1979

Jealousy as a function of self preoccupation and styles of loving

Teresa L. Johnston
University of Richmond

Matt E. Jaremko

Jealousy as a Function of Self Preoccupation and Styles of Loving

Teresa L. Johnston and Matt E. Jaremko

University of Richmond

Introduction

In reviewing psychological studies, there has been no investigation in the area of jealousy as affected by styles of loving and self preoccupation. In relation to the general area of jealousy, Bryson (1977) did a study in which he wished to discover those characteristics of situations in which jealousy is usually expressed. His procedure effectively simulated a situation in which jealousy was expressed. As a result of his study, Bryson defined jealousy as it was created by his procedure, a situation in which an intruder is seen as a threat to an already established relationship between two persons. This definition is the one which was accepted and incorporated into the present study. A modification of the Bryson procedure was used to test further hypotheses.

Two previously established scales, the SAMPLE and the SAS, were also used in the investigation of this area. First, the SAMPLE love scale (Lasswell and Lasswell, 1976) provided an excellent measurement for different styles of loving. The six styles are: storgic (life-long friendships), agape (other-centered), manic love (dependent and possessive), pragmatic love (practical and sensible), ludic love (playful and self-centered), and erotic love (romantic). Ones responses on this scale supposedly indicate the ways in which he or she defines love.

Second, the SAS (Noles and Jaremko, 1979) provided a measurement for self preoccupation. Self preoccupation may

be defined as the degree to which a person focuses on his feeling, his appearance, his needs, and the impression he is making on other people (Fenigstein, Schierer, & Buss, 1975).

The present study was done to investigate jealousy as a function of styles of loving and self preoccupation. It was hypothesized that a high self preoccupied person would tend to be more jealous than a low self preoccupied person. This hypothesis could be supported by the accepted definition of a self preoccupied person. In other words, because the self preoccupied person is self-centered, he would probably be more jealous than the low self preoccupied person who is other-centered. Furthermore, it might also be hypothesized that persons who define love in manic or ludic terms would express more jealousy than would those who define love in other terms. This hypothesis could be supported primarily by those significant correlations found for the SAS and manic and ludic love in our previous correlational study. This hypothesis might also be supported simply by the definitions of these styles of loving. Each style is based on self-centeredness, and "jealousy" is actually included in the definition of manic love.

Method

Subjects. Subjects were twenty undergraduates, nine females and eleven males. They were divided into two groups, ten high self preoccupied persons, four females and six males, and ten low self preoccupied persons, five females and five males. Each subject received course credit for participating. These

subjects were chosen on the basis of their scores on the SAS which was given earlier by another student. Those persons having scores below 185 were included in the high self preoccupied group and those having scores above 230 were included in the low self preoccupied group.

Apparatus. Within the procedure of this study the administration of several scales was included. First, the SAMPLE love scale (1976) was used. This scale is a fifty-item, true-false questionnaire that yields scores for six styles of loving. Lasswell and Lasswell (1976) and Rosenman (1978) present preliminary psychometric information on this device. Second, the SAS, which was developed by Noles and Jaremko (1979) to measure different types of trait self preoccupation was also included in this study. The SAS is a fifty-item Likert-type questionnaire that is still experimental. Some preliminary reliability and validity data are provided by Noles and Jaremko (1979). Third, a values ranking task which included seven items which were to be ranked according to the subjects' values was also used. Fourth, an "I Feel" scale, which included a list of ten feelings, was used by the subjects to rate their feelings. Fifth, a Personality Rating scale, which included twenty general personality characteristics, was used by the subjects to rate themselves and the confederates. Both the "I Feel" scale and the Personality Rating scale were based on a scale from 1 to 7, "1" being "not at all" and "7" being "a great deal". (Refer to Appendix A for examples of these scales.)

Procedure. This procedure included the participation of an

experimenter, two confederates, one female and one male, and one subject. However, the confederates were presented to the subject as subjects. According to the sex of the subject, Confederate A, the establisher of a relationship with the subject, was always of the opposite sex, and Confederate B, the intruder, was always of the same sex.

The experiment began as the subject was met by the experimenter and seated in a room at a table with two chairs. The subject was first given a consent form to read and sign. It read as follows: "This experiment involves working closely with other people in order to achieve a goal. You will be required to work with two other persons, who are also subjects, on a problem of values clarification. After working with these persons, you will be asked to fill out scales evaluating yourself and the two other subjects.

If you decide to participate, all of your responses will be kept confidential." After reading the consent form, the SAMPLE love scale was then given to the subject. After completing this task, the experimenter brought Confederate A into the room and introduced him/her to the subject. The confederate was seated next to the subject. These persons were given the values ranking task and told to work together to reach an agreement on their ranking. A time limit of five minutes was given to complete this task. During these five minutes, the confederate and subject were left alone while the confederate expressed interest and liking by making three inquiries about the subject's values, three compliments to the

subject, and by using three touches. These behaviors of the confederate were consistent with each subject. After five minutes, the experimenter reentered the room and said that she now wanted each subject to work on other scales separately. Confederate A was taken out of the room and the subject was then given one "I Feel" scale with which to rate themselves and two Personality Rating scales with which to rate themselves and Confederate A. After completing these scales, the subject was told that he/she would now repeat the values ranking task by working with two subjects. The subject was taken to another room with a table and three chairs in which Confederates A and B were already seated. These persons were introduced to one another and the values ranking task was explained once again. A five minute limit was also given for the completion of this task. The subject and Confederates A and B were left alone while the confederates expressed interest in and liking of one another by using the same means which were used with the subject. The subjects comments and opinions were virtually ignored by both confederates. At the end of the five minutes, the subject was taken to his original location and asked to complete the "I Feel" scale rating himself and three Personality Rating scales rating himself and both confederates. After completing these scales, the subject was debriefed.

Results

Analysis of the data included several statistical procedures. First, a t-test was done for the Personality Rating scores obtained for the subjects' rating of Confederate B,

the intruder. This analysis yielded a t value of 3.27 which is significant at the .05 level. Second, a correlational analysis was done for the scores from the subjects' rating of the intruder with the Personality Rating scale with the scores for the "I Feel" scale. The results of this analysis yielded a positive correlation. A correlational analysis was also done for the "I Feel" scale with each style of loving. This analysis yielded notable positive correlations with the manic, ludic, and erotic styles of loving. Table 1 gives the specific correlational values found.

Third, a two-factor mixed design, repeated measures on one factor, was used to analyze the data from the "I Feel" scale, from the rating of self on the Personality Rating scale, and from the rating of the partner on the Personality Rating scale. The analysis of the "I Feel" scores yielded an F-ratio for conditions of 4.12, an F-ratio for trials of 13.52, and an F-ratio for trials by conditions of 12.79. These F-ratios are reported in Table 2. The analysis of the scores from the rating of self on the Personality Rating scale yielded an F-ratio for conditions of 8.37, an F-ratio for trials of 2.66, and an F-ratio for trials by conditions of 2.92. These F-ratios are reported in Table 3. Finally, an analysis of the scores from the rating of the partner on the Personality Rating scale yielded an F-ratio for conditions of 3.14, an F-ratio for trials of 1.23, and an F-ratio for conditions by trials of 1.72.

Discussion

Many conclusions might be drawn from these statistical

analyses. First, from the significant t value one conclusion might be drawn. Concerning an intruder, the opinions of a high self preoccupied person are likely to be significantly different from those held by a low self preoccupied person. Second, from the correlational analysis, it might be concluded that feelings of jealousy are related to some extent to ones opinion of an intruder. Furthermore, feelings of jealousy also seem to be more related to manic, ludic, and erotic styles of love than to other styles of love. Our correlational analysis and this conclusion support our initial hypothsis. Third, several conclusions might also be drawn from the F-ratios. By our analysis of the "I Feel" scores, it can be concluded from the F-ratio for trials that there was a significant change in the scores for the pre and post tests. In other words, the experimental procedure probably created a significant change in the feelings of the subjects about themselves. From the F-ratio for trials by conditions, it might be concluded that there was a significant interaction or that the high self preoccupied subjects and the low self preoccupied subjects were both effected. However, these two groups were effected at different rates. In other words, it is possible that the high group experienced more intense feelings of jealousy than did the low group.

For the analysis of the self rating with the Personality Rating scale, the F-ratio for conditions leads one to conclude that whether one is a high or low self preoccupied person effects the degree to which one experiences jealousy. For

the F-ratio for trials and for trials by conditions, the same conclusions might be drawn as were noted in the above paragraph.

Finally, for the analysis of the rating of the partner with the Personality Rating scale, the significant F-ratio for conditions further support previouly stated conclusions.

Appendix A. - Examples of Scales

In responding to the items below, when it is appropriate, think of your most significant peer love relationships. If you cannot decide which has been the most significant, think of your most recent significant relationship. If you wish, you may think of your ideal love relationship whether you have actually experienced it or not.

T F I believe that "love at first sight" is possible.

T F I did not realize that I was in love until I actually had been for some time.

T F When things aren't going right with us, my stomach gets upset.

T F From a practical point of view, I must consider what a person is going to become in life before I commit myself to loving him/her.

T F You cannot have love unless you have first had caring for a while.

T F It's always a good idea to keep your lover a little uncertain about how committed you are to him/her.

T F The first time we kissed or rubbed cheeks, I felt a definite genital response (lubrication, erection).

T F I still have good friendships with almost everyone with whom I have ever been involved in a love relationship.

T F It makes good sense to plan your life carefully before you choose a lover.

T F When my love affairs break up, I get so depressed that I have even thought of suicide.

T F Sometimes I get so excited about being in love that I can't sleep.

T F I try to use my own strength to help my lover through difficult times, even when he/she is behaving foolishly.

T F I would rather suffer myself than let my lover suffer.

T F Part of the fun of being in love is testing one's skill at keeping it going and getting what one wants from it at the same time.

T F As far as my lovers go, what they don't know about me doesn't hurt them.

T F It is best to love someone with a similar background.

T F We kissed each other soon after we met because we both wanted to.

T F When my lover doesn't pay attention to me, I feel sick all over.

19. T F I cannot be happy unless I place my lover's happiness before my own.

20. T F Usually the first thing that attracts my attention to a person is his/her pleasing physical appearance.

21. T F The best kind of love grows out of a long friendship.

22. T F When I am in love, I have trouble concentrating on anything else.

23. T F At the first touch of his/her hand, I knew that love was a real possibility.

24. T F When I break up with someone, I go out of my way to see that he/she is O.K.

25. T F I cannot relax if I suspect that he/she is with someone else.

T F I have at least once had to plan carefully to keep two of my lovers from finding out about each other.

T F I can get over love affairs pretty easily and quickly.

T F A main consideration in choosing a lover is how he/she reflects on my family.

T F The best part of love is living together, building a home together, and rearing children together.

T F I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let my lover achieve his/hers.

T F A main consideration in choosing a partner is whether or not he/she will be a good parent.

T F Kissing, cuddling, and sex shouldn't be rushed into; they will happen naturally when one's intimacy has grown enough.

T F I enjoy flirting with attractive people.

T F My lover would get upset if she/he knew some of the things I've done with other people.

T F Before I fell in love, I had a pretty clear physical picture of what my true love would be like.

T F If my lover had a baby by someone else, I would want to raise it, love it, and care for it as if it were my own.

T F It is hard to say exactly when we fell in love.

T F I couldn't truly love anyone I would not be willing to marry.

T F Even though I don't want to be jealous, I can't help it when he/she pays attention to someone else.

T F I would rather break up with my lover than to stand in his/her way.

1. T F I like the idea of me and my lover having the same kinds of clothes, hats, plants, bicycles, cars, etc.

2. T F I wouldn't date anyone that I wouldn't want to fall in love with.

3. T F At least once when I thought a love affair was all over, I saw him/her again and knew I couldn't realistically see him/her without loving him/her

4. T F Whatever I own is my lover's to use as he/she chooses.

5. T F If my lover ignores me for a while, I sometimes do really stupid things to try to get his/her attention back.

6. T F It's fun to see whether I can get someone to go out with me even if I don't want to get involved with that person.

7. T F A main consideration in choosing a mate is how he/she will reflect on one's career.

8. T F When my lover doesn't see me or call for a while, I assume he/she has a good reason.

9. T F Before getting very involved with anyone, I try to figure out how compatible his/her hereditary background is with mine in case we have children.

0. T F The best love relationships are the ones that last the longest.

hen answering the above questions, did you usually have in mind:

1. Your most significant relationship?

2. Your most recent relationship?

3. Your ideal relationship?

Sex_____

Class_____

SELF-ANALYSIS SCALE

Please choose the number that most closely describes how you generally feel about each statement. Try to be as honest and open as you can be. Your first impression is usually the most accurate so don't spend too much time on any one item. Write the number you choose on the line next to each question.

		Always			Sometimes			Never	
1.	At a small gathering, I am concerned with the impression I'm making.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
2.	I am aware of all the "right" people to know.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
3.	When others laugh at me, I am able to be unaffected by it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
4.	When my troubles are mounting up, I can still think of others less fortunate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
5.	I've had good experiences when I've tried to understand someone who is angry at me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
6.	When I walk by a mirror, I usually look at how my clothes appear.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
7.	At small parties, I am usually aware of who is looking at me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
8.	I wonder what it would be like to be famous.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
9.	My opinions change depending on whom I'm with.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
10.	I agree with people even when I disagree so as to avoid conflict.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
11.	I enjoy being with important people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
12.	Being busy makes me feel important.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
13.	I like telling of other people's good fortune.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
14.	I find it difficult to fall in love.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
15.	I am conscious of how I look even when no one else is around.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____
16.	I attempt to imitate people whom I feel are accepted by others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	_____

7. I am embarrassed to be seen with unattractive people because of what others may think.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7_____
8. I am generally uninterested in other people's affairs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7_____
9. I am concerned with getting ahead in life because it is important to be successful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7_____
0. I feel I lack the necessary abilities to be successful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7_____

Value Ranking - My most important values

____wealth

____family

____intelligency

____attractiveness

____boyfriend/girlfriend

____independence

____friends

AT THIS MOMENT, I FEEL:

	NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE	A MODERATE AMOUNT	A GOOD DEAL	A GREAT DEAL
	1	2	3	4	5
1. HAPPY					
2. INSECURE					
3. ACCEPTED					
4. ANGRY					
5. HURT					
6. EMBARRASSED					
7. EXCITED					
8. APPRECIATED					
9. INTERESTING					
10. REJECTED					

PERSONALITY RATING SCALE

	NOT AT ALL	LITTLE	A MODERATE AMOUNT		A FAIR AMOUNT		A GREAT DEAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
AFRAID							
AGREEABLE							
AGGRESSIVE							
ANNOYING							
CALM							
CONTRARY							
COOPERATIVE							
CRITICAL							
CRUEL							
DEVOTED							
FRIENDLY							
HOSTILE							
INTERESTED							
INTELLIGENT							
KIND							
MEAN							
UNSOCIABLE							
UNDERSTANDING							
THOUGHTFUL							
UNPLEASANT							

Appendix B. - Statistical Analyses

Table 1

Correlational Analysis

	"I Feel" Rating
Intruder Pers. Rating	.4345
Storgic Love	.0429
Agape Love	.1015
Manic Love	.4094
Pragmatic Love	.1543
Ludic Love	.2277
Erotic Love	.2567

Table 2

Two-Factor Mixed Design - "I Feel" Rating

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	2254.97	39	—	—	—
Between Subjects	1818.47	9	—	—	—
Conditions	99.22	1	99.22	4.12	>.005
$Error_b$	1719.25	18	95.51	—	—
Within Subjects	436.50	20	—	—	—
Trials	133.22	1	133.22	13.52	<.005
Trials x Conditions	126.03	1	126.03	12.79	<.005
$Error_w$	177.25	18	9.85	—	—

Table 3

Two-Factor Mixed Design - Personality Rating Scale-Self Rating

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	6983.60	39	___	___	___
Between Subjects	5491.60	9	___	___	___
Conditions	1742.40	1	1742.40	8.37	<.01
$Error_b$	3749.20	18	208.29	___	___
Within Subjects	1492.00	20	___	___	___
Trials	168.10	1	168.10	2.66	<.20
Trials x Conditions	184.90	1	184.90	2.92	<.20
$Error_w$	1138.00	18	63.28	___	___

Table 4

Two-Factor Mixed Design - Personality Rating Scale-Partner Rating

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	4314.00	39	___	___	___
Between Subjects	3491.00	9	___	___	___
Conditions	518.40	1	518.40	3.14	<.10
$Error_b$	2972.60	18	165.14	___	___
Within Subjects	823.00	20	___	___	___
Trials	48.40	1	48.40	1.23	>.10
Trials x Conditions	67.60	1	67.60	1.27	>.10
$Error_w$	707.00	18	39.28	___	___

References

Bryson, J.B. Situational determinants of the expression of jealousy. San Diego State University. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, 1977.

Fenigstein, A., Scheirer, M.F., & Buss, A.H. Public and private self-consciousness: theory and assessment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 522-527.

Lasswell, T.E., & Lasswell, M. I love you but I'm not in love with you. Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, 1976, 2, 211-224.

Noles, S. & Jaremko, M.E. The measurement of self preoccupation. University of Richmond. Paper presented at the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, 1979.

Rosenman, M.F. Liking, loving, and styles of loving. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 1243-1246.

Rubin, Z. Liking and loving: an invitation to social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehardt, & Winston, 1973.