepts in the analysis of qualitative data. *The Sociological Review*, 27(4): 651-677.

- Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. 1979. Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(1): 12-24.
- Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. 1993. The difference between communal and exchange relationships: What it is and is not. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19(6): 684-691.
- Clark, M. S., Mills, J., & Powell, M. C. 1986. Keeping track of needs in communal and exchange relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(2): 333-338.
- Clark, M. S., & Taraban, C. 1991. Reactions to and willingness to express emotion in communal and exchange relationships. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 27(4): 324-336.
- Cohen, J. 1960. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1): 37-46.
- Davidson, A. R., Jaccard, J. J., Triandis, H. C., Morales, M. L., & Diaz, Guerrero, R. 1976. Cross-cultural model testing: toward a solution of the etic-emic dilemma. *International Journal of Psychology*, 11(1): 1-13.
- De Leersnyder, J., Mesquita, B., & Kim, H. S. 2011. Where do my emotions belong? A study of immigrants' emotional acculturation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(4): 451-463.
- De Leersnyder, J., Boiger, M., & Mesquita, B. 2013. Cultural regulation of emotion: Individual, relational, and structural sources. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4(55): 1-11.
- Ekman, P., & Cordaro, D. 2011. What is meant by calling emotions basic. *Emotion Review*, 3(4): 364-370.
- Feeney, J. A. 2005. Hurt feelings in couple relationships: Exploring the role of attachment and perceptions of personal injury. *Personal Relationships*, 12(2): 253-271.
- Feeney, J. A. 2004. Hurt feelings in couple relationships: Towards integrative models of the negative effects of hurtful events. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 21(4): 487-508.
- Fehr, B., Baldwin, M., Collins, L., Patterson, S., & Benditt, R. 1999. Anger in close relationships: An interpersonal script analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(3): 299-312.
- Frijda, N. H. 1988. The laws of emotion. *American Psychologist*, 43(5): 349-358.
- Gottman, J. M. 1993. The roles of conflict engagement, escalation, and avoidance in marital interaction: a longitudinal view of five types of couples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61(1): 6-15.
- Gottman, J., & Silver, N. 2004. *Siete reglas de oro para vivir en pareja*. Barcelona: DeBolsillo.
- Greenberg, L. S. 2010. Emotion-focused therapy: A clinical synthesis. *Focus*, 8(1): 32-42.
- Greenberg, L. S., James, P. S., & Conry, R. F. 1988. Perceived change processes in emotionally focused couples therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 12(1): 1-10.
- Harmon-Jones, E., & Harmon-Jones, C. 2016. Anger. In L. Feldman Barrett, M. Lewis, & J. M. Haviland-Jone (eds.). *Handbook of Emotions*. Guilford Press, pp. 774-791.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. 1994. Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5(1): 1-22.

- Helfrich, H. 1999. Beyond the dilemma of cross-cultural psychology: Resolving the tension between etic and emic approaches. *Culture & Psychology*, 5(2): 131-153.
- Hofstede, G. 1983. National cultures in four dimensions: A research-based theory of cultural differences among nations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 13(1-2): 46-74.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. 2010. *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind. Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. 1985. Measurement in cross-cultural psychology: A review and comparison of strategies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 16(2): 131-152.
- Johnson, S. M., & Greenberg, L. S. 1987. Emotionally focused marital therapy: An overview. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 24(3S): 552-560.
- Kagan, J. 2010. Emotions and Temperament. In M. H. Bornstein, *Handbook of Cultural Developmental Science*. New York: Psychology Press, pp. 175-195.
- Koch, L. C., Niesz, T., & McCarthy, H. 2014. Understanding and reporting qualitative research: An analytical review and recommendations for submitting authors. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 57(3): 131-143.
- L'Abate, L. 1977. Intimacy is sharing hurt feelings: A reply to David Mace. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 3(2): 13-16.
- Lazarus, R. S. 1991. Progress on a cognitive-motivational-relational theory of emotion. *American Psychologist*, 46(8): 819-834.
- Leary, M. R., Springer, C., Negel, L., Ansell, E., & Evans, K. 1998. The causes, phenomenology, and consequences of hurt feelings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(5): 1225-1237.
- Lemay Jr, E. P., Overall, N. C., & Clark, M. S. 2012. Experiences and interpersonal consequences of hurt feelings and anger. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(6): 982-1006.
- Matsumoto, D. 1989. Cultural influences on the perception of emotion. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20(1): 92-105.
- Mesquita, B., & Boiger, M. 2014. Emotions in context: A sociodynamic model of emotions. *Emotion Review*, 6(4): 298-302.
- Mesquita, B., & Walker, R. 2003. Cultural differences in emotions: A context for interpreting emotional experiences. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 41(7): 777-793.
- Mesquita, B., Boiger, M., & De Leersnyder, J. 2017. Doing emotions: The role of culture in everyday emotions. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 28(1): 95-133.
- Mesquita, B., Boiger, M., & De Leersnyder, J. 2016. The cultural construction of emotions. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 8: 31-36.
- Mikulas, W. L., & Vodanovich, S. J. 1993. The essence of boredom. *The Psychological Record*, 43(1), 3-12.
- Niblo, D. M., & Jackson, M. S. 2004. Model for combining the qualitative emic approach with the quantitative derived etic approach. *Australian Psychologist*, 39(2): 127-133.

- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. 2004. Enhancing the interpretation of significant findings: The role of mixed methods research. *The Qualitative Report*, 9(4): 770-792.
- Power, M., & Dalgleish, T. 1997. *Cognition and emotion. From order to disorder*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Rogers, K. B., & Smith-Lovin, L. 2012. Answering the call for a sociological perspective on the multilevel social construction of emotion: A comment on Boiger and Mesquita. *Emotion Review*, 4(3): 232-233.
- Rusu, P. P. 2016. Dyadic coping in Romanian couples. In M. K. Falconier, A. K. Randall, & G. Bodenmann (eds.). *Couples Coping with Stress: A Cultural Perspective*. New York: NY: Routledge, pp. 187-202.
- Sanford, K. 2007. Hard and soft emotion during conflict: Investigating married couples and other relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 14(1): 65-90.
- Sanford, K., & Rowatt, W. C. 2004. When is negative emotion positive for relationships? An investigation of married couples and roommates. *Personal Relationships*, 11(3): 329-354.
- Shaver, P., Schwartz, J., Kirson, D., & O'Connor, C. 1987. Emotion knowledge: further exploration of a prototype approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(6): 1061-1086.
- Strongman, K. 2003. *The Psychology of Emotion*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Vangelisti, A. L., & Young, S. L. 2000. When words hurt: The effects of perceived intentionality on interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 17(3): 393-424.
- Vangelisti, A. L., Young, S. L., Carpenter-Theune, K. E., & Alexander, A. L. 2005. Why does it hurt? The perceived causes of hurt feelings. *Communication Research*, 32(4): 443-477.