A Prototype Analysis of Missing: Centrality, Valence, and Correlates of the Experience of Interpersonal Separation

Remy Fiorentino

Haverford College

Abstract

To date there has been no research on the experience of "missing" in romantic relationships. The current study seeks to define and analyze the concept of missing from a prototype perspective. In Study 1, subjects listed features of missing. In Study 2, centrality and valence rankings for these features were collected, and a prototype of missing was created. Analysis revealed significant differences in how each gender defined missing. Analysis also revealed a number of significant correlations between specific feature ratings and attachment style, implicit theories of relationships, self-esteem, and neuroticism. The correlations between centrality/valence of features and certain personality traits, such as low self-esteem, suggest serious potential problems in the context of a "missing" situation. Each independent variable yielded a prototype that differed significantly from the general prototype, suggesting that it may be crucial to relationship stability and satisfaction to understand how one's partner might define missing differently from one's self.

Introduction

In any romantic relationship, individuals must learn to cope with a partner who is not always right by their side. Most of the time, this separation is inevitable and becomes accepted, lest the couple break up. A husband and wife will normally part ways in the morning, and rejoin each other's company after work. A college couple might have different classes and schedules, and live in separate dorms, but still make time when possible to be with one another. Sometimes, however, the separation is more than momentary; at some point for each individual, one should begin to "miss" the other person that he or she is separated from. We all may have some idea of what it means to miss another person, especially a romantic partner, but surprisingly, there has not been any empirical research to uncover what this common experience really means.

Long distance relationships seem to have become more prevalent (Scott, 2002). With the popularity of internet and cell-phone use among college-aged adults, individuals have the ability to communicate with a romantic partner at almost any hour, and for very little expense. The ease of maintaining open and constant communication has probably helped to make the separation and distance more bearable. Although this communication may help to reduce the perception that one lacks psychological intimacy, it may not be as effective in reducing one's feelings of missing. Anecdotally and intuitively, missing someone seems to be the perception of one's separation from a loved one. Conversely, believing that one lacks adequate psychological intimacy is more global and takes into account all relationships, or lack thereof. Regardless of the exact numbers or frequency, anecdotal evidence supports a rise in long distance relationships, and presumably a corresponding increase in feelings of missing.

Understanding the construct of missing and its correlates can help to elucidate and ultimately mitigate the negative aspects of missing and interpersonal separation. Furthermore,

exposing the differences between groups of people and how (or if) they experience missing differently may help make relationships more harmonious. Perhaps an individual, upon realizing how important constant communication is to his or her significant other, would take steps to show affection more readily, thereby improving the relationship. Understanding differences within a group also can also benefit therapy. In either an intrapersonal or interpersonal setting, understanding how different groups of people experience missing differently can help therapists and laypeople to understand these feelings, and perhaps change them.

Aim of the Study

In the psychological literature, the concept of missing or separation has been largely ignored. It is not clear why this is the case, but this study seeks to address this void in a preliminary but broad-based way. The goal of this study is to identify the key features that comprise the general concept or prototype of missing. Beyond that, an exploratory study will be conducted to see how different aspects of an individual's personality, as well as one's tendencies in relationships, may correlate with how that individual experiences or defines this feeling.

Before we can examine the correlates of missing we must first define the concept. A concept as ephemeral as missing, love, or commitment is obviously very difficult to define with a simple sentence or set of questions. Missing is a personal and subjective emotion. Fehr (1988) found significant variability between individuals when subjects were asked to list features for, and rate the centrality of, the experiences of love and commitment—two constructs quite similar to missing. We can presume that by its very nature, missing will also mean slightly different things for everyone, and these differences are neither trivial nor uninteresting. This study will employ a prototype analysis similar to that used by Fehr (1988), to find which elements are most

universally held as being part of the concept of missing, and which of those are most “central” or “peripheral”.

Some individuals may resist the prototype methodology, or any other mode of inquiry, as a fruitful means to elucidate the meaning of an emotional word such as missing. Indeed, Fehr’s (1988) literature review found at least eighteen different “definitions” of love. Researchers working on the similar concept of loneliness have also met with problems in trying to operationalize and define that concept (Mikulincer & Segal, 1990). Emotions and the words that describe them are by their very nature subjective and varied. These past difficulties only underscore why the prototype methodology is the most precise way to define an emotional construct like missing, as it is centered around the subjective evaluations of many individuals.

Still others might be concerned that this method does not rely on the overt, observable, and measurable responses favored by behaviorists. Stokes (1987) replies to such concerns by calling upon psychologists to use “description, and in-depth analysis of the meaning of loneliness to individuals” (p. 57), not just observable behavior, in order to understand and help define a concept. In allowing for individual differences and disagreement among subjects, one can examine, understand, and possibly explain those differences, and in doing so substantially contribute to the literature.

Prototype Analysis

Past researchers have tried to characterize concepts such as loneliness or love by using a “classical definition;” that is where each concept has a complete list of features that are both necessary and sufficient. The fact that the earlier researchers have not been able to agree on such a definition suggests that laypeople indeed do not use a classical definition for these concepts (Fehr, 1988). Furthermore, such definitions require categorical membership—a binary all-or-

none situation—where all those within a group are essentially homogenous. Emotions vary from person to person, both in terms of what elicits them, and how the individual evaluates them, and any study that tries to examine these emotions must take that variability into account. By using a prototype analysis, we can determine which features are common to the greatest number of individuals. These highly-consistent features become the prototype of "missing", to which we can compare specific individuals or groups and make relative judgments and predictions.

Importantly, the prototype analysis will show us concepts that are *unique* to a particular group of people. For example, almost every subject might rate "wanting to be with" as a highly central concept, but maybe only women tend to rate "looking at old photographs" as something central to the experience of missing. For these reasons, prototype analysis has recently become widely accepted as a method to systematically examine and compare subjective or emotional concepts, and is be the model used for this study.

Past Research

Fehr's (1988) research closely examined the lay concepts of love and commitment. Her series of studies took a prototype perspective and sought to define these concepts in practical terms, and to also see how they related to each other. Fehr's work is the basis of the current study, and the model we are using to define missing. In Fehr's first study, subjects listed features of love and commitment that they felt best embodied the prevailing lay definition. In Study 2, Fehr asked a second sample to rate how central they considered each feature (that is, each feature listed more than twice, from Study 1) to the concepts of love and commitment using a scale of 1 (extremely poor feature) to 8 (extremely good feature). The individual centrality ratings were averaged for all subjects and the mean ratings show which features were regarded as most central to the concepts. For example, the top-rated features of love were "trust" and "caring", with

ratings of 7.5 and 7.3 respectively. For comparison, “excitement” was rated 5.0, and “scary”, the least central feature, was rated 2.3. According to Fehr’s methodology, trust and caring are the most central features of love, and therefore form the foundation of a prototype for love.

This study will borrow from the methodology of Fehr, but will extend beyond just a prototype analysis. We are looking for more and different kinds of information than what she sought in her second study. Hassebrauck and Aron (2001) looked at relationship quality and prototype matching in relationships. Relationships that were judged as being closer to the general prototype of a typical relationship tended to experience greater relationship satisfaction. They found that atypical relationships were less satisfying, and our study may help to elucidate what it is that makes these relationships atypical. For example, this study will look at is the correlation between specific personality traits or relationship tendencies, and centrality ratings. A highly neurotic person, a person with low self-esteem, or a person with an insecure attachment style seems much more likely to relate to a loved one in an atypical, if not harmful way. It is easy to imagine a situation where one’s neuroticism and anxiety leads to a focusing on certain less-typically-central aspects of missing such as worry or fear. Using correlational data from our Study 2, we can examine the relationship between these personality and relationship traits, and how they experience missing. It is hypothesized that highly neurotic individuals see certain items, such as “worrying about your partner” as being more central to their experience of missing than the general population would. Strong correlations between neuroticism and peripheral (atypical) features of missing would extend and bolster Hassebrauck and Aron’s (2001) findings. It would also help to show just *how* exactly these relationship prototypes differ across personality scales and demographics.

Loneliness

Missing, also known as interpersonal separation, may appear to be closely linked to the feeling of loneliness. For example Rokach and Brock (1995) consider “relocation/significant separation” as one of five factors that can cause loneliness. Additionally, Shaver and Buhrmester (1983) conceptualize loneliness as having two main component causes: a perceived lack of psychological intimacy, and a perceived lack of integrated involvement. The former is characterized by a lack of one-on-one involvement, whereas the latter is characterized by a lack of active participation in a group or team.

The word loneliness is closely related to the adjectives “lone” and “alone. A preliminary look at previous research (Heffner, Le, Loving, & MacLin, 2002) showed that subjects listed alone, lonely, sad, anxious, and depressed, most frequently when asked to list words that come to mind when thinking about someone who was separated from them (a definition of missing). While there was obviously some overlap with the concept of loneliness, there were also many words that would not have been listed if loneliness and separation were identical concepts. “Love”, “longing”, and “desire”, would probably not have been mentioned frequently if loneliness and missing meant the same thing. Using data from our Study 1 will help to define the concept of missing more clearly. In doing so, we may also help to clarify the distinction between missing and loneliness by showing that missing has many features that were not found in previous loneliness research.

The experience of missing does not necessarily require feelings of loneliness, however. An individual may miss a romantic partner, but he or she is still probably not alone—they may to have additional friends or family to offer support through involvement and intimacy. Additionally, a man might miss his girlfriend because she is away, but they need not be truly separated from each other. Geographic separation need not include emotional or communicative

separation. If she is on a trip, she can call and talk; long distance couples can write letters, drive to see each other, or use the internet to communicate via email or instant messaging. Loneliness and the feeling of missing that comes from separation are not necessarily synonymous, but may contain similarities.

According to Peplau and Perlman (1982), loneliness is an unpleasant subjective experience that arises from a perception of insufficient social relationships. That is, loneliness is how individuals feel when they perceive inadequate social contact when considering their entire social network. Intuitively, this definition could be a definition for missing, but might similarly describe social anxiety, or a reason for depression. Clearly, a simple dictionary-style definition does little to elucidate how loneliness is felt and experienced. It lacks descriptive power and does not lend itself to easy testing in any empirical setting, although obviously many attempts have been made.

Bereavement

Bereavement, also known as grief, is the term for the feeling of loss when a loved one dies (Aiken, 2001). Bereavement is an irrevocable state—once a person dies, he or she will not return, and so it is generally a more negative and intense emotion than missing or loneliness. The prevailing theories about bereavement agree that bereavement is a multiple-stage experience. The first stage is characterized by initial shock, bewilderment, and anger. The middle stage(s) involve a range of emotions including volatility, confusion, depression, and rumination. The final stage is described as one of reorganization, acceptance, and recovery (Aiken, 2001). There is disagreement over the middle stages; Aiken notes that some theorists support a three-stage model, while others posit a seven-stage model.

Typically, the experience of bereavement and grief immediately follows the death of a loved one, leaving the individual without that person to provide support or intimacy. In this way, bereavement could be similar to missing, but on a larger and more permanent scale. Both bereavement and missing occur during involuntary separation from a loved one, resulting in negative emotion. In the case of missing a romantic partner, the separation is generally only temporary, and he or she will eventually return. In the case of a breakup or divorce, the relationship may not return to its formerly happy state, however the partner is still alive, and the level of negative emotion should be lower. Although the construct of missing may share certain characteristics with loneliness and bereavement, the apparently-substantial differences warrant a targeted examination of missing by itself.

In summary, loneliness parallels missing because *perception of inadequate intimacy* seems to be a component of both concepts. Loneliness however, is a generalized experience: an individual feels lonely in general, but a non-lonely person can simply miss one person and not feel largely isolated. Bereavement shares the component *undesired separation from a loved one with missing*, however in bereavement the person is deceased rather than simply separated. A comparative study of all three constructs may show substantial overlap, but there is ample cause at the current time to warrant an examination of "missing" on its own, leaving comparison studies for future research.

The Current Study

As mentioned before, the methodology of this prototype study will follow that of Fehr and others (Hassebrauck & Aron, 2001; Helgeson et al., 1987). The first part of the study, (Study 1) involves obtaining a list of free-response features that come to mind when one thinks about missing. The second part of our study (Study 2) will have a second set of participants rate the

centrality for the most commonly-listed features, and complete scales assessing aspects of their personality, including neuroticism, attachment style, self-esteem, and their implicit theories of relationships.

Gender

Erber & Erber (2001) note that "for every study that reports gender differences on such measures as Rubin's Love Scale… romanticism… or passionate love… there is an equal number of studies that fail to find gender differences" (p. 123). Rotenberg & Korol (1995) found gender differences among single students for loneliness as well as "love style" using the Love Attitude Scale. Cramer & Neyedley (1998) found a significant difference between genders for loneliness when controlled for masculinity. They found that when controlling for the masculine sex-role, men tended to be lonelier than women, but that those differences were not significant when just comparing gender. Fehr (1988) reported no significant gender differences for centrality ratings in the prototype analysis of love and commitment. Because "missing" seems to be a complex and layered experience with a high degree of subjectivism (Heffner, Le, Loving, & MacLin, 2002), we expect to find gender differences.

Attachment Style

Attachment style is a dimension of an individual's personality that guides and influences the way that he or she interacts with and becomes intimate with others (Erber & Erber, 2001; Bowlby, 1982). Bowlby found that children develop an attachment style towards their caregivers that is relatively stable over time. He identified three types or styles of attachment: secure, anxious, and avoidant. Although they are certainly not immutable or permanent, attachment styles have been shown to be moderately stable, even into adulthood. Securely attached adults are comfortable being close with others, and being depended on, as well as depending on others.

They do not generally worry about getting “too close” to someone, or fear being abandoned. Anxiously-attached individuals perceive others as less willing to be intimate. They believe their partner may not love them as much, or that the partner is not as committed as the anxious individual wants him or her to be. Avoidantly-attached adults are sometimes uncomfortable with being too close to a partner and do not want to be too intimate or dependent. Hazan and Shaver (1987) found that 56% of individuals were considered as having a secure attachment style; 19% as having an anxious style; and 25% as an avoidant style—rates almost identical to those previously found among children.

There is strong evidence that the attachment styles of two partners have a deep impact on the present and future of their relationship. Certain pairings seem to be highly stable over time. This finding is of interest in the current study because it seems likely that high relationship stability, in the face of either high or low satisfaction, would influence how individuals experiences, and thus defines, missing. While the secure-secure dyad is an obvious one, (which is in fact marked by the highest stability and satisfaction), anxious-avoidant pairs are similarly stable. Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) found no anxious-anxious or avoidant-avoidant dyads in their sample of over 350 subjects. Erber and Erber (2001) explain this in terms of expectations—an anxious-avoidant pair, just like a secure-secure one, conforms to each individual’s expectations of what a relationship is supposed to be. Although this study will not examine subjects’ partners’ attachment styles, it is important to understand trends in attachment style pairing, and their implications for the relationship’s future. Kirkpatrick and Davis’s findings will allow us to speculate on the relationship satisfaction of the dyad, even though we will only be collecting data from one of persons in that couple.

Keelan, Dion, and Dion (1994) found that insecure individuals in relationships had significantly lower satisfaction, commitment, and trust when compared to secure individuals. An individual with a secure attachment style might experience missing differently if he or she is currently paired with an avoidant or anxious individual. This relationship might be less stable and satisfying than normal, and he or she might miss the person less, or rate negative aspects of missing as more central than she usually would if she were matched with a secure individual.

An individual with an anxious attachment style seems likely to have particular difficulty managing his or her emotions when a partner is physically separated from them. Feeney and Kirkpatrick (1996) found that insecurely-attached (i.e., not securely-attached) individuals showed higher levels of anxiety than secure individuals when trying to perform tasks with their romantic partner absent from the room. This too leads us to hypothesize that the experience of missing is significantly different between groups. An anxious or avoidant person would most likely show even more stress in a real-life setting where they are separated for a much longer period of time. Furthermore, because the security and satisfaction of a relationship is inevitably tied to a partner's attachment style as well, we expect would that both the individual's and the partner's style would influence the experience of missing.

Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) proposed a four-category of attachment style model in lieu of Hazan and Shaver's (1987) three-category model. Bartholomew and Horowitz conceptualized this model as having two dimensions: how the individual perceives himself or herself, and how he or she perceives others (see Figure 1, from Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991, p. 227). The three-category model is essentially intact, with the exception of avoidantly attached individuals now comprising two groups. Dismissing avoidants limit intimacy because it contradicts their goal of autonomy and independence. Fearful avoidants have a negative model of

themselves in addition to a negative model of others, and therefore limit intimacy so as to avoid rejection (Collins & Allard, 2001).

This study will use a two-dimensional attachment scale, developed by Brennan, Clark, & Shaver (1998). For consistency, the "model of other" as referenced in Figure 1 will herein be referred to as the avoidance scale, and the "model of self" as the anxiety scale. Shaver and Fraley (1997) strongly recommend researchers to use such a scale because there is no evidence that these categories actually exist as distinct types, and that precision can be gained when using a two-dimensional scale rather than a typological measure.

Implicit Theories of Relationships

Implicit theories of relationships predict and seek to distinguish two categories of personal orientations towards relationships and their development. Implicit theories state that individuals should subscribe to either a theory of "growth" or "destiny". Knee (1998) reports that individuals who favor believe that "successful relationships are constructed and developed by conquering obstacles and growing closer," (p. 361). Also, those individuals that endorse destiny beliefs "may be sensitive to early indications that they cannot succeed…and thus, may similarly tend to give up easily," (p. 361). Individuals favoring destiny tend to support a less flexible view of love and of people, making the implicit assumption that people cannot or do not change very much. However, if a destiny individual is highly satisfied from the beginning, he or she tends to enjoy above-average satisfaction and longevity when compared to a growth individual.

Knee (1998) found that the relationship between initial satisfaction and longevity was much stronger for those individuals that subscribed heavily to destiny as their implicit theory. For those favoring growth, relationship longevity was only marginally improved by having high initial satisfaction. Knee (1998) also found that growth individuals favored active coping,

planning, and suppression of competing activities. Belief in destiny was associated with restraint and disengagement in response to a negative event in the relationship.

We expect to see individuals favoring growth to view missing as a neutral or even positive and beneficial situation, occurring in the natural course of a relationship. Indeed it seems that no two people can spend every waking hour in each other's company, practically or psychologically. If those who favor growth in this study do view separation as necessary or at least not overly-negative, then we anticipate strong correlations with optimistic and pro-relational (i.e., potentially helpful for maintaining the relationship, such as "thinking about the future")features of missing. Though a person with a "destiny" orientation may feel disinterested or worried about the future when he or she is separated from a loved one, an individual favoring a "growth" view might feel excited to see their partner again. This might be similar to the way a securely attached individual would experience missing.

Self-Esteem

According to Branden (1987, as quoted in Covington, 2001, p. 351) "Self-esteem is the *evaluative* component of self-concept." This involves judgments of one's values and abilities. A person with high self-esteem will judge themselves as more loveable, less limited, and more able to overcome limitations and meet challenges, when compared to an individual with low self-esteem.

It seems likely that poor self-esteem will correlate strongly with certain psychological problems or personality factors. Self-esteem has been shown to negatively correlate with feelings of depression and loneliness (Ouellet & Joshi, 1986). There is also evidence that self-esteem is related to attachment style, where securely attached individuals have significantly higher self-esteem than insecurely attached ones (Feeney & Noller, 1990).

Because individuals with low self-esteem also have a tendency to ruminate more frequently and more negatively (Di Paula & Campbell, 2002), we expect that individuals with low self-esteem should also experience missing in a substantively different way. Rumination involves the replaying of past negative events over and over in one's mind. We expect someone with a tendency to ruminate within a relationship, especially a long distance relationship, will focus more on the negative or anxious aspects of missing and less on the positive or hopeful aspects.

Dion and Dion (1973) found that individuals with high self-esteem experienced romantic love more frequently, but that those with lower self-esteem reported the relationships as being more intense. The lower self-esteem individuals also evaluated their partners more favorably, which might at first seem to contradict Di Paula and Campbell's (2002) findings. Because lower self-esteem individuals tend to have less frequent and more intense relationships, it is plausible that any given romantic partner is more important to them than it would be for a high self-esteem individual. If this were the case, then Dion and Dion's (1973) findings are reconciled with Di Paula and Campell's (2002): an individual who places high importance on an uncommon relationship will likely suffer more stress or anxiety during times of separation. That is, we expect self-esteem to be negatively correlated with neuroticism and anxious attachment style. We also expect low self-esteem individuals to rate anxious features of missing as consistently more central and less negative.

Neuroticism

Neuroticism is one of the "big-five" aspects of personality delineated by McCrae & Costa (1985). Neuroticism is generally defined as the tendency to have a negative self-concept and feel greater amounts of negative emotion. More commonly, and easier to understand, is the tendency

to define neuroticism in terms of its traits or common manifestations. Neurotic individuals are often anxious, depressed, tense, irrational, shy, moody, or have poor emotional control and feelings of guilt, (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985).

Although neuroticism is an important factor of personality, it has been shown to correlate highly with a large range of different problems and disorders. As Claridge and Davis (2000) note, nearly every time neuroticism is included in a test battery, significant differences are found. Neuroticism has been shown to correlate strongly with many instances of abnormal functioning, and therefore when used by itself its predictive power may be diminished. For example anxiety, depression, and shyness may often occur in tandem, but a neurotic individual need not have all three elements. Therefore, knowing this individual has scored highly on a neuroticism test does not necessarily elucidate which traits the person has.

For the purposes of this study we will not be trying to predict pathologies that may be related to neuroticism. The neuroticism subscale of our questionnaire will be used as a general catch-all to identify predisposition to negatively affective behavior. One can imagine how an individual who shows several affective symptoms of anxiety or depression might experience missing in a different way than someone who did not show any. Conceptually, we should expect neuroticism to correlate with insecure attachment styles, especially preoccupied (highly anxious, low avoidance) attachment. Buunk (1997) in fact found such a correlation. He also found that neuroticism correlated highly with jealousy, which suggests we can expect correlations to certain features of missing as well. We additionally expect neuroticism to be negatively correlated with self-esteem, as one of the characteristics of neuroticism is negative self-concept.

Besides attachment style, neuroticism has also been shown to correlate particularly highly with worry and anxiety (Keogh, French, & Reidy, 1998). We expect that because of the close

link between neuroticism and worry, individuals scoring high on the neuroticism scale will rate negative and ruminative features of missing as more central to the construct, and by extension, more salient to them personally. An individual who worries or ruminates excessively about a loved one should miss that person more strongly, and more negatively, than one who does not worry much at all.

Study 1

The purpose of Study 1 was to generate a list of the most frequently cited features of missing. This is directly comparable to Fehr's (1988) Study 1. Once collected, these words can be assessed for centrality and importance to the individual in Study 2.

Method

Procedure

Subjects (*N* = 76: 28 men and 48 women from an introductory psychology class at Haverford College) were given a questionnaire asking them to list features of "missing". Subjects were asked to "Think for a moment about what it means to 'miss' a romantic partner… For example, you might want to list things including what you feel like, think about, or things you do when you miss someone" (see Appendix 1 for the full text of the task for Study 1). The mean age for the subjects was 18.7 (*SD* = .95). Subjects were predominantly white (78.9%). 41.1% of subjects reported being in a relationship (*M* = 63.8 weeks; SD = 55.8), and of those 32 individuals in relationships, 11 of them (34.4%) reported being in a long distance relationship (*M* distance = 335.9 miles; *SD* = 303.7 miles). Subjects listed as many features as they could within three minutes. The mean number of features listed was 8.0 (*SD* = 3.7).

Grouping Words into Features

During the first round of coding, each judge began by reading over each list of features and transcribing into a word processor. In doing so, the words and phrases were formatted in a way that would make them more consistent with each other and make them easier to sort. For assistance in doing this we used Fehr's (1988) and Rosenberg and Sedlak's (1972) methodology for combining free response entries. A summary is available as Appendix 2, borrowed directly from Fehr (p. 561).

Once the phrases were transcribed, each of the four judges independently counted the frequency of each phrase, and then judges met in pairs to review their lists. In the rare instances where a feature was coded differently between the two, they came to a consensus after considering the alternative coding. Upon completion of each of the two lists, the judges combined the two lists together, and again went through the consensus procedure for each phrase listed, also making sure that the word forms were the same. The judges counted the frequencies of each of the unique features, and every feature mentioned at least twice was kept for use in Study 2. In addition, several features that were mentioned only once were included. We did this at our discretion to create a greater range of the types of features. In particular, there were a low number of positive features of missing, which we expected would correlate with avoidant attachment style, so we included some of them. Allowing additional features that are "peripheral" to the prototype of missing should improve the power of the correlation tests. We expect that these low-frequency features will be rated as peripheral in general, but will be significantly more central and have a higher valence for some of trait scales.

Results

In Study 1 we compiled a frequency table of free-response features that came to mind when subjects were asked to describe the feeling of missing. Table 1 shows the complete final list of frequencies sorted by the number of subjects that listed each feature.

No single feature was listed by a majority of the subjects, and most features were listed by three or fewer subjects. The most frequently listed feature of missing was “feeling lonely”, which was mentioned (or a variant of it) as a feature of missing by 38 individuals. The fifth most frequently-listed feature, “reminiscing”, was mentioned by 16 individuals, representing only 21.1% of the subjects.

The majority of items listed in Study 1 were “feeling” states, such as “feeling sad” or feeling empty”, and “thinking” states, such as “reminiscing” or “thinking about partner”. Other categories which seemed to emerge included actions like “crying”, desires like “sexual desire”, and physical states like “heartache”. The majority of features could be categorized as having a negative affect or connotation, especially the “feeling” states. The “thinking” states, actions, and desires could be characterized as generally being pro-relational, although they do not generally seem affectively-positive on their face.

Study 2

Method

The goal of Study 2 was to collect centrality and valence rankings for the features found in Study 1, producing a prototype definition for missing comparable to Fehr’s definitions of love and commitment. Additionally, Study 2 looked at how the ratings of specific features correlated with various personality and relationship tendencies

Procedure

For Study 2, an online questionnaire was created using the word list collected in Study 1 (Table 1). Subjects were told to “rate how central (i.e., typical vs. atypical) each of the following features is to the experience of ‘missing’ someone. In addition, please rate the extent to which each is pleasant or unpleasant” (see Appendix 3 for the full instructions of Study 2). Those subjects not currently in relationships were instructed to consider their most recent relationship.

The participants (*N*=71: 39 men and 31 women; 1 subject did not indicate gender) came from the Haverford College student body. The average age was 20.27 (*SD*=1.28; Range=18-22). The subjects were predominantly white (78.6%). 37 subjects reported currently being involved in a romantic relationship (*M* length of relationship = 64.3 weeks; *SD* = 59.2 weeks). Of those in relationships, 8 reported being in a long distance relationship (*M* distance = 1375 miles; *Mdn* = 400 miles; *SD* = 2399).

Students were recruited on campus to participate in the study and were offered the chance to win a small cash prize of 25 dollars. The online questionnaire was administered in a lab setting rather than emailed as a web link out of concern that a non-lab setting would be too distracting for a questionnaire of this length. The subsequent sections of the test were self-reported scales, looking at attachment style, neuroticism, self-esteem and implicit theories of relationships.

Measures

Brennan, Bartholomew, and Shaver’s (1998) Experiences in Close Relationships scale was designed to measure attachment style with two independent scales: anxious attachment and avoidant attachment. These two scales are modeled after the adult attachment categories first proposed by Bowlby (1982), and later revised for by Hazan & Shaver (1987) and Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). The 36-item scale contains two subscales, each consisting of 18 items rated on a 7-point Likert scale. Brennan et al reported the internal consistency (alpha) for anxious

and avoidant attachment as .91 and .94 respectively. In the present study, internal consistency was .90 and .90 respectively. See Appendix 4 for the complete attachment scale and instructions as used in this study.

Growth and destiny were measured using a revised version of Knee's (1998) Implicit Theories of Relationship scale. The original study consisted of four items for each of the two scales, and was rated on a 7-point Likert scale. The original scales had an alpha of .71-.80 for growth and .68-.71 for destiny. The version of the scale used in Study 2 is a 22 item revised by Knee (yet unpublished) and includes 7 additional items for each subscale. The internal reliability alphas for the new scale in our Study 2 were .79 for growth, and .85 for destiny. See Appendix 4 for the complete scale and instructions as used in this study.

Rosenberg (1965) created the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale to measure one's overall positive or negative self-evaluation and self-concept. The scale has ten items and is scored on a 4-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". This scale is well-accepted as a short and reliable scale to measure self-esteem. Internal consistency was .88 for this study, which is comparable to other alpha reliability scores for this 10-item measure. See Appendix 4 for the complete Rosenberg Self-esteem scale and instructions as used in this study.

John, Donahue, and Kentle's (1991) "Big Five Inventory" of personality is a 44-item scale designed to measure neuroticism, openness, extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness, collectively known as the "big five" personality factors. This study administered all 44 items, but only the 8-item neuroticism scale was used. See Appendix 4 for the complete scale (neuroticism scale consists of items 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39). The neuroticism scale is scored on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly".

Results

List of Features

The list is shorted by mean centrality from 1 (highest *M* centrality rating) to 77 (lowest *M* centrality rating). This study will not examine differences between “central” and “peripheral” features of missing as previous prototype analyses have done. However, for possible future research, the median centrality rating was 4.51, so the 38 features that scored above that could be considered central, while the 39 below could be considered peripheral if a 50% median-split were used to determine which features were central.

Although some of the most frequently listed items from Table 1 also appear among the most central items in Table 2, many others have very low centrality ratings. For example, Feeling Empty was the 8th most frequently mentioned feature from Study 1, but was only the 57th most central feature. Conversely, “wanting to talk” was only mentioned by 6 individuals from the sample size of 76 in Study 1, yet it was rated as the 2nd most central feature overall in Study 2.

Gender

Table 2 also shows the different mean centrality ratings and rakings, between genders. A t-test was performed on each feature, with 29 of the 77 features being statistically significant ($p < .05$) between genders. Because a t-test will only reveal which means are different on an absolute scale, a Mann-Whitney test was appropriate. By conducting Mann-Whitney tests for each feature, one can determine whether the *rankings* are statistically significant, regardless of whether the mean centrality ratings themselves were actually significant. For example, “sexual desire” is ranked eleventh on the list of features (1 being most central, 77 being least central). Men’s mean centrality for “sexual desire” was 5.69, and women’s was 5.45. These means did not significantly differ from each other. However, “sexual desire” was the *most central* feature for

men, and only the 25th most central feature for women. This finding is an interesting difference not captured by the t-test, but was exposed as statistically significant with the Mann-Whitney test ($p < .02$). The last column of Table 2 shows the Z-scores for the Mann-Whitney tests, as well as their significance level. Seventeen features were statistically significant. Many, but not all, of the features that were significant with the t-test were also significant with the Mann-Whitney test.

Of the 27 significant differences in the features centrality ratings, the only one which was viewed as more central to men than women was the feature of relief (M = 3.28 for men, 2.36 for women; $p < .05$). The features with the highest significance level ($p < .01$), all of which were more central for women are: “feeling vulnerable”, “writing”, “wanting to touch partner”, “look at things that remind you of partner”, “talk to friends as a way to distract yourself”, “anticipation”, “wondering what partner is doing”, “yearning”, “wanting to talk to partner”, “crying”, “thinking about partner”, “wanting to be with/see partner”, “looking at pictures of partner”, “feeling emotional”, and “appreciating partner”.

Of the 17 features that were statistically significant with the Mann-Whitney test, 10 of those were differences that were not detected with the t-tests of centrality. Those results are as follows: “feeling angry”, “feeling forgotten”, “want understanding”, “feeling uncomfortable”, “being quiet/not talkative”, “compare current partner to alternatives”, “apathy”, “sexual desire”, “watching movies”, and “feeling liberated”. All 10 of those differences found the males with the higher centrality rank order (as opposed to mean ratings). Of remaining 7 significant differences, which were significant using the t-test and the Mann-Whitney, all of them were more central for females.

The valence results yielded fewer significances, but showed a similar pattern as the centrality ratings and rankings. Of the 19 significant differences, women rated 16 of the features

as having a more positive valence than their male counterparts. All 16 of those features could be classified as being generally positive or good feelings associated with missing. Some representative examples are: “imagining”, “anticipation”, “talking about your partner”, “appreciating partner”, and “buying gifts for partner”. The three that men found to be more positive (or less negative) are: “feeling forgotten”, “feeling depressed”, and “feeling anxious”; all three of these features could be considered negative.

For the Mann-Whitney test, only 3 out of the 16 significances found were not previously detected with the t-tests, again all of which were higher in valence ranking for men: “feeling dependent”, “apathy”, and “worrying”. This follows the same pattern previously described, whereby the men rated negative features of missing as being more positive.

To summarize, the general trend for gender was that women tended to rate most features as more central to the concept of missing than men did. Of the features that men rated higher, or had higher rank orders for, all of them were negative emotions like “feeling angry”, or anti-relational ones, such as “relief”. The items that women endorsed as more central tended to be positive ones like “feeling love”, or negative items that were still pro-relational, such as “feeling sad”, or “feeling nostalgic”. For valence, men tended to rate negative items as being more positive, while women rated positive items as being more positive.

Attachment

This analysis eschews using the four-factor attachment categories from Bartholomew and Horowitz and instead utilizes the two dimensions of anxiety and avoidance. Using two separate numerical scales instead of four categories allows one to make full use of the range of the continuous data with correlational analyses.

Before conducting correlation measures, 16 items were selected as being particularly relevant to anxiously- or avoidantly-attached individuals. The features, listed in the first column of Table 4, were hypothesized to correlate with both attachment styles. It was predicted that these 16 items should be positively correlated with anxiety and negatively correlated with avoidance, with the exception of "relief", "independence", and "feeling liberated", which were hypothesized to correlate in the opposite direction (i.e. positively with avoidance). Valence correlations are also included in Table 4.

Table 4 shows that our hypotheses with respect to attachment style were largely supported. For the 16 items listed, all but three were correlated with one or both features when using a significance level of $p < 0.1$. As predicted, the anxiety scale was significantly correlated with items like "moping", "feeling insecure", and "feeling lonely", while the avoidant scale was positively correlated with "relief", and negatively correlated with "wanting to be with/see partner". Additionally, anxiously-attached individuals tended to report that feeling depressed was significantly more positive (higher valence). Surprisingly, the valence of "independence" was negatively correlated with avoidance. That is, avoidantly-attached individuals tended to feel that independence was less positive than the other subjects reported it.

For a complete list of correlations between attachment styles and centrality and valence ratings, see Tables 8 and 9 respectively.

Implicit Theories of Relationships

Although "growth" and "destiny" might be conceptualized as being opposite ends of one spectrum, we have chosen to treat them as two independent scales as Knee does (1998). Knee found no significant correlation between the two scales, with *r*s from -.01 to -.07. In the present study we found a modest negative correlation of -.29 ($p < .02$).

As with attachment style, a predetermined set of features was correlated with the growth and destiny scales that comprise the ITR measure. Centrality for six of the eight features were significantly correlated ($p < .05$) with at least one of the two ITR scales (see Table 5). “Reminiscing”, “uncertainty”, and “compare current partner to alternatives” were positively correlated with destiny, while “feeling separated” and “corresponding with partner” were negatively correlated. “Look at things that remind you of partner” was the only item of the eight that was significantly correlated with the growth scale. “Compare current partner to alternatives” and “corresponding with partner” approached significance ($p < 0.10$ for both). All three items were positively correlated with growth.

For the valence ratings, 5 of the 8 were correlated with the destiny scale. “Reminiscing”, “writing”, and “corresponding with partner” were all significantly negatively correlated, while “feeling separated”, and “compare current partner to alternatives” were positively correlated. The valence ratings were not significantly correlated with growth scale for any of the features, except that “feeling separated” approached significance ($p < .10$).

There were clearly more significant results correlated with the destiny scale than the growth scale, but in general our hypotheses were largely supported. A complete list of correlations can be seen in Tables 8 and 9.

Self-Esteem

Self-esteem was predicted to correlate negatively with selected affectively negative features of missing like “feeling depressed” and “feeling insecure”, and positively with the features of “try to have fun” and “appreciate partner”. A complete list of predicted features are shown in Table 6 along with the correlation coefficients. All but one of the features correlate with self-esteem are in the predicted direction (“worrying” is the exception), but only three of the

eleven features were statistically significant. “Loss of self-esteem”, “feeling insecure”, and “feeling dependent” were all significantly negatively correlated with self-esteem. The only predicted feature whose valence correlated significantly with self-esteem was “feeling insecure”. For a complete list of correlations between self-esteem and centrality and valence ratings, see Table 8 and 9 respectively.

Self-esteem was negatively correlated with neuroticism ($r = -.51$, $p < .001$), as predicted. Self-esteem was also negatively correlated with both attachment styles. Self-esteem was negatively correlated with anxious attachment ($r = -.36$, $p < .01$), as well as with avoidant attachment ($r = -.26$, $p < .05$)

Neuroticism

Neuroticism was predicted to correlate positively to the features in Table 7 with the exception of “relief”, which was predicted to correlate negatively. Again, the direction of correlation was in the prediction direction (except for “relief” and “feeling anxious”), but only three were statistically significant, with an additional feature being marginally significant. Centrality ratings for “loss of self-esteem”, “feeling insecure”, and “feeling emotional” were significantly positively correlated with neuroticism, and “feeling depressed” was marginally significant ($p < .10$). The valence of “feeling insecure” was also negatively correlated with neuroticism. For a complete list of correlations between neuroticism and centrality and valence ratings, see Tables 8 and 9 respectively. Neuroticism was significantly positively correlated with the anxious-attachment scale ($r = .53$, $p < .001$) and negatively correlated with self-esteem ($r = -.51$, $p < .001$), in line with our predictions.

Discussion

The results from Study 1 (Table 1) provided a list of features that came to mind when subjects were asked to list the features of missing. Although the distribution makes sense with respect to previous research on interpersonal separation and loneliness, it does not in itself define what "missing" really is. The fact that so many of the features of missing were only listed by a handful of subjects underscores the main weakness of an open-ended free response question. Study 1 also does not help clarify what aspects of most central or most positive, but they provide a starting point for Study 2.

The results of Study 2 largely supported our predictions. There were a considerable number of significant results for gender and attachment style, as hypothesized. There were also a substantial number of correlations for the "destiny" scale of implicit theories about relationships, but the "growth" scale did not yield many. Finally, scales of self-esteem and neuroticism produced a few weaker correlations, but many of those were for the features we had predicted. All together, our findings support the idea that in the interpersonal realm of "missing" in romantic relationships, relationship tendencies, not our individualistic personality traits, matter most. Attachment style is about how *an individual relates* to the people he or she forms relationships with, while self-esteem is about how *an individual feels* about him or herself. The former is interpersonal, and the latter is intrapersonal.

Table 2 shows the list in decreasing rank of the centrality ratings. It was not especially surprising that the list did not exactly correspond to the list in Table 1 that shows the frequencies of the features listed from Study 1. Although Fehr (1988) does not discuss the differences between her frequency listings from Study 1, and her centrality ratings from Study 2, her data shows a similar pattern. Generally, the most frequently words tended to also be the most central,

but there were exceptions to the rule. For Fehr, the most central feature of love, “trust” was the eighth most frequently listed word, being mentioned by less than 15% of the population. Conversely, the most frequently listed word from her first study, “caring” was mentioned by over 43% of her subjects, and was the second most central feature behind “trust”.

As far as the actual features themselves, and what kind of a definition of “missing” they seem to create as a whole, the top features listed from Study 1, and listed as central in Study 2 predominately focus on negative emotions and anticipated reunion. Looking at the ten most central features, only number 10, “feeling separated” could really be considered emotional in content. Of the remainder, I would categorize them as mostly anticipatory (“wanting to talk to partner”, “wanting to be with/see partner”) or reflective (“thinking about partner”, “thinking”). Looking beyond the top ten, many of the features are a form or synonym of the feature of thinking, and of feeling. If I had to create an abbreviated definition based on the research of missing and could only use a few features, I think that “wanting to be with partner”, “thinking about partner”, and “feeling lonely” capture the essence of “missing” as well as any other subset of features could. All three of which were among the ten most frequently listed features from Study 1.

Gender

The number of significant differences between men and women was somewhat surprising given Fehr’s (1988) finding that overall, there were no significant differences between men and women for love and commitment. Fehr (1988) says that “for love [and commitment] there was no overall difference between men’s and women’s ratings, nor did differences emerge when analyses were performed separately for central features and for peripheral features… all Fs <1.69, ps $>.10$” (p. 564). The results from our Study 2 were quite different, with men rating

features as less central ($p < .05$). Of the 38 features ranked by centrality scores at or above the median, 23 had significantly different means and 7 had significantly different rank-orders across gender (see Table 2). Overall, men and women differed on 26 of the 38 most central features for $p < 0.5$. When looking at the entire list and lowering the significance level to $p < .10$, the number jumps to 46 of 77. Why do we find significant results but not Fehr? It is unclear, but one possibility is that there were significant differences for particular *features* of missing, but that overall, men and women rated all of the features, averaged together, similarly. If Fehr only compared the mean centrality ratings for all of the features, she could have obscured differences on individual features. Our Study 2 found significant differences using both tests.

It is clear that while gender may not be as important in shaping how individuals feel about love and commitment, it plays a large role in influencing our definitions of, and thus experience of, missing. These differences are important beyond just the clinical realm. Couples who experience a lot of missing, such as long distance relationships, should be aware that their partner may feel quite differently about the separation.

Interestingly, these gender differences all seem to point in the same general direction, leading me to believe that there may be a single factor that underlies the differences. As mentioned previously, the only features that men rated as more central to missing than women did were negative emotions like “feeling angry”, or features that suggest an avoidant attachment style, like “relief” (Table 3). In fact both of these features were seen as significantly more positive for men (“feeling angry” had a significantly higher valence ranking for men, and “relief” was significantly more positive for men, *p*s $< .05$). Opposite results were found for women, rating positive features like “feeling love” as significantly more central. They also rated higher features that suggest an insecure attachment style, but perhaps more precisely seem to function to

help maintain the relationship. “Feeling sad”, or “feeling nostalgic”, “wanting to talk with”, “wanting to be with/see” can be considered pro-relational features of missing.

These differences are striking and consistent, and they cannot be explained in terms of attachment style, as there were no significant differences between gender for either attachment scale. From the centrality data it seems clear that men view the experience of missing more negatively than women do, by rating positive items as less positive and negative items as more negative. While these differences could be the result of some lurking third variable (e.g. masculine v. feminine sex roles: Cramer & Neyedly, 1998), they certainly suggest that there is a solid difference in how each gender reports the experience of “missing”. To say that this difference is fundamental and inherit to the sex of the subject is beyond the scope of this study, but does not diminish the importance of the findings.

Women seem to be more concerned with maintaining the relationship despite the separations, and also seem more affected by it emotionally. Both men and women should to be aware of how their partner defines the experience of missing their partner. Where there is a divergence in what it means to “miss” one’s partner, there is a great risk of misunderstanding, misinterpretation, and relationship dissatisfaction. When a man is separated from his partner, his feelings are most characterized by “sexual desire”, but his partner reports “wanting to be with/see” as most central to her experience. If they are not aware of each other’s feelings, the woman might be offended or bothered by the immediacy of his sexual advances. In any relationship with some degree of separation, and missing, it would be beneficial for both parties to be aware of potential differences in how they experience this state.

Turning to valence, a similar pattern is apparent with respect to gender and ratings. Women rated virtually all of the top features as more positive than men did. Looking at the 35

most negative features of missing (the 35 features that were rated as least positive overall), only five of them were rated as more negative for women than men. The other 30 were viewed as more negative by men. Although the vast majority of these differences were not significant in our study, the overwhelming trend is quite telling. Looking at the 5 exceptions, women rated "crying", "feeling lonely", "being unproductive", "lack of concentration", and "waiting for partner" as being more positive than men did. All five of these exceptions have a strong power dimension to them, and endorsing such features might make one feel or appear weaker.

What are the implications of women generally finding missing to be more positive, as evidenced by their rating the central features as positive? It seems to suggest that being separated from a loved one and missing them is less unpleasant, and perhaps seen as a necessary part of maintaining relationships. When separated, women tend to think positively about the relationship and anticipating their partner's return. Men rate "anticipation" as significantly less positive and central, while men rate "relief" as a more positive aspect of separation. These generalizations may remind one of the growth and destiny scales, with the females seeming to endorse a "growth" view of relationships, and males a more "destiny" oriented view. In fact, in conducting a post-hoc independent-sample t-tests (equal variances not assumed), we see that men scored significantly higher on the destiny scale (t=-2.362, $p < .05$). Women scored higher on average than men on the growth scale, but the results were not significant (t=1.379, $p > .1$). The differences in implicit theories of relationships may be one of the factors underlying this profound gender split, but further tests are needed to evaluate the extent to which this is the case.

Although the extent and reliability of gender differences need to be fully established, these initial results show great promise. If these results do extend to the general population, we believe we have demonstrated real and important gender differences of practical value to

therapists, as well as laypeople. A couple that understands how their definitions of missing differ should be able to handle times of separation better.

Attachment Style

The correlations between the anxious attachment scale and centrality ratings for the pre-selected features were particularly robust and in the predicted direction, but there were also a number of significant correlations for the avoidance scale. These data support the hypothesis that individuals that endorse a particular attachment style tend to define their experience of missing quite differently from those who endorse one attachment style. Individuals with a higher anxious attachment style were positively correlated with “feeling sad”, “moping”, “feeling forgotten”, “feeling insecure”, “feeling lonely”, and others. In Table 8, there are additional correlations that were not specifically predicted, but fit in nicely with the trend, including “loss of self-esteem” and “feeling of loss. These feelings tend to have a strong negative affect. Simply put, the centrality rankings suggest that separation from a partner is more difficult for an individual scoring high on the anxious attachment scale. These results support Feeney & Noller’s (1990) finding that anxious attachment style was associated with lower satisfaction. Feeling sad, lonely, forgotten, and insecure do not seem likely to help improve relationship quality or personal happiness. Furthermore, these data may help to explain at *why* anxious attachment style tends to be detrimental to relationships.

Interestingly, anxiety was positively correlated with valence for several negative features: “feeling depressed”, “feeling forgotten”, and “feeling sad” (the latter two were only marginally significant, $p < .10$). These findings were not predicted, and have an interesting implication for attachment style if they can be replicated and generalized. They suggest that although individuals scoring high on the anxiety attachment measure rate many negative emotions as being more

central, that they may not view all of these negative features quite so negatively. To test this hypothesis, one could collect valence ratings of the *general* experience of missing, and compare the mean ratings by attachment style, expecting to find no significant differences for the anxiety scale. This does not necessarily mean that “missing” or separation is not detrimental, or even more detrimental, to an anxious individual in a relationship, but simply that they do not *appraise* their experience of missing to be more negative.

The avoidant attachment scale was not significantly correlated with as many factors as predicted, but the findings still show were still consistent our hypothesis. Avoidance was negatively correlated with “feeling sad” and “wanting to be with/see partner”, and positively correlated with “relief”. Individuals who tended to endorse the avoidance scale tended to rate negative emotions as less central to their experience of missing. More avoidant individuals also tended to rate many negative emotions as being more positive. As seen in Table 9, “feeling sad”, “feeling helpless”, “feeling depressed”, “feeling incomplete”, “feeling incomplete /losing a part of yourself”, “heartache”, and “being unproductive”, were all significantly and positively correlated. “Feeling separated” in particular was correlated at r = .51, which is extremely high for this type of study.

Interestingly and unexpectedly, avoidance was significantly *negatively* correlated with valence of “independence”. This seems to contradict the finding that avoidance was associated with a higher valence for “feeling separated”, as well as the fact that desiring less closeness and attachment is the definition of avoidant attachment style. Although this finding may be a statistical anomaly, there is the possibility that subjects rated the valence of independence (and perhaps other features) *within the context of a relationship*, rather than simply at its face value. It would be very surprising if avoidant attachment was negatively correlated with independence in

general, but in the context of this study, subjects may have situated the independence feature within the context of a romantic relationship. Regardless, this finding is unusual and interesting, and should be examined further.

A final noteworthy trend from the data is that anxious attachment is consistently correlated with features that are pro-relational, and avoidant attachment is correlated with many features that could be categorized as anti-relational. “Wanting to be with/see partner” and “thinking about partner” were both positively correlated with the anxious scale, and negatively correlated with the avoidant scale ($p < .10$ for “thinking about partner). Avoidance was also negatively correlated with “talking about partner”, “corresponding with partner”, and “appreciating partner”.

To summarize the attachment style trends, anxiously-attached individuals tended to rate negative emotions and feelings as more central, but tended to rate those same kinds of feelings as having a more positive valence. They were also more likely to endorse thought patterns and activities likely to help maintain communication and preserve the relationship as being central to “missing”. Avoidantly-attached individuals rated negative emotions as less central to their experience of missing, “relief” as more central, and rated negative emotion states as having a higher valence. They also tended to rate the pro-relational features as being less central to their definition and experience of missing.

Although adult attachment style tends to be quite stable over a period of several months, attachment is by no means immutable (Erber & Erber, 2001). Strong correlations between attachment styles and certain negative aspects of missing might provide extra immediacy for attachment researchers and therapists to find ways of altering or overcoming the negative aspects of insecure attachment.

In light of the strong and consistent correlations consistent with our hypotheses, this research has advanced our knowledge of “missing” and how it relates to attachment style, but it has also bolstered attachment style in a small way. Attachment style theory is generally well-accepted, but we have found yet another area of personal relationships where attachment style seems to have implications for relationship quality: interpersonal separation and missing. Consistent correlations between the features of missing and attachment style can only help to strengthen both theories, especially when the current findings are consistent with the theoretical framework of previous research.

Implicit Theories of Relationships

The “growth” versus “destiny” model of implicit theories of relationships is a relationship-centric pair of scales, similar in form to attachment style, but differing in what it measures. The significant correlation results were consistent with Knee’s (1998) conceptualization of the scales (Table 5). The growth scale tended to be positively correlated with reflective and pro-relational features such as “corresponding with partner”, “thinking”, and “feeling nostalgic”—all of which were negatively correlated with the growth scale (all ps $< .10$; see Table 8). These features were all rated as being highly central in general, with centrality rankings of 4, 6, and 12 respectively (see Table 2). The kinds of feelings that the destiny scale was most positively correlated with tended to be anti-relational, including “uncertainty”, “feeling lost”, and “apathy”. These features are rated 53, 71, and 74 respectively.

The definition of missing from Study 2 is much more similar to the growth model than the destiny model. A post-hoc test compared the mean scores for the two scales and revealed a strong significant difference in our population (growth: $M = 4.8$, $SD = .84$; destiny: $M = 3.2$, $SD = .94$). A paired-samples t-test showed that the significance level was $p < .001$ ($t = -9.4$). This

striking difference could have serious implications for individuals that favor destiny and not growth. If in practice, high-destiny individuals have as dramatically different a definition of missing as the current data suggests, one would expect increased discord in relationships high in interpersonal separation. This trend should be exacerbated when an individual has a partner high in growth or that favors the more “traditional” model of missing (i.e., the general model of missing from Table 2).

As Knee (1998) notes, both growth and destiny have, at least theoretically, separate evolutionary benefits. Some relationships may be challenging in the beginning, but with some effort and persistence, improve dramatically. A high-destiny individual would be likely to end the relationship based on initial dissatisfaction. On the other hand, an individual that is trapped in an unhealthy relationship might try to “tough it out”, if he or she endorses “growth”. The literature has not fully developed the practical costs and benefits of these styles. I now suspect that if “destiny missing”, or indeed any version of missing that deviates substantially from the general prototype of missing, that he or she will be judged as being less-sensitive and less-desirable, especially if the partner endorses the prototype model. Recall that Hassebrauck and Aron’s (2001) work found that people tended to rate atypical individuals and relationships as less positive.

With respect to valence, the same pattern can be seen with the directionality of the significant correlations. Destiny was negatively correlated with the valence of “reminiscing”, “writing”, “feeling love”, “feeling hopeful”, “corresponding with partner”, and “thinking about partner” (for a full list of correlations, see Table 9). Valence was correlated positively with a number of affectively negative features like “heartache”, “feeling empty”, and “apathy”. The opposite is true for “growth”; it tends to be positively correlated with communicative and

affectively positive features, and negatively correlated with negative items like "feeling depressed". The trend was not as consistent for the growth scale as the destiny scale, however.

The similarities in the pattern of differences between attachment style and implicit theories of relationships suggest that the scales might be correlated to each other. Growth was significantly negatively correlated with avoidant attachment (r = .-30, $p < .02$), however the other correlations were not significant. This suggests that these scales are largely tapping different aspects of individuals' relationship tendencies and ideals, but that it is possible that there may be some relationship between them. A modest relationship between the two may help explain some of the parallels found between these two different measures.

Self Esteem

The results show good evidence that self-esteem is related to certain differences in people's prototype definitions of missing, however the results were not as strong as predicted (Table 6). Although self-esteem was negatively correlated with "loss of self-esteem", "feeling insecure", and "feeling independent", it was not correlated with "crying", "worrying", "feeling lonely", or "appreciating partner" (the last of which was predicted to have a positive relationship with self-esteem). Self-esteem was not positively correlated with many aspects of missing.

We had anticipated that higher self-esteem individuals would tend to rate positive aspects of missing like "feeling love", and positive coping methods like "corresponding with partner" as being more central but they were not (Table 6 and Table 9). The anticipated pattern was better supported by the negative correlations between self-esteem and feature centrality.

Self-esteem seems to have an impact on how individuals experience missing. For the great majority of features, however, the differences were small and not significant, though generally in the predicted direction (Table 8 and 9). Self-esteem was found to positively correlate

with the valence of certain positive aspects of missing, including “feeling love” and “wanting to talk with partner”, and negatively correlate with negative aspects such as “feeling insecure” and “feeling sad”. Although there was a modest trend for higher self-esteem individuals to rate certain negative emotion states as being less central to the concept of missing, they also tended to rate those features as being less positive in valence. A good example of this finding is “feeling insecure” (Table 6).

These findings suggest that generally, higher self-esteem individuals tend to rate positive aspects of missing as more central, and negative aspects of missing as less central. This does not in itself mean that missing is a more positive, or an easier, experience for higher self-esteem individuals. Valence was significantly negatively correlated with many of the negative emotion states of missing, suggesting that missing is more negative and perhaps more difficult for someone with high self-esteem. Someone with high self-esteem generally believes he or she is well liked, and has an accompanying positive view of himself or herself. If that individual found themselves separated from their romantic partner, one can see how this might be difficult to manage because it is inconsistent with their general view. Imagine a situation where the female of a romantic dyad leaves to spend a month overseas for work. A low self-esteem male might think “this kind of thing always happens to me”, and be depressed, but accustomed to the situation and has probably developed coping skills. A male with higher self-esteem might be shocked and confused, and perhaps be unprepared to cope with the situation. This hypothesis is further supported by the fact that self-esteem was not positively correlated with many relationship-maintenance features like “corresponding with partner”, or “thinking about partner”.

The data from Study 2 show moderate support of our hypotheses about neuroticism. Only 3 of the predicted 11 features were significantly correlated with neuroticism (Table 7).

“Loss of self-esteem”, “feeling insecure”, and feeling emotional” were positively correlated with neuroticism. “Moping” and “feeling irritable” were also correlated (Table 8). Although many of these results are consistent with expectations about neuroticism, the vast majority of features were not correlated. Are these few significant results anomalies, and neuroticism is not correlated with definitions of missing?

Neuroticism

Although neuroticism might be helpful in predicting some aspects of atypical missing definitions, by and large the results were relatively weak. The weakness could be attributed to the small size of the neuroticism scale used, which is only 8 items (Appendix 4). Additionally, neuroticism is a broad personality trait that has been defined to include many different and not-necessarily-linked characteristics.

Future research may decide to use a different and more precise measure for neuroticism, and find that it correlates much better with aspects of missing, but I believe that the concept of neuroticism itself is too imprecise. It seems as though there are other measures, such as attachment style, that are much more helpful and consistent in predicting one’s prototype of missing.

Implications and Future Directions

The results from this study have yielded a robust and detailed prototype for the definition of missing. The definition appears to share certain features that are common to loneliness and bereavement, but also contains features that seem novel to “missing”. We found strong and consistent significant differences in how each gender defines and experiences missing. We also found that certain trait scales, such as the attachment scales, could be used as predictors of an individual’s “style of missing”. The scales that were intrapersonal (self-esteem and neuroticism)

had fewer correlations, and seem to be poorer predictors of "missing style" than interpersonal ones (attachment style and implicit theories of relationships).

Identifying which relationships are likely to succeed and which are not is, and should be, an important task for romantic partners. The experience of missing seems to share many characteristics of loneliness, which is known to be potentially detrimental and unpleasant. Even if the positive aspects of missing help to mitigate the negative ones, a significant difference between partners about how they understand define "missing" could exacerbate any dissatisfaction or relationship problems.

The findings were largely consistent with current theories. We found significant gender differences for the majority of features, even though Fehr's (1988) similar study did not. Due to the particular robustness of the gender differences in Study 2, I believe that future research in "missing", and prototype research in general, needs to increase the level of sophistication used in gender analyses, even when the purpose of the study is not to examine gender specifically. I predict that using t-tests and Mann-Whitney tests between gender for the individual features of love and commitment in Fehr's Study 2 would produce substantial and valuable gender differences.

Two questions that I wish had made it onto the end of the questionnaire are "Overall, how central do you believe 'missing' is to romantic relationships?" and "Overall, how positive do you view the experience of 'missing' a romantic partner?". Because men tended to rate all of the features listed as being "less central" to missing, I inferred that men might simply view *missing* in general as less central to relationships in general. While a logical inference, the differences could be attributable to reporting bias, whereby men might be less willing to *report* or admit to finding features of missing as "central". In subsequent research, this hypothesis can

easily be tested by including an item to assess the general centrality of missing to the individual. Likewise, future testing can validate or disprove the inference that rating central features as more positive and peripheral features as more negative (which was the tendency for females) indicated the individual perceived “missing” to be a generally more positive experience.

The primary weakness of this study is that it is correlational in nature rather than experimental. It is not clear whether self-esteem actually influences missing or not. Missing may influence self-esteem, and it is even possible that attachment style contributes to both. Also, the sheer number of significance tests increases the likelihood of making type-2 errors. On Table 8, for example, there are 6 scales correlated with 77 features. Using a significance level of .05, we can expect that over 20 of the significances found could be due to chance variation on Table 8 alone. To mitigate the likelihood of type-2 errors I pre-selected features that should correlate with particular scales, and the results validated our hypotheses.

With a prototype definition of missing, we may be able to group more features together conceptually when they have consistent concurrence. This could lead to even better understanding of what “missing” is, but could also lead to the development of a new interpersonal scale previously alluded to: “missing style”. Whether future research finds evidence for a general “missing style” remains to be seen, but the variability found so far suggests that “missing” is very individualistic and may have many components contributing a small part to this general experience. Future research should first determine how prevalent “missing” is, and how damaging it might be to the health of relationships and to individuals. If the results warrant it, we should consider how to effectively counsel and advise others, as well as ourselves, in dealing with this phenomenon that seems to becoming more prevalent.

In conclusion, the prevalence of negative aspects included in peoples' concepts of missing suggests that this experience is an important one warranting further investigation in the future. Significant gender differences suggest possible areas of misinterpretation and potential friction, but which could be mitigated if these differences were widely understood and accepted. By determining what causes or correlates with missing we can help individuals understand why they feel the way they do, and hopefully help them to successfully manage the negative aspects of the experience.

References

Aiken, R. S. (2001). *Dying, death, and bereavement*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 61*, 226-244.

Baum, J. (1979). *An exploration of widowhood: Coping patterns adopted by a population of widows*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. (1998). Attraction and close relationships. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 2,* (4th ed., pp 193-281). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and Loss, Vol III: Loss*. New York, Basic Books.

Branden, N. (1987). *How to raise your self-esteem*. New York: Bantam Books.

Brennan, K., Bartholomew, K., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Methods of assessing adult attachment: Do they converge? In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment Theory and Close Relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford.

Buunk, B. (1997). Personality, birth order and attachment styles as related to various types of jealousy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 23,* 997-1006.

Claridge, G., & Davis, C. (2001). What's the use of neuroticism? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 383-400.

Collins, N. L., & Allard, L. M. (2001). Cognitive representations of attachment: the content and function of working models. In G. J. O. Fletcher & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Vol. 2. Interpersonal Processes* (pp. 60-85). United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers.

Covington, M. (2001). The science and politics of self-esteem: Schools caught in the middle. In Owens, T., Stryker, S., & Goodman, N. (eds), (2001). *Extending Self-Esteem Theory and Research: Sociological and Psychological Currents,* (pp. 351-374). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cramer, K.M., & Neyedly, K.A. (1998). Sex differences in loneliness: the role of masculinity and femininity. *Sex Roles, 38*, 645-653.

Di Paula, A., & Campbell, J. (2002). Self-esteem and persistence in the face of failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83,* 711-724.

Dion, K. L., & Dion, K. K. (1973). Correlates of romantic love. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 41*, 51-56.

Erber, R., & Erber, M. W. (2001). *Intimate relationships: Issues, theories, and research.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). *Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach.* New York: Plenum.

Feeney, J., & Kirkpatrick, L., (1996). Effects of adult attachment and presence of romantic partners on physiological responses to stress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 255-270.

Feeney, J., & Noller, P., (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 281-291.

Fehr, B. (1988). Prototype analysis of the concepts of love and commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*, 557-579.

Gerstein, L. H., & Tesser, A. (1987). Antecedents and responses associated with loneliness. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4,* 329-363.

Hassebrauck, M., & Aron, A. (2001). A prototype matching model of relationship quality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 1111 – 1122.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Conceptualizing romantic love as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 511-524.

Heffner, K., Le, B., Loving, T. J., & MacLin, M. K. (2002). *The psychology of interpersonal separation and "missing"*. Unpublished raw data.

Hegelson, V. S., Shaver, P. R., & Dyer, M. (1987). Prototypes of intimacy and distance in same-sex and opposite-sex relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4*, 195-233.

Heinemann, G. (1979). *Determinants of primary support system strength among urban, widowed women: Does life stage make a difference?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Circle Campus.

John,O. P., Donahue,E. M., & Kentle,R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory* (Tech. Rep. No. 4A). Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

Keogh, E., French, C., & Reidy, J. (1998). Predictors of worry. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping: An International Journal 11*, 67-80.

Kirkpatrick, L. & Davis, K. (1994). Attachment style, gender, and relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 502-512.

Knee, C. R. (1998). Implicit theories of relationships: Assessment and prediction of romantic relationship initiation, coping, and longevity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 360-370.

Lopata, H., Heinemann, G., & Baum, J. (1982). Loneliness: Antecedents and coping strategies in the lives of widows. In Peplau & Perlman (Eds.). *Loneliness: A Sourcebook of Current Theory, Research, and Therapy* (pp. 310-326) New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Mikulincer, M., & Segal, J. (1990). A multidimensional analysis of the experience of loneliness. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7*, 209-230.

Ouellet, R., & Joshi, P. (1986). Loneliness in relation to depression and self-esteem. *Psychological Reports, 58,* 821-822.

Owens, T., Stryker, S., & Goodman, N. (Eds.), (2001). *Extending Self-Esteem Theory and Research: Sociological and Psychological Currents*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Perlman, D., & Peplau, L. A. (1982). Theoretical approaches to loneliness. In D. Peplau & L. A. Perlman (Eds.). *Loneliness: A Sourcebook of Current Theory, Research and Therapy* (pp. 123-134). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Rokach, A., & Brock, H. (1995). The effects of gender, marital status, and the chronicity and immediacy of loneliness. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 10,* 833-848.

Rosenberg, M. 1965. *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rosenberg, S., & Jones, R. (1972). A method for investigating and representing a person's implicit personality theory: Theodore Dreiser's view of people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 22*, 372-386.

Rosenberg, S., & Sedlak, A. (1972). Structural representations of implicit personality theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. New York: Academic Press.

Rotenberg, K., & Korol, S. (1995). The role of loneliness and gender in individuals' love styles. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 10*, 537-546.

Scott, A. (2002). *Communication characterizing successful long distance marriages.* Unpublished dissertation, Lousiana State University dept of Philosophy.

Shaver, P. R., & Buhrmester, D. (1983). Loneliness, sex-role orientation, and group life: A social needs perspective. In P. B. Paulus (Ed.), *Basic Group Processes* (pp. 259-288). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Shaver, P. R., & Fraley, R. C. (1997). *Self-report measures of adult attachment.* Retrieved December 9, 2002, from the World Wide Web: http://tigger.uic.edu/~fraley/measures/measures.html.

Stokes, J. P. (1987). On the usefulness of phenomenological methods. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality 2*, 57-62.

Figure 1

Bartholomew and Horowitz's Four-Category Model of Attachment

MODEL OF SELF
(Dependence)

MODEL OF OTHER (Avoidance)	Positive (Low)	Negative (High)
Positive (Low)	CELL I SECURE Comfortable with intimacy and autonomy	CELL II PREOCCUPIED Preoccupied with relationships
Negative (High)	CELL IV DISMISSING Dismissing of intimacy Counter-dependent	CELL III FEARFUL Fearful of intimacy Socially avoidant

Model of adult attachment.

Table 1

Frequency of Features of "Missing" Listed in Study 1

Frequency	Feature Of Missing
38	Feeling lonely
32	Feeling sad
24	Corresponding with partner (e.g., calling, writing)
18	Wanting to be with / see partner
16	Reminiscing
15	Longing for partner
15	Thinking about partner
13	Wanting to touch partner
13	Feeling incomplete / Losing a piece of yourself
12	Feeling empty
12	Sexual Desire
10	Feeling depressed
9	Feeling anxious
9	Crying
9	Worrying
8	Looking at pictures of partner
8	Wondering what partner is doing
7	Feeling bored
7	Dreaming about partner
7	Listening to music
6	Anticipation
6	Feeling nostalgic
6	Wanting to talk to partner
6	Feeling helpless
5	Imagining
5	Feeling insecure
5	Talk to friends as a way to distract yourself
5	Obsessing about partner
4	Feeling angry
4	Look at things that remind you of your partner
4	"Sinking" feeling in stomach
4	Talking about your partner
4	Thinking about the future
4	Waiting for partner
4	Wonder about the relationship
4	Listlessness/lack of energy/feeling tired
3	Buying gifts for partner
3	Lack of concentration
3	Feeling emotional
3	Feeling frustrated
3	Heartache
3	Feeling hopeful
3	Hopelessness
3	Wanting a hug
3	Feeling love
3	Restlessness
3	Feeling separated
3	Try to have fun
3	Uncertainty
3	Yearning
2	Apathy
2	Writing
2	Drawing
2	Liberated
2	Feeling of loss
2	Loss of self-esteem
2	Lack of excitement
2	Moping
2	Being quiet / not talkative
2	Thinking
2	Feeling uncomfortable
2	Being unproductive
2	Feeling vulnerable
2	Watching movies
2	Watching romantic movies
2	Wondering if partner is thinking of you
1	Relief
1	Bittersweet
1	Compare current partner to alternative partners
1	Feeling dependent
1	Feeling forgotten
1	Appreciating partner
1	Independence
1	Feeling irritable
1	Feeling lost
1	Want support
1	Want understanding

Table 2

Centrality Ratings and Rankings for Features of Missing and Significance Tests for Gender Differences

	Centrality ratings and rankings							Mann-Whitney U
	Overall		Men		Women		*t*	*z*
Thinking about partner	5.94	1	5.59	3	6.45	3	3.39**	-2.37
Wanting to talk to partner	5.94	2	5.56	5	6.50	2	3.85**	-2.23*
Wanting to be with/ see partner	5.92	3	5.41	9	6.52	1	3.61**	-2.99**
Corresponding with partner	5.85	4	5.44	7	6.32	4	2.62*	-.96
Reminiscing	5.83	5	5.62	2	6.16	6	1.75†	-.47
Thinking	5.77	6	5.56	4	6.00	10	1.51	-.20
Wanting to touch partner	5.76	7	5.38	10	6.23	5	2.93**	-.31
Wondering what partner is doing	5.71	8	5.50	6	6.13	8	2.69**	-.65
Look at things that remind you of partner	5.69	9	5.32	12	6.16	7	2.90**	-.45
Feeling separated	5.62	10	5.23	14	6.10	9	2.61*	-1.38
Sexual desire	5.61	11	5.69	1	5.45	25	-.70	-2.39*
Feeling nostalgic	5.54	12	5.18	19	5.97	11	3.12**	-1.29
Longing for partner	5.54	13	5.18	20	5.97	12	2.26*	-1.11
Talking about your partner	5.49	14	5.21	17	5.84	14	2.07*	-1.12
Feeling sad	5.48	15	5.21	16	5.94	13	2.24*	-.67
Wondering if partner is thinking of you	5.46	16	5.33	11	5.74	18	1.15	-.05
Wonder about relationship	5.41	17	5.41	8	5.55	22	.47	-.87
Looking at pictures of partner	5.32	18	4.87	24	5.84	15	2.78**	-1.70†
Appreciating partner	5.28	19	4.85	26	5.81	17	2.97**	-1.36
Dreaming about partner	5.27	20	5.23	15	5.35	28	.36	-1.15
Thinking about the future	5.27	21	5.15	21	5.39	27	.69	-.22
Imagining	5.25	22	5.18	18	5.45	24	.74	-.35
Feeling lonely	5.24	23	4.85	25	5.71	19	2.16*	-1.53
Try to have fun	5.20	24	4.90	23	5.52	23	1.77†	-.04
Listening to music	5.17	25	5.28	13	5.16	33	-.33	-1.79†
Anticipation	5.13	26	4.68	29	5.81	16	3.31**	-2.36*
Yearning	5.07	27	4.69	28	5.68	20	3.00**	-1.85
Waiting for partner	4.97	28	4.82	27	5.29	31	1.29	-.48
Talk to friends as a way to distract yourself	4.87	29	4.38	35	5.58	21	3.17**	-1.22
Feeling emotional	4.85	30	4.36	38	5.42	26	3.47**	-2.00*
Compare current partner to alternatives	4.83	31	5.08	22	4.48	49	-1.48	-2.35*
Heartache	4.79	32	4.44	34	5.35	29	2.26*	-2.12*
Wanting a hug	4.75	33	4.36	37	5.32	30	2.26*	-1.15
Worrying	4.73	34	4.67	30	4.84	39	.41	-1.06
Feeling love	4.68	35	4.33	41	5.23	32	2.03*	-1.19
Feeling depressed	4.64	36	4.55	32	4.87	38	.80	-.38
Feeling frustrated	4.54	37	4.49	33	4.71	41	.60	-1.20
Moping	4.51	38	4.16	47	5.00	35	2.13*	-1.38
Feeling of loss	4.51	39	4.28	43	4.90	37	1.53	-.39
Want support	4.50	40	4.16	48	5.03	34	2.46*	-.72
Feeling hopeful	4.49	41	4.31	42	4.65	43	.92	-.01
Lack of concentration	4.45	42	4.38	36	4.65	44	.67	-.43
Restlessness	4.39	43	4.13	51	4.74	40	1.58	-.40
Watching movies	4.35	44	4.56	31	4.19	58	-1.02	-2.57*
"Sinking" feeling in stomach	4.28	45	4.21	45	4.48	50	.59	-.55
Bittersweet	4.27	46	4.03	57	4.70	42	1.90†	-.53

	Centrality ratings and rankings							Mann-Whitney U
	Overall		Men		Women		*t*	*z*
Obsessing about partner	4.25	47	4.08	55	4.52	47	1.06	-.44
Feeling vulnerable	4.24	48	3.79	67	4.90	36	2.97**	-1.72†
Feeling irritable	4.24	49	4.05	56	4.52	48	1.17	-.17
Feeling bored	4.21	50	4.26	44	4.26	56	-.01	-.85
Feeling incomplete/ losing a piece of yourself	4.18	51	3.97	60	4.45	52	1.03	-.06
Feeling insecure	4.16	52	4.08	53	4.32	54	.56	-.40
Uncertainty	4.15	53	4.00	59	4.45	51	1.05	-.35
Feeling anxious	4.15	54	4.13	50	4.29	55	.40	-1.11
Independence	4.14	55	4.21	46	4.00	63	-.49	-1.56
Being unproductive	4.10	56	4.08	54	4.23	57	.39	-.41
Feeling empty	4.10	57	4.13	52	4.13	61	.00	-1.66†
Feeling forgotten	4.08	58	4.33	39	3.87	65	-1.13	-3.28**
Want understanding	4.06	59	4.33	40	3.81	67	-1.27	-2.15*
Buying gifts for partner	4.04	60	3.62	72	4.57	46	2.22*	-1.56
Being quiet/ not talkative	3.97	61	4.15	49	3.84	66	-.82	-2.23*
Feeling dependent	3.90	62	3.79	66	4.13	60	.81	-.22
Listlessness/lack of energy/ feeling tired	3.84	63	3.87	63	3.90	64	.07	-.79
Feeling helpless	3.80	64	3.64	69	4.00	62	.90	-.88
Lack of excitement	3.80	65	3.90	62	3.61	69	-.70	-1.92†
Feeling liberated	3.76	66	4.03	58	3.42	73	-1.47	-2.51*
Feeling uncomfortable	3.73	67	3.92	61	3.58	70	-.86	-2.49*
Watching romantic movies	3.72	68	3.44	73	4.16	59	1.72†	-1.32
Crying	3.68	69	3.03	76	4.58	45	3.77**	-3.18**
Loss of self-esteem	3.61	70	3.64	70	3.65	68	.01	-1.94†
Feeling lost	3.61	71	3.74	68	3.52	72	-.49	-1.95
Writing	3.59	72	3.03	75	4.35	53	3.25**	-2.34*
Feeling angry	3.58	73	3.79	65	3.39	74	-1.10	-2.29*
Apathy	3.58	74	3.82	64	3.35	75	-1.21	-2.39*
Hopelessness	3.54	75	3.62	71	3.52	71	-.21	-1.37
Relief	2.85	76	3.28	74	2.35	77	-2.64*	-1.66†
Drawing	2.56	77	2.31	77	2.94	76	1.54	-.82

† = $p < .10$
* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Equal Variances not assumed for T-tests
All Tests are 2-Tailed Independent Sample
*N*s from 69-71

Table 3

Valence Ratings and Rankings for Features of Missing and Significance Tests for Gender Differences

	Valence ratings and rankings							Mann-Whitney U
	Overall		Men		Women		*t*	*z*
Corresponding with partner	5.48	1	5.08	2	6.00	2	2.72**	-2.06*
Feeling love	5.46	2	5.03	3	6.03	1	2.95**	-2.43*
Listening to music	5.30	3	5.13	1	5.55	6	1.24	-.23
Feeling hopeful	5.24	4	4.95	7	5.65	4	2.22*	-1.74†
Appreciating partner	5.14	5	4.67	11	5.74	3	3.48**	-2.47*
Try to have fun	5.10	6	4.97	6	5.23	11	.83	-.67
Talk to friends as a way to distract yourself	5.01	7	4.67	10	5.52	7	2.83**	-1.42
Independence	4.97	8	5.00	4	4.97	18	-.10	-.93
Watching movies	4.94	9	4.80	9	5.06	15	.84	-.20
Feeling liberated	4.94	10	5.00	5	4.90	19	-.31	-1.30
Dreaming about partner	4.90	11	4.54	14	5.39	8	2.56*	-2.19*
Imagining	4.85	12	4.59	12	5.19	12	2.06*	-1.14
Reminiscing	4.85	13	4.51	15	5.26	9	2.47*	-1.79†
Buying gifts for partner	4.80	14	4.21	20	5.58	5	4.40**	-3.13**
Relief	4.72	15	4.87	8	4.55	24	-.81	-1.35
Writing	4.72	16	4.51	16	5.00	16	1.73†	-.28
Talking about your partner	4.68	17	4.23	19	5.26	10	2.94**	-1.94†
Drawing	4.63	18	4.54	13	4.77	21	.74	-.19
Looking at pictures of partner	4.61	19	4.10	23	5.19	13	3.52**	-2.84**
Thinking	4.55	20	4.44	17	4.74	22	.96	-.17
Thinking about partner	4.51	21	4.15	22	5.00	17	2.84**	-2.49*
Anticipation	4.42	22	3.97	26	5.10	14	3.41**	-2.47*
Thinking about the future	4.37	23	4.18	21	4.61	23	1.45	-.79
Sexual desire	4.34	24	4.44	18	4.23	28	-.57	-1.46
Look at things that remind you of partner	4.24	25	3.80	30	4.81	20	2.93**	-2.00*
Feeling nostalgic	4.17	26	4.05	24	4.29	26	.80	-.44
Wanting to be with/ see partner	4.04	27	4.03	25	4.00	31	-.07	-.53
Wanting to talk to partner	4.03	28	3.95	27	4.13	29	.51	-.20
Wondering if partner is thinking of you	3.92	29	3.77	31	4.10	30	.99	-1.22
Wondering what partner is doing	3.86	30	3.53	33	4.26	27	2.45*	-2.19*
Watching romantic movies	3.80	31	3.33	35	4.39	25	3.04**	-2.30*
Wanting a hug	3.67	32	3.87	28	3.33	35	-1.45	-1.78†
Wanting to touch partner	3.66	33	3.87	29	3.35	34	-1.51	-1.40
Bittersweet	3.46	34	3.59	32	3.27	36	-1.26	-1.24
Compare current partner to alternatives	3.42	35	3.33	36	3.55	32	.80	-1.10
Being quiet/ not talkative	3.32	36	3.15	39	3.52	33	1.21	-.60
Feeling emotional	3.23	37	3.31	37	3.10	41	-.90	-.60
Wonder about relationship	3.18	38	3.23	38	3.10	40	-.53	-.46
Apathy	3.16	39	3.42	34	2.81	46	-1.90†	-2.02*
Want understanding	3.13	40	3.05	40	3.19	39	.54	-.83
Longing for partner	3.13	41	3.03	43	3.23	38	.55	-.49
Yearning	3.10	42	3.03	41	3.26	37	.68	-.37
Waiting for partner	2.97	43	3.03	42	2.87	43	-.48	-.83
Want support	2.96	44	2.90	45	3.00	42	.36	-.26
Restlessness	2.93	45	3.00	44	2.81	45	-.68	-1.12

	Valence ratings and rankings							Mann-Whitney U
	Overall		Men		Women		*t*	*z*
Lack of concentration	2.80	46	2.82	48	2.84	44	.06	-.24
Feeling bored	2.77	47	2.82	50	2.68	48	-.49	-.10
Feeling irritable	2.72	48	2.82	49	2.55	49	-.94	-1.03
Uncertainty	2.69	49	2.82	47	2.48	50	-1.20	-1.14
Being unproductive	2.62	50	2.56	56	2.74	47	.67	-1.22
Lack of excitement	2.62	51	2.74	52	2.42	52	-1.21	-1.61
Feeling anxious	2.55	52	2.85	46	2.13	68	-2.91**	-2.39*
Obsessing about partner	2.54	53	2.74	53	2.35	54	-1.08	-1.09
Feeling dependent	2.52	54	2.80	51	2.23	57	-1.74†	-2.25*
Feeling frustrated	2.51	55	2.54	58	2.42	51	-.45	-.30
Feeling angry	2.46	56	2.66	54	2.26	56	-1.31	-.12
Worrying	2.43	57	2.63	55	2.13	69	-1.79†	-2.85**
Heartache	2.41	58	2.46	61	2.39	53	-.23	-.57
Moping	2.39	59	2.54	57	2.13	65	-1.76†	-1.22
Feeling of loss	2.35	60	2.46	60	2.16	62	-1.02	-1.70
Feeling separated	2.34	61	2.49	59	2.13	66	-1.53	-.94
Feeling uncomfortable	2.32	62	2.44	62	2.13	67	-1.28	-1.25
Listlessness/lack of energy/ feeling tired	2.30	63	2.33	66	2.20	59	-.47	-.17
Feeling lonely	2.28	64	2.26	68	2.32	55	.23	-.14
Feeling helpless	2.25	65	2.36	64	2.16	60	-.65	-.87
Feeling empty	2.24	66	2.37	63	2.03	72	-1.16	-1.65
Hopelessness	2.21	67	2.36	65	2.06	70	-.95	-1.22
Feeling lost	2.21	68	2.28	67	2.16	63	-.41	-.26
Feeling incomplete/ losing a piece of yourself	2.20	69	2.18	71	2.16	64	-.06	-.05
"Sinking" feeling in stomach	2.15	70	2.18	70	2.16	61	-.07	-.50
Feeling vulnerable	2.13	71	2.24	69	2.03	71	-.86	-.30
Crying	2.10	72	2.03	75	2.23	58	.57	-1.08
Feeling insecure	2.03	73	2.08	74	1.90	74	-.76	-.15
Loss of self-esteem	2.03	74	2.15	73	1.90	73	-.90	-1.02
Feeling sad	1.99	75	2.03	76	1.87	75	-.75	-.13
Feeling forgotten	1.93	76	2.15	72	1.58	76	-2.84**	-2.24*
Feeling depressed	1.70	77	1.85	77	1.45	77	-2.13*	-.79

† = $p < .10$
* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Equal Variances not assumed for T-tests
All Tests are 2-Tailed Independent Sample
*N*s from 69-71

Table 4

Centrality and Valence Correlations of Select Features of Missing with Attachment Scales

	Centrality		Valence	
Feature of Missing	Anxiety	Avoidance	Anxiety	Avoidance
Wondering if partner is thinking of you	.21†			
Relief		.28*		
Feeling Sad	.25*	-.28*	.30†	
Moping	.33**	-.23†		
Feeling Forgotten	.30*		.23†	
Feeling insecure	.41**			
Feeling anxious				
Feeling depressed	.20†		.34**	
Wondering what partner is doing				
Feeling dependent	.23†			
Longing for partner				
Feeling lonely	.33**			
Worrying				
Independence				-.29*
Wanting to be with/ see partner	.24*	-.26*		

† = $p < .10$
* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$
*N*s from 70-71

Table 5

Centrality and Valence Correlations of Select Features of Missing with Implicit Theories of Relationships Scales

Feature of Missing	Centrality		Valence	
	Growth	Destiny	Growth	Destiny
Reminiscing		-.36**		-.31**
Writing				-.45**
Feeling separated		-.25*	-.23†	.25*
Look at things that remind you of partner	.28*			
Uncertainty		.25*		
Thinking about the future				
Compare current partner to alternatives	.22†	.24*		.37**
Corresponding with partner	.22†	-.25*		-.30*

† = $p < .10$
* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$
*N*s from 70-71

Table 6

Centrality and Valence Correlations of Select Features of Missing with Self Esteem

Feature of Missing	Centrality	Valence
Feeling helpless		
Feeling depressed		
Uncertainty		
Loss of self-esteem	$-.45^{**}$	
Feeling insecure	$-.39^{**}$	$-.26^{*}$
Feeling dependent	$-.26^{*}$	
Try to have fun		
Worrying		
Crying		
Feeling lonely		
Appreciating partner		

† = $p < .10$

* = $p < .05$

** = $p < .01$

*N*s from 70-71

Table 7

Centrality and Valence Correlations of Select Features of Missing with Neuroticism

Feature of Missing	Centrality	Valence
Relief		
Feeling depressed	$.22^{\dagger}$	
Uncertainty		
Loss of self-esteem	$.35^{**}$	
Feeling insecure	$.32^{**}$	
Hopelessness		
Worrying		
Crying		
Feeling emotional	$.32^{**}$	$.24^{*}$
Feeling anxious		
Obsessing about partner		

† = $p < .10$
*= $p < .05$
**= $p < .01$
*N*s from 70-71

Table 8

Centrality Correlations of Features of Missing with Anxiety, Avoidance, Growth, Destiny, Self-Esteem, and Neuroticism Scales

Feature of Missing	Anxiety	Avoidance	Growth	Destiny	Self-Esteem	Neuroticism
Thinking about partner	$.22^{\dagger}$	$-.22^{\dagger}$	.12	$-.21^{\dagger}$	-.06	.16
Wanting to talk to partner	.11	$-.21^{\dagger}$	.13	$-.25^{*}$	.03	.06
Wanting to be with/ see partner	$.24^{*}$	$-.26^{*}$	$.27^{*}$	-.04	-.10	.09
Corresponding with partner	.08	$-.31^{**}$	$.22^{\dagger}$	$-.25^{*}$	.08	.11
Reminiscing	.10	-.16	.12	$-.36^{**}$	.01	-.01
Thinking	.16	$-.26^{*}$	$.22^{\dagger}$	$-.24^{*}$	.06	.16
Wanting to touch partner	.15	-.11	-.03	-.08	-.15	.19
Wondering what partner is doing	.09	-.16	.07	-.16	.03	.05
Look at things that remind you of partner	.17	$-.25^{*}$	$.28^{*}$	-.11	.16	.00
Feeling separated	.19	-.17	-.01	$-.25^{*}$	-.14	.12
Sexual desire	.02	-.04	.01	-.09	$.27^{*}$	-.12
Feeling nostalgic	.14	$-.34^{**}$	$.22^{\dagger}$	$-.35^{**}$	.14	.07
Longing for partner	.18	-.20	.08	$-.22^{\dagger}$	-.02	.14
Talking about your partner	.07	$-.27^{*}$	-.10	-.11	$.25^{*}$	-.02
Feeling sad	$.25^{*}$	$-.28^{*}$	$.26^{*}$	-.16	.02	.12
Wondering if partner is thinking of you	$.21^{\dagger}$	-.02	.06	-.18	.05	-.01
Wonder about relationship	-.01	-.05	.19	-.03	-.02	-.03
Looking at pictures of partner	-.01	-.177	$.22^{\dagger}$	-.17	.15	.04
Appreciating partner	-.10	$-.32^{**}$	$.20^{\dagger}$	$-.32^{**}$	.17	.04
Dreaming about partner	-.05	-.11	-.08	-.12	.19	-.06
Thinking about the future	-.11	-.09	-.11	-.09	$.38^{**}$	$-.21^{\dagger}$
Imagining	.05	-.03	.01	$-.22^{\dagger}$	-.13	.15
Feeling lonely	$.33^{**}$	-.18	.15	-.05	-.14	.15
Try to have fun	.04	-.03	-.14	.02	.03	-.11
Listening to music	-.10	-.10	-.01	-.12	$.21^{\dagger}$	-.11
Anticipation	.02	-.08	-.06	-.15	.02	.12
Yearning	.14	-.11	-.08	-.13	-.02	.06
Waiting for partner	.02	-.04	.02	.01	.00	-.05
Talk to friends as a way to distract yourself	.10	-.02	-.01	-.16	-.06	.11
Feeling emotional	$.24^{*}$	$-.21^{\dagger}$	.04	-.01	.01	$.32^{**}$
Compare current partner to alternatives	.13	-.12	$.22^{\dagger}$	$.24^{*}$	.08	-.06
Heartache	.08	$-.29^{*}$	.04	-.16	.06	.00
Wanting a hug	$.24^{*}$	-.09	-.17	-.09	-.08	$.21^{\dagger}$
Worrying	.06	-.20	.09	-.19	.04	.09
Feeling love	-.05	-.13	.00	-.19	.19	-.06
Feeling depressed	$.20^{\dagger}$	-.13	.06	.00	-.13	$.22^{\dagger}$
Feeling frustrated	.19	.12	-.16	.01	-.07	.13
Moping	$.33^{**}$	$-.23^{\dagger}$	.15	-.13	-.15	$.28^{*}$
Feeling of loss	$.24^{*}$	-.04	-.04	.02	$-.24^{*}$	$.20^{\dagger}$
Want support	.06	-.06	.00	-.18	-.07	.12
Feeling hopeful	-.13	-.12	-.04	-.14	$.24^{*}$	-.15
Lack of concentration	.07	.12	$-.21^{\dagger}$	$.22^{\dagger}$	.02	.01
Restlessness	.12	-.02	-.03	.11	-.08	.09

Feature of Missing	Anxiety	Avoidance	Growth	Destiny	Self-Esteem	Neuroticism
Watching movies	-.11	-.10	.06	.06	-.01	.16
"Sinking" feeling in stomach	.08	-.10	.01	.07	-.10	.11
Bittersweet	.09	.10	-.04	-.09	.00	-.20†
Obsessing about partner	.17	.00	-.128	.01	-.12	.16
Feeling vulnerable	.17	-.20†	.12	-.21†	-.15	.18
Feeling irritable	.10	-.02	.01	.04	-.15	.27*
Feeling bored	.09	-.04	.28*	-.03	-.12	.08
Feeling incomplete/losing a piece of yourself	.21†	-.15	-.09	.08	-.17	.04
Feeling insecure	.41**	.09	.03	.10	-.39**	.32**
Uncertainty	.11	.08	-.04	.25*	-.04	-.02
Feeling anxious	-.01	-.08	.06	-.04	.06	.02
Independence	-.13	.09	-.23†	.05	-.05	-.03
Being unproductive	.07	.11	-.14	.18	-.14	-.03
Feeling empty	.17	-.06	-.08	.14	-.13	.08
Feeling forgotten	.30*	-.03	-.12	.02	-.22†	.16
Want understanding	.19	-.09	.07	.06	-.02	.04
Buying gifts for partner	.00	-.25*	.19	-.06	.07	.20
Being quiet/ not talkative	.13	.12	-.10	.22†	-.18	.10
Feeling dependent	.23†	-.14	.00	.14	-.26*	.22†
Listlessness/lack of energy/feeling tired	.04	.07	.08	.19	-.16	.14
Feeling helpless	.17	.01	.21†	.09	-.11	.06
Lack of excitement	.23†	-.13	-.02	.27*	-.01	.11
Feeling liberated	-.23†	.14	-.09	.12	-.005	-.13
Feeling uncomfortable	.14	-.02	-.06	.20†	-.19	.14
Watching romantic movies	.05	-.07	.01	.00	.23†	.05
Crying	.02	-.09	-.05	-.04	-.05	.13
Loss of self-esteem	.25*	.11	-.11	.21†	-.45**	.35**
Feeling lost	.12	-.06	-.10	.28*	-.21†	.08
Writing	.12	-.09	-.01	-.19	-.13	.15
Feeling angry	-.04	-.06	.05	.07	-.12	.00
Apathy	.00	.09	-.03	.27*	-.30*	.05
Hopelessness	.11	-.09	-.14	.20	-.14	.11
Relief	-.10	.28*	.04	.15	-.05	-.14
Drawing	.06	-.11	.13	-.16	-.14	.11

† = $p < .10$
* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Equal Variances not assumed for T-tests
All Tests are 2-Tailed Independent Sample
*N*s from 69-71

Table 9

Valence Correlations of Features of Missing with Anxiety, Avoidance, Growth, Destiny, Self-Esteem, and Neuroticism Scales

Feature of Missing	Anxiety	Avoidance	Growth	Destiny	Self-Esteem	Neuroticism
Corresponding with partner	-.03	$-.22^{\dagger}$	.12	$-.30^{*}$	.07	.08
Feeling love	-.11	-.06	.00	$-.27^{*}$	$.31^{**}$	-.15
Listening to music	-.12	-.01	-.10	-.11	.19	-.19
Feeling hopeful	-.03	.02	.01	$-.28^{*}$	.11	-.01
Appreciating partner	-.13	-.19	$.20^{\dagger}$	$-.47^{**}$	.03	.05
Try to have fun	-.01	.11	-.12	-.08	.06	-.09
Talk to friends as a way to distract yourself	.10	-.14	.10	$-.24^{*}$	.11	.08
Independence	$-.29^{*}$	.11	-.17	-.13	.16	$-.31^{**}$
Watching movies	-.08	-.11	-.15	.03	$.27^{*}$	-.14
Feeling liberated	-.13	.11	.08	-.05	-.04	$-.20^{\dagger}$
Dreaming about partner	.05	.02	-.09	$-.21^{\dagger}$	.08	-.04
Imagining	-.04	$-.22^{\dagger}$	$.34^{**}$	-.18	.05	.09
Reminiscing	.00	-.13	.15	$-.31^{**}$	.10	.07
Buying gifts for partner	.14	-.19	.05	-.18	-.09	$.26^{*}$
Relief	-.16	.08	-.14	.14	.13	-.19
Writing	-.05	-.09	.12	$-.45^{**}$	.13	-.02
Talking about your partner	.05	-.06	-.01	$-.32^{**}$	.01	.06
Drawing	.13	$-.31^{**}$	$.26^{*}$	$-.21^{\dagger}$	.09	.10
Looking at pictures of partner	-.07	-.19	$.21^{\dagger}$	-.15	.14	.03
Thinking	-.14	.01	-.06	-.18	.14	-.08
Thinking about partner	.01	-.01	.13	$-.25^{*}$	.05	-.06
Anticipation	.17	-.05	-.01	$-.25^{*}$	.02	.14
Thinking about the future	-.17	-.14	.05	$-.13^{\dagger}$	.03	-.02
Sexual desire	-.05	.12	-.12	.03	.18	-.15
Look at things that remind you of partner	.11	.02	-.03	-.02	.19	.08
Feeling nostalgic	.01	-.04	-.13	-.16	.11	.11
Wanting to be with/ see partner	.01	.09	$.21^{\dagger}$	.09	-.08	-.07
Wanting to talk to partner	$-.22^{\dagger}$	.04	-.12	-.10	$.31^{*}$	-.16
Wondering if partner is thinking of you	-.13	-.04	.19	-.08	.15	.03
Wondering what partner is doing	-.13	.15	.18	.04	.04	-.06
Watching romantic movies	-.01	.03	.05	$-.20^{\dagger}$	.06	.06
Wanting a hug	-.16	-.02	.01	-.09	-.05	-.01
Wanting to touch partner	.17	.11	$-.28^{*}$	$.24^{*}$	-.03	.02
Bittersweet	-.07	.16	-.17	.14	-.11	.01
Compare current partner to alternatives	-.16	.05	-.07	$.37^{**}$	.09	$-.24^{*}$
Being quiet/ not talkative	$.21^{\dagger}$	.14	-.06	$.20^{\dagger}$	-.19	.16
Feeling emotional	$.26^{*}$	.12	.01	.04	-.17	$.24^{*}$
Wonder about relationship	$-.23^{\dagger}$	.05	.07	.04	.08	-.03
Apathy	.18	.11	-.04	$.27^{*}$	-.05	-.06
Want understanding	.07	.03	-.03	.02	.05	-.08
Longing for partner	-.10	.07	-.02	-.05	.03	-.05
Yearning	-.02	.08	.10	-.02	.12	-.04
Waiting for partner	.07	.01	.09	.18	.08	-.10

Feature of Missing	Anxiety	Avoidance	Growth	Destiny	Self-Esteem	Neuroticism
Want support	.12	.15	-.03	.15	-.08	.03
Restlessness	-.02	.15	.04	.12	-.13	-.03
Lack of concentration	.06	.13	.01	.17	.00	-.09
Feeling bored	-.02	.03	.17	.12	.03	-.08
Feeling irritable	.19	.27*	-.20†	.26*	-.23†	.22†
Uncertainty	.04	.18	.04	.19	-.13	-.05
Being unproductive	-.04	.40**	-.15	-.08	-.09	-.07
Lack of excitement	.07	.07	.04	.16	-.14	.02
Feeling anxious	.11	.19	-.05	.16	-.26*	.05
Obsessing about partner	.16	.16	.17	.15	-.16	.11
Feeling dependent	.04	.00	.05	.11	-.02	-.02
Feeling frustrated	.13	.06	.13	.19	-.21†	.06
Feeling angry	.16	.03	-.18	.24*	-.01	-.07
Worrying	.03	.11	.07	.23†	.11	-.02
Heartache	.00	.24*	.02	.39**	-.11	-.06
Moping	.05	.15	.01	.21†	-.16	.02
Feeling of loss	.06	.09	.13	.19	-.14	.04
Feeling separated	.14	.51**	-.23†	.25*	-.21†	-.02
Feeling uncomfortable	.04	.17	.04	.14	-.12	.09
Listlessness/lack of energy/ feeling tired	-.02	.07	.07	.17	-.07	-.08
Feeling lonely	-.16	.01	.01	.01	.13	.01
Feeling helpless	-.04	.30*	-.06	.08	-.10	.16
Feeling empty	.00	.05	.25*	.30*	.00	.01
Hopelessness	.07	.15	.07	.10	.01	.02
Feeling lost	.20†	.08	.14	.07	-.21†	.06
Feeling incomplete/losing a piece of yourself	.12	.26*	.12	.20†	-.13	.03
"Sinking" feeling in stomach	-.10	.07	-.04	.15	.01	-.05
Feeling vulnerable	-.04	.10	-.11	.15	-.04	-.11
Crying	-.09	.03	-.04	.04	-.11	.04
Feeling insecure	.12	.17	-.12	.00	-.26*	.10
Loss of self-esteem	.01	.15	-.03	.25*	-.11	.02
Feeling sad	.14	.30*	.02	.14	-.32**	.09
Feeling forgotten	-.03	.23†	.12	.21†	-.11	.06
Feeling depressed	.00	.34**	-.24*	.18	-.18	-.02

† = $p < .10$
* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Equal Variances not assumed for T-tests
All Tests are 2-Tailed Independent Sample
*N*s from 69-71

Appendix 1

In this section you will be asked to list as many features or characteristics of different interpersonal concepts as you can. For example, if you were asked to list the characteristics of the concept "extroversion" you might write: "liveliness", "vivaciousness", "likes to party", "sociability," and so on.

Think for a moment about what it means to "miss" a romantic partner. Please list as many features or characteristics of "missing" a romantic partner as come to mind. For example, you might want to list things including what you feel like, think about, or things you do when you miss someone. Even if you've never missed a romantic partner, you can still write things relevant to what you think it might be like to miss a romantic partner. There are no right or wrong answers. Please do not take more than about 3 minutes to complete this task.

Appendix 2

Methodology for Combining Free Response Entries

1. Different grammatical forms of the same word or phrase were combined.

Modifiers were ignored unless they altered the meaning of the word they modified (such as “not”).

2. Words or phrases judged to be virtually identical in meaning, such as “butterflies in my stomach” and “nervous”.

3. When combining words, for example, “confused” and “confusion”, we have the most-often-cited word subsume the other. In times when several all had the same frequency, we combined them into the simplest or root form of the word, or in the case of a verb, the infinitive form ending with –ing.

4. The rule of thumb was to be as conservative as possible in the initial stages of coding, so that any decision that required judgment or deliberation could be done with other judges present.

Appendix 3

We are interested in your thoughts about the experience of "missing" a romantic partner (i.e., how you feel when you are separated from a romantic partner). In particular, listed below are a series of characteristics, or "features" that may be associated to the experience of missing a romantic partner. We are interested in how central each of these features is to the experience of missing someone (i.e., if you think that each of these is a key component of the experience of missing), and if you think these are pleasant or unpleasant.

Using the provided scaled, please rate how central (i.e., typical vs. atypical) each of the following features is to the experience of "missing" someone. In addition, please rate the extent to which each is pleasant or unpleasant (or how you imagine this experience would feel).

Appendix 4

Attachment Style

The following statements concern how you feel in romantic relationships. We are interested in how you **generally experience romantic relationships**, not just in what is happening in your current relationship if you are currently involved. Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it. Write the number in the space provided, using the following rating scale:

Not True			Somewhat True			Very True
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.
2. I worry about being abandoned.
3. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.
4. I worry a lot about my relationships.
5. Just when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away.
6. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.
7. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.
8. I worry a fair amount about losing my partner.
9. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.
10. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him/her.
11. I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back.
12. I often want to merge completely with romantic partners, and this sometimes scares them away.
13. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.
14. I worry about being alone.
15. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.
16. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
17. I try to avoid getting too close to my partner.
18. I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner.
19. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.
20. Sometimes I feel that I force my partners to show more feeling, more commitment.
21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.
22. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
23. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.
24. If I can't get my partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry.
25. I tell my partner just about everything.
26. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.
27. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.
28. When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure.
29. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.
30. I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like.
31. I don't mind asking romantic partners for comfort, advice, or help.
32. I get frustrated if romantic partners are not available when I need them.
33. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.
34. When romantic partners disapprove of me, I feel really bad about myself.
35. I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance.
36. I resent it when my partner spends time away from me.

Implicit Theories of Relationships

The following items regard beliefs about relationships. For each item, please write the number that best reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree, using the scale below from 1 to 7.

I strongly disagree						*I strongly agree*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. Potential relationship partners are either compatible or they are not.
2. The ideal relationship develops gradually over time.
3. A successful relationship is mostly a matter of finding a compatible partner right from the start.
4. A successful relationship evolves through hard work and resolution of incompatibilities.
5. Potential relationship partners are either destined to get along or they are not.
6. A successful relationship is mostly a matter of learning to resolve conflicts with a partner.
7. Relationships that do not start off well inevitably fail.
8. Challenges and obstacles in a relationship can make love even stronger.
9. If a potential relationship is not meant to be, it will become apparent very soon.
10. Problems in a relationship can bring partners closer together.
11. The success of a potential relationship is destined from the very beginning.
12. Relationships often fail because people do not try hard enough.
13. In order to last, a relationship must seem right from the start.
14. With enough effort, almost any relationship can work.
15. A relationship that does not get off to a perfect start will never work.
16. It takes a lot of time and effort to cultivate a good relationship.
17. Struggles at the beginning of a relationship are a sure sign that the relationship will fail.
18. Without conflict from time to time, relationships cannot improve.
19. Unsuccessful relationships were never meant to be.
20. Arguments often enable a relationship to improve.
21. Early troubles in a relationship signify a poor match between partners.
22. Successful relationships require regular maintenance.

Self Esteem

Below you will find a number of personal belief statements. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the number under the appropriate heading.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
2. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
3. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
4. I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.
5. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
6. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
7. I certainly feel useless at times.
8. At times I think I am no good at all.
9. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
10. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

Personality – Big-5

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Using the scale provided, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

1 Disagree strongly
2 Disagree a little
3 Neither agree nor disagree
4 Agree a little
5 Agree Strongly

I see myself as someone who ...

1. Is talkative
2. Tends to find fault with others
3. Does a thorough job
4. Is depressed, blue
5. Is original, comes up with new ideas
6. Is reserved
7. Is helpful and unselfish with others
8. Can be somewhat careless
9. Is relaxed, handles stress well
10. Is curious about many different things
11. Is full of energy
12. Starts quarrels with others
13. Is a reliable worker
14. Can be tense
15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker
16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm
17. Has a forgiving nature
18. Tends to be disorganized
19. Worries a lot
20. Has an active imagination
21. Tends to be quiet
22. Is generally trusting
23. Tends to be lazy
24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset
25. Is inventive
26. Has an assertive personality
27. Can be cold and aloof
28. Perseveres until the task is finished
29. Can be moody
30. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences
31. Is sometimes shy, inhibited
32. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone
33. Does things efficiently
34. Remains calm in tense situations
35. Prefers work that is routine
36. Is outgoing, sociable
37. Is sometimes rude to others
38. Makes plans and follows through with them
39. Gets nervous easily
40. Likes to reflect, play with ideas
41. Has few artistic interests
42. Likes to cooperate with others
43. Is easily distracted
44. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature