

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SEXUAL JEALOUSY INVENTORY

by

Edward Alexander Clarke

B.A., McGill University, 1977

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department
of
Psychology

© Edward Alexander Clarke 1981

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

October 1981

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Edward Alexander Clarke

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of thesis: The development of a sexual jealousy inventory

Examining Committee:

Chairperson: Dr. Dennis Krebs

Dr. Phillip G. Wright
Senior Supervisor

Dr. William Krane

Dr. James E. Marcia

Dr. Julie R. Brickman
External Examiner
Clinical and Consulting
Psychologist

Date Approved: December 16, 1981

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Dissertation:

The development of a sexual jealousy inventory

Author:

(Signature)

Edward Alexander Clarke

(Name)

December 16, 1981

(Date)

ABSTRACT

Sexual jealousy is a complex emotion which is usually defined in the context of a situation, beliefs and perceptions, an affective state, and behaviours. Psychoanalysts and psychiatrists have developed typologies and etiological theories of sexual jealousy based on their work with clinical populations. Psychologists have focused more on the development of jealousy within a cultural context. Recent psychological research has been aimed at the development and use of measuring scales to examine the correlates of jealousy and to examine sex differences in sexual jealousy expression. None of the research, however, has clearly demonstrated a valid and reliable measuring instrument.

A new inventory was constructed on the basis of literature-derived social and dispositional characteristics of sexually jealous people. The purpose of the three studies described in this paper was to evaluate the inventory in terms of internal reliability, and convergent, discriminant and concurrent validities as they relate to construct validity. The inventory was shown to have internal reliability, and convergent and discriminant validity. Concurrent validity was not demonstrated. The latter result was related to weaknesses in the development of the inventory and in the criteria questions used to evaluate concurrent validity.

The overall trend of positive results from the three studies was seen as a justification for the continuation of the development and evaluation of a sexual jealousy inventory on the basis of literature-derived social and dispositional characteristics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep appreciation to my senior supervisor, Dr. Philip G. Wright, who was a constant source of support and guidance. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee--Dr. B. Krane, Dr. J. Marcia and Dr. J. Brickman--for their challenging and helpful suggestions, and occasional barbs. Two people who were particularly necessary for my thesis were Ms. J. Foster, M.A. and H. Veiel--without them I would not have been able to put any of my own or my committee's ideas into action. I'd also like to thank a lovely young couple who provided me with much food for thought during the course of my thesis--Connor and Blue. Lastly, I would like to thank jealousy for giving me something other than heartache.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval.....	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables	vii
I. Introduction	1
Definitions and examples of jealousy	2✓
Typologies and etiological theories of sexual jealousy	4✓
Psychological research on jealousy	20✓
II. Construction and evaluation of a sexual jealousy inventory	33
Construction of the Zander Jealousy Inventory	33
Evaluation of the Zander Jealousy Inventory	35
Experiment 1	40
Experiment 2	54
Experiment 3	65
III. Discussion	82
IV. Appendices	92
Reference notes--unpublished sources	119
References--published sources	120

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1--Means, standard deviations and reliability coefficients of the ZJI and SRJS.....	43
Table 2--Differential reliability index of ZJI items.....	44
Table 3--ZJI items and factor loadings of the two factor solution.....	47
Table 4--Pearson correlation coefficients between the ZJI, SDS, SRJS, SRJS subscales and age.....	51
Table 5--Means, standard deviations and reliability coefficients of the ZJI and SRJS.....	58
Table 6--Items and factor loadings of the two factor solution.....	59
Table 7--Pearson correlation coefficients between the ZJI, SRJS, Endurance and Play scales, SRJS subscales, SDS and age.....	63
Table 8--Means, standard deviations and reliability coefficients of the ZJI and SRJS.....	69
Table 9--ZJI items and factor loadings of the two factor solution.....	70
Table 10--Pearson correlations between jealousy scores and partner perception questions--between sex....	73
Table 11--Pearson correlations between jealousy scores and partner perception questions--within sex.....	75
Table 12--Pearson correlation coefficients between the ZJI,	

SRJS, SRJS subscales, SDS, years together, Endurance and Play scales and age.....	76
Table 13--Summary of Pearson correlation coefficients from Experiments I, II, and III.....	79

I. Introduction

Sexual jealousy is, and probably always has been, a controversial topic. The romantic notion that sexual jealousy is an expression of true love has recently been supplanted by the belief that sexual jealousy is a clear sign of immaturity. Of course, one's particular perspective depends upon the circles in which one moves. Some cultures clearly regard sexual jealousy as an integral aspect of interpersonal relations. In our society the responses vary considerably--some people are proud of their jealous feelings, some hate themselves for them and others claim to not really know what feeling sexually jealous is all about.

This paper describes an attempt to develop a sexual jealousy measuring instrument. The initial section of the introduction provides a definition and gives examples of sexual jealousy. Following this I review the theoretical and observational work of psychoanalysts, psychiatrists and psychologists and their respective typological and etiological theories of sexual jealousy. Each of these professional groups has provided valuable perspectives on jealousy but as yet no integrated theory has emerged. The purpose of the review is not to propose such an integration but rather to provide the reader with background information on the ways in which sexual jealousy

has been conceptually and empirically analyzed. It is within the section which reviews the recent empirical studies of sexual jealousy that the rationale for the development of a new sexual jealousy inventory is presented.

Definitions and examples of jealousy

The definition of sexual jealousy usually entails the identification of four components: 1) a situation; 2) beliefs and perceptions; 3) an affective state; and 4) behaviours. The situations vary but they typically involve an established relationship between Person A (the jealous individual) and Person B (the partner), and the presence of Person C (the other). In some cases Person C may not be present at all but Person A will be convinced of their actual or potential existence. In other cases, the relationship between Person A and Person B will be seen as established only by Person A. The beliefs and perceptions of the jealous individual are that he or she is actually losing or may potentially lose the physical and emotional affection of the partner to the other. Person A usually perceives Person C as someone with physical, emotional or behavioural attributes more desirable to Person B than his/her own. The perception of the other as a threat to the established relationship can range from a suspicion that the partner prefers to talk with them to an absolute delusional

conviction that the partner is secretly and spitefully being sexually active with them. In some cases the belief in infidelity is reflected in uninvited and repetitively intrusive thoughts about the nature of activities between the partner and the other. The affective component may involve a range of emotional reactions including fear, anxiety, anger, helplessness and guilt. Jealousy's affective part can be said to be made up of many single emotions which are stimulated in varying degrees by the nature of the situation and the perceptions of the individual. The behavioural component of jealousy includes a wide range of possible reactions. Person A may vigilantly or zealously watch over the actions of Person B while the latter is with Person C; A may interrogate B about the nature of his/her activities while apart; A may inspect B's personal belongings and clothing for evidence of intimate contact; A may withdraw from interacting with B; A may make angry accusations accompanied by physical violence or make excessive demands of B as proof of his/her (B's) willingness to make retribution for actual or imagined wrongdoings (Arnold, 1960; Bowman, 1965; Bringle, Roach, Andler, & Evenbeck, Note 1; Spielman, 1971; Shepherd, 1961; Tipton, Benedictson, Mahoney, & Hartnett, 1978; Note 2). Clanton & Smith (1977) point out that jealous reactions can occur when a person perceives that she or he is losing the affection of a partner to non-human others such as hobbies, pets and work but the present review is concerned with sexual or

romantic jealousy as outlined above.

While many writers have emphasized the differences between jealousy and envy (Evans, 1975; Klein, 1957; Spielman, 1971) their usage is often confused in everyday language. The distinctions made by Bryson (Note 3) and definitions discussed by Bringle et al. (Note 1) offer clear and operational definitions. For these researchers there is a distinction to be made between jealousy, envy and rivalry. Jealousy is said to exist when a pre-established relationship between a person and an asset (ie., a person or object) is viewed as being threatened by another. Envy exists when an individual is upset over the relationship someone else has with an asset. Rivalry exists when two people, neither of whom has an established relationship with a mutually desired object or person, compete for its possession. The definition of jealousy, presented above, is the one which will be adopted for the purposes of this paper.

Typologies and etiological theories of sexual jealousy

Jealousy has not been extensively examined by psychologists until recent years. Psychiatrists and psychoanalysts have been only moderately more concerned with the phenomenon despite the recognition that jealousy is very common in a normal population and is quite prevalent within a clinical one (Langfeldt, 1961). Romantic and sexual jealousy have been written about in the

literary works of many nations for centuries but the current Western conceptions of this complex emotion owe much to the work of early twentieth century psychiatrists and psychoanalysts. The initial attempts to identify and understand jealousy's different forms were represented in the literature by case studies and theoretical examinations from a Freudian and neo-Freudian perspective. Recently researchers in social and clinical psychology have begun to examine and evaluate some of the correlates of sexual jealousy through experimental studies. They also present their own theories on the etiology of jealousy. With only a few exceptions (eg., Arnold, 1960) emotion theorists have paid surprisingly little attention to jealousy.

1. The psychoanalytic/psychiatric literature

Typologies of sexual jealousy, or attempts to differentiate its varying forms, are found primarily within the psychoanalytic and psychiatric literature. The psychoanalytic/psychiatric typologies are based on case studies and clinical observations of jealous individuals. Mooney (1965) identifies two traditional classification systems within this framework, one psychodynamic and the other descriptive.

The psychodynamic classification system is based on certain intrapsychic mechanisms believed to be responsible for the different levels of observed intensity in jealous reactions. The

descriptions of these processes explain their functioning within men but it is assumed that the mechanisms for women are of a similar nature (Jones, 1930). Freud's (1922/1955) classification of jealousy stands as the classic psychodynamic typology. He divided jealousy into three general categories or grades--normal, projected and delusional. Normal jealousy is in response to a situation in which there is an actual threat by a competitor to an individual's relationship with a sexual partner. It is not seen as being a completely rational or conscious reaction as it still owes its source to the previously experienced Oedipal situation of competition with the father for possession of the mother. Normal jealousy is a mixture of: 1) grief at the thought of losing the love object; 2) a narcissistic injury or loss of self-esteem; 3) anger at the rival; and 4) self-criticism for the loss. It is the base upon which the other two types of jealousy are formed. Projected jealousy is a more intense form that is the result of the projection of an unconscious impulse of unfaithfulness. Bleuler (1911) had earlier identified this process as the prime etiological factor in jealousy. For Freud, projected jealousy is represented in the phrase, "it is not I who is unfaithful, but it is she". Delusional jealousy is the result of unconscious homosexual impulses which are distorted and projected onto the accused. It also originates in the repressed temptation of infidelity but the desired object is now of the same sex as the

jealous individual. It is represented in the phrase, "I do not love him, but she loves him". Freud observed that delusional jealousy is associated with paranoid disorders.

Jones (1930), following Freud, reiterated the same grades of jealousy but relabelled the projected type as neurotic jealousy. Both neurotic and delusional jealousy are again viewed as magnified forms of normal jealousy. The particular type of jealousy which manifests itself in an individual depends on the degree of unconscious fixation at the Oedipal level. Here Jones refers to the circumstances and strategic mechanisms which were at play during the individual's prior situation with the mother and father. For Jones the components of normal jealousy are the same as Freud's with one addition--the repressed guilt of moral inferiority which has its roots in the unacceptable impulse to possess the mother. This aspect is expanded upon by Seidenberg (1952) who maintains that symptoms of jealousy reflect both an indirect gratification of the Oedipal wish and suffering because of the guilt surrounding this wish. Jones' formulations of neurotic and delusional jealousy are the same as Freud's.

A number of other psychodynamic writers have presented individual case studies which serve to provide additional confirmatory evidence for the proposed intrapsychic mechanisms at work in sexually jealous people (Barag, 1949; Pao, 1977; Riviere, 1932). More general explanations of the dynamics of the phenomenon of sexual jealousy are presented in papers by

Tellenbach (1974) and Evans (1975).

The descriptive classification systems generally type jealous reactions according to the nature of the presenting symptoms and do not usually intermesh etiology with typology. Some authors do, however, include their own theories of etiology. Rather than presenting clear-cut symptom descriptions, the descriptive classifications are based on the degree of intensity of the jealous reactions and on whether or not the individual regards his or her jealousy as being ego-syntonic or dystonic (Mooney, 1965). Mooney identifies three categories of jealousy usually found within the descriptive systems: 1) normal; 2) irrational or obsessive; and 3) pathological or delusional. Normal jealousy is defined as a justified and appropriate reaction to the threat of loss. Irrational or obsessive jealousy is a reaction beyond what is called for by the actual situation. This might involve recurrent investigative rituals and suspicions about the partner's behaviour with another. According to Cobbs & Marks (1979) such individuals are generally upset by the degree of their own reactions and regard them as a sign of their own imbalance i.e., the ego-dystonic form. Pathological or delusional jealousy involves the firmly held belief that one's sexual partner is unfaithful in spite of evidence and opinion to the contrary, i.e., the ego-syntonic form. Confirmation for the belief is often found in the most circumstantial of evidence. Mooney reviews 138 cases from the literature and his own files

and reports that those with delusional jealousy were more likely to have had paranoid delusions, ideas of reference, bizarre behaviour and other psychotic symptoms whereas those with obsessive jealousy were more likely to have had neurotic symptoms such as depression, suicidal tendencies and personality disorders.

Although the labels they use and the particular phenomena they refer to differ, Docherty & Ellis (1976) and Shepherd (1961) use similarly based descriptive systems to classify jealousy into three categories. Docherty & Ellis divide jealous reactions into excessive, obsessive-delusional and ego-dysfunctional types. They do not define the excessive category and focus primarily on obsessive-delusional jealousy which they say occurs when individuals have a strong and persistent belief that their partner is or has been sexually unfaithful. There is no loss of ego functioning in other areas of the person's life which distinguishes this type from ego-dysfunctional jealousy. Docherty & Ellis suggest that obsessive-delusional jealousy in men might be the result of their having witnessed their mothers in extra-marital affairs during early adolescence. This was a pattern they identified while treating three couples in which the husbands experienced jealousy. The authors found that the husbands' descriptions of their wives were not substantiated by observation and tended to more closely resemble descriptions of their mothers.

Shepherd divides jealousy into normal, morbid and morbid-delusional types. He extracted these types from his review of the psychiatric and psychoanalytic literature on jealousy and his own case studies. He regards the division between normal and morbid jealousy as being unclear and blurred. The categories are traditionally differentiated on the basis of differences in the intensity of such symptoms as suspiciousness, proof-seeking, doubt and angry reactions. Shepherd argues that the borderline between a normal and a morbid intensity of these symptoms is arbitrary. He reviews, in detail, the disorders which he found to be associated with the two categories of morbid jealousy--non-delusional and delusional. The non-delusional morbid reactions are linked to neurotic and personality disorders. He associates the occurrence of this type of jealousy with precipitating events in the interpersonal life of the individual. He argues that social and environmental factors play a role in the development of jealousy. Freud (1922/1958) had made an indirect reference to the function of societal norms in contributing to jealous reactions but Shepherd was the first among the psychiatric writers to directly acknowledge the importance of social expectations. Shepherd found the delusional morbid category to occur most frequently with the following disorders: 1) toxic or cerebral organic disorders--including alcoholism, senility, epilepsy and Parkinson's disease; 2) functional psychoses--with jealousy as a

primary or secondary diagnosis most often in conjunction with paranoid and schizophrenic disorders; and 3) affective disorders--major depressive illnesses with paranoid features.

X Enoch, Trethowen & Barker (1967) and Langfeldt (1961) divide jealousy into only two categories--normal and delusional. Enoch et al. subsume obsessional and delusional jealousy under the heading of "the Othello syndrome". They maintain that all individuals with this syndrome are psychotic and differ only by the number of associated symptoms and their demonstrated degree of personality disintegration. The authors do not define normal jealousy. An earlier paper by Todd & Dewhurst (1955) first referred to the Othello syndrome as a delusional belief in the infidelity of the partner. They noted that the syndrome could occur in pure form or in association with paranoid schizophrenia, cyclothymia (manic-depressive psychosis), epilepsy and alcoholism. Through an analysis of case studies Todd & Dewhurst suggest that there is an inherited constitutional factor which predisposes people to develop the Othello syndrome. In addition, they identify the differences in the sexual needs of partners, reactions to pregnancy and menopause, and impotence due to alcoholism as possible precipitating events to the onset of the syndrome. Langfeldt (1961) also argues that there is a constitutional vulnerability in jealous people that, when triggered by biological or psychogenic factors, results in delusional jealous reactions. He

regards normal jealousy as an experience common to everyone in varying degrees whereas delusional jealousy, or what he refers to as "the erotic jealousy syndrome", is marked by intense paranoid ideation and the loss of an ability to reality-test. He reports on 66 cases which had delusional jealousy as a secondary diagnosis. The primary diagnoses included alcoholism, melancholia, organic syndromes, feeble-mindedness, psychopathy and schizophrenia.

Downing (1977) and Schmideberg (1953) point out that the psychiatric/psychoanalytic literature often neglects to acknowledge or examine the role played by the partner in fostering the reactions of the jealous individual. The problem of jealousy is seen as residing within the individual's psyche and the interpersonal and cultural factors are de-emphasized. Schmideberg reports treating a woman whose lover was being treated for delusional jealousy by another analyst who published a paper on the basis of this man's delusions. Schmideberg was aware, however, that the lover's delusions were based more on factual than intrapsychic evidence. Shepherd (1961) maintains that even when actual evidence of infidelity exists true morbid jealousy always involves a reaction beyond what seems appropriate. Vauhkonen (1968) reiterates this point by saying that the patient's behaviour is a better diagnostic indicator than the accuracy or inaccuracy of his or her assertions.

The majority of analysts and psychiatrists focus on the classification, etiology and phenomenology of jealousy. In their descriptions of jealousy there is a strong emphasis on the pathology or the disruptive effects it has on the individual and those around him or her. Two psychoanalytic papers take a more positive approach to the phenomenon of jealousy by focusing on the potential transforming properties that such a reaction can have. Vollmer (1946/1977) takes a developmental psychodynamic stance on the function of jealousy for the child and by implication, for the adult. He argues that jealous reactions reflect a formative stage wherein we are faced with having to depend more upon ourselves as a source of support and nurturance instead of being overly and unrealistically reliant upon a possession--ie., the mother or the partner. Jealousy is seen as having the potential to trigger off a differentiation of the ego which allows for creative (rational) competitiveness. Downing (1977) presents Freud's psychodynamic formulation of sexual jealousy as one of the many possible ways of approaching the experience for ourselves. She argues that it is a particular perspective which cannot be proven except in the level of self-understanding it can allow each of us to experience. Downing also relates jealousy to Jung's conception of the Shadow. As with other encounters with the Shadow, jealous reactions force us to face the darker sides of our nature which allows for the possibility of growth.

As can be seen in the review above psychoanalysts and psychiatrists tend to divide sexual jealousy into two or three types reflecting functional and dysfunctional forms. They have been more concerned with explanations for dysfunctional sexual jealousy. Only the early psychoanalysts attempted to explain the nature of normal jealousy. Whatever the form, the etiology is usually identified as being solely related to psychosexual conflicts and corresponding intrapsychic strategies. There is little recognition of the role that interpersonal and cultural factors play in the development and maintenance of sexual jealousy. As well, these depth psychology approaches have been developed in reference to men and do not directly address the issue of sexual jealousy in women. Nonetheless, this literature has contributed to an initial means of conceptualizing the development and workings of jealousy within the individual.

2. Social and clinical psychology literature

A number of sociologists and anthropologists have described the patterns of jealousy when discussing social behaviour in different cultures (Murdock, 1949; Stephens, 1963), but it is for the most part, only within the past decade that social psychologists have begun examining the phenomenon of sexual jealousy. In contrast to the psychiatric/psychoanalytic writers, psychologists have been less concerned with classification and

intrapsychic etiological processes and have been more concerned with examining etiology from a cultural and interpersonal perspective.

The only classification systems of jealousy, from a social and clinical psychology perspective, were found in the volume on jealousy edited by Clanton & Smith (1977). They divide jealousy into normal and pathological. Normal jealousy is a negative reaction to the threat of loss of a valued relationship. Pathological jealousy is the expression of the negative reaction in a destructive way. Ellis (1977) takes a more cognitive approach and divides jealousy into rational and irrational categories. Rational jealousy is a reality based reaction to the fact or possibility that one is losing the sexual affections or the attention of one's partner. Irrational jealousy is a catastrophic reaction to the situation wherein the individual overplays the significance of the threat. Mazur (1977) looks in more detail at the jealous experience and divides it into five types as follows: 1) possessive jealousy--the jealous person requires reassurance from, and a sense of power and control over, the other whom he/she regards as a possession; 2) exclusion jealousy--this is the most painful type of jealousy wherein the jealous person feels excluded from the time, events and enthusiasm the partner shares with others; 3) competition jealousy--this form of jealousy involves a projection of a feeling of inadequacy which leads the jealous person to compete

with the partner for the recognition of achievements and friendships; 4) egotism jealousy--this is a reflection of the need to have a partner who fits into a traditional sex role; it is a reaction to the freedom and flexibility which a partner may bring to his/her role within the relationship; and 5) fear jealousy--this form reflects the fear of being alone and of losing someone special and is usually based on an uncertainty about the commitment of the partner.

~~W~~ Etiological theories from the social psychology perspective concentrate on the effects of cultural norms and beliefs on interpersonal relations. It has been argued that jealousy is essentially an innate biological reaction to a perceived threat to one's possessions (Gesell, 1906; Saul, 1967). Cross-cultural patterns have been examined for evidence of an inborn culture-free jealous response. Stephens (1963) studied a number of different societies with polygynous and polyandrous customs of matrimony and found varying degrees of tolerance for adultery but found none in which jealousy was absent. It varied in form, intensity and frequency in accordance with the different social sanctions prevalent in each of the cultures observed. Davis (1936/1977) anticipated Stephens' findings by making the point that jealousy is a response to those culturally defined situations that signal a transgression of customary sexual rights. Jealousy does appear then to be universal but its definition, both literal and topographic, is culturally

determined. Clanton & Smith (1977) regard jealousy as the label for the combination of the biological instinct we feel when our possession of the partner is threatened and the socially defined patterns of feelings and behaviours to deal with the arousal. In a similar vein, Walster & Walster (1977) have applied Schachter's (1962) two factor theory of emotion to jealousy. They regard the mechanisms of physiological arousal in jealousy to be the same as those of other emotions but the interpretation of this arousal will be determined by the instilled beliefs about what one should or must feel in a culturally or subculturally defined jealous situation. Bernard (1977) refers to this as the "institutionalization of emotions".

A number of psychologists have attempted to identify the representative North American beliefs which foster the occurrence of sexual jealousy. Fleming & Washburn (1978) give the following examples of jealousy enhancing beliefs: 1) jealousy is an expression of true love; 2) one's partner is a possession to be possessed; and 3) love is a quantitative entity that can only be given to one person at a time. Ellis (1954), in a book on the subject of sexuality in America, presents the view that the practice of monogamy and its inherent notion of possessive-property rights serves to support the idea that it is one's right to be possessive with a partner. Monogamy also teaches people that there is only one ideal mate and has as its goal the propagation of socioeconomic and sexual possessiveness

and competitiveness. As well, Ellis believes that the concern for one's economic security base with one's partner contributes to the tendency for jealous reactions. Viewed within a traditional sex-role context, wives may lose providers and husbands may lose hostesses and nursemaids.

The societal beliefs about the prescribed roles for women are regarded by many as being primarily responsible for the traditional view that women are the more jealous sex. Historically, women have had fewer economic and social alternatives outside of their reliance upon their husbands. They have been more dependent on men for social status mobility and freedom of action (Mead, 1977; Skolnick, 1978). Bernard (1977) argues that the belief in monogamous exclusivity has been responsible for keeping women in an unfavourable and inferior social position. She believes that normal jealousy will decrease and lose its function as the institutions of the romantic-monogamic ideologies wither away. The idea that women have had to bear the brunt of the practice of exclusivity has been borne out in cross-cultural studies. Murdock (1949) looked at the taboos against extra-marital sex in a large number of patriarchal cultures. He found that the societal sanctions for extra-marital sex were always more severe against women.

Gilmartin (1977) interviewed "swinging" and normal couples. He found that the internalized norms or the beliefs of the couples differentiated their ability to deal with jealousy

provoking situations. The normal couples believed in, and equated, psychological and physical monogamy while the swinging couples regarded sex with others as a recreational activity and psychological intimacy as the primary focus of their relationships with their principal partner. Jealousy was still found to occur among the swingers but its role was diminished. Gilmartin argues that the occurrence of jealousy among swingers was due to the greater difficulty in trying to internalize new beliefs emotionally rather than intellectually. Stinnet & Birdsong (1978) looked at group marriages and found that while no group was free from jealousy, a regular sexual rotation of bed partners, to insure sharing and lower favouritism, was found to effectively decrease its occurrence. Adams (1980) reported on a group of individuals who use a rotating sleep schedule and report experiencing no jealousy.

The social psychology approach has focused on the effects of cultural beliefs and prescribed interpersonal sex roles on the development of what has, to this point, been regarded as "normal" jealousy. In contrast to the psychiatric/psychoanalytic literature this approach shows little concern for the clinical manifestations of sexual jealousy. Despite a recognition of the broad social influences there has not yet been a delineation of specific interpersonal patterns of interaction which reflect these influences. In terms of women and men, the social psychology approach provides a perspective from which to view

sex differences in the intensity and expression of sexual jealousy.

Psychological research on jealousy

The two main thrusts of psychological research into sexual jealousy have been attempts to develop objective measures of jealousy and to delineate the sex differences in the expression of sexual jealousy. All of this research is quite recent and a good proportion remains unpublished. What follows below is a review of the literature on these two areas of research interest.

1. Objective measures of jealousy

Apart from the theoretical and observational work of psychoanalysts/psychiatrists and social psychologists presented above, there has been a recent expansion of experimental research on jealousy. A great part of this research has focused on developing paper and pencil tests to measure jealousy and correlate it with certain personality characteristics.

Tipton, Benedictson, Mahoney & Hartnett (1978, Note 2) took a factor analytic approach to construct a measuring instrument for sexual jealousy. The authors viewed jealousy as having three components: 1) cognitive; 2) emotional; and 3) behavioural. Tipton et al. generated 92 items from interviews with 25 people who

were asked to give their views on the nature of jealousy. Items were also generated on the basis of the following conceptualizations of people with a high propensity for jealousy: 1) they will place more value on the needs met by the significant other; 2) they will have fewer significant relationships with people and thus will have most of their needs met by the significant other; 3) they will have lower feelings of self-worth; and 4) they will tend to have fewer resources and skills to develop other significant relationships. Three factor analyses of the items were done on data from a total of 335 subjects and the same five factors were extracted in each analysis. The five factor labels are: 1) need for loyalty; 2) need for intimacy; 3) moodiness/emotionality; 4) self-confidence; and 5) envy. The authors believe that the first factor captures the basic component of the cognitive and emotional experience of the jealous individual. The cognitive aspect involves the belief that one's partner is giving his/her attention to someone else and the emotional aspect is the distress reaction to this belief. No reliability or validity data were presented by the authors.

White (1977, Note 4) developed a questionnaire to measure different aspects of romantic involvement and included questions related to jealousy (eg., "In general, how jealous a person are you"). White found that jealousy correlated with dependency upon the relationship and a sense of low self-esteem.

Aronson & Pines (Note 5) have developed an extensive inventory which asks people detailed questions about the antecedents and correlates of jealousy. Preliminary results with a small sample of college students indicate that jealousy is correlated with feelings of insecurity and a poor self-image. Younger subjects were more likely to report experiencing jealousy than older subjects. This finding supports the contention by Constantine & Constantine (1974) that jealousy decreases with age. These researchers found that people under the age of 31 were more likely to identify jealousy as a problem in their relationships than were people over the age of 31. Aronson & Pines also found that those individuals who had been unfaithful with current partners tended to report higher levels of jealousy than faithful partners.

}
Some
or
handwritten

Bringle, Roach, Andler & Evenbeck (Note 1, Note 6) have developed a scale which is designed to measure the intensity of individual reaction differences to jealousy evoking situations. They refer to this quantitative aspect as dispositional jealousy. On the basis of 100 college students' descriptions of jealousy situations and characteristics, 20 representative items were generated to form the Self-Report Jealousy Scale (SRJS). The items generated showed that people do not necessarily distinguish envy from jealousy as many of the items actually involve envy as it has been defined by Bringle et al., (Note 1). The authors argue that in real life situations the distinctions

between jealousy and envy blur as more than one emotion can influence a person's behaviour. Thus, they suggest that the subjects' inability to discriminate between jealousy and envy makes a conceptual distinction unimportant to the meaning of jealousy on a self-report scale.

The authors report the internal consistency of the SRJS to be over .90 by coefficient alpha (N=751) and test-retest reliability to be .73. A factor analysis with 651 subjects identified four factors in the scale: 1) sexual jealousy (eg., "your steady date expresses a desire to date others"); 2) social jealousy (eg., a friend is smarter and gets higher grades"); 3) family jealousy (eg., "your brother or sister is given more freedom); and 4) work jealousy (eg., another person gets the promotion for which you were qualified). In four studies Bringle et al. (Note 1, Note 6) looked at the correlations between the SRJS and 11 personality scales. Sex roles and jealousy were examined by correlating the Bem Social Reliability Index, Gough's Feminine Interest Scale and the Attitudes Toward Women Scale with the SRJS for 90 subjects. A moderately significant finding was that more feminine persons report more jealousy. Correlations between the SRJS and the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, the Life Satisfaction Scale and the Rotter Locus of Control Scale (N=144) indicated that subjects who score high on the SRJS show low self-esteem, dissatisfaction with life, as well as an external locus of control (all correlations

significant at the .01 level). Correlations between the SRJS and the Zuckerman Anxiety Scale, the Steiner Benevolent-Malevolent Scale and the Machivellianism Scale (N=90) showed highly jealous people to be significantly more anxious and, to a lesser degree, more malevolent in their attitudes toward the world than low jealous people. The correlations between the SRJS and the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale and a dogmatism scale (N=92) showed no relationship between social desirability and the scale but highly jealous people were found to be more dogmatic. Bringle et al. conclude that the pattern of results from these correlations offers some support for the construct validity of the SRJS based on what would be expected from the literature on jealousy.

In a study designed to evaluate the hypothesis that jealous people would not be able to use a cognitive coping strategy as well as nonjealous people in a stressful situation Jaremko & Lindsey (1979) found no significant differences. What was interesting was their finding that the SRJS was significantly and negatively correlated with the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale ($r = -.44$) and was not significantly correlated with the Locus of Control Scale ($r = .12$). These results are not consistent with the findings of Bringle et al..

It is clear from this review of the literature on objective measures of jealousy that the Self-Report Jealousy Scale is the most highly developed scale to date. It is the only scale which

has been evaluated in terms of reliability and const: validity. The other inventories have offered suggestive findings but have not yet provided evaluative data with regard to reliability and validity.

2. Sex differences and associated findings in psychological research

The question of whether or not there are qualitative and quantitative differences in the experience of jealousy between women and men has been of interest to a number of the above researchers. The traditional view that women are the more jealous sex has already been discussed within the context of culturally determined sex-roles and romantic ideology. None of the research has directly addressed the quantitative question but the research and theorizing on the qualitative aspects of jealousy in men and women have provided evidence for qualitative sex differences in jealousy reactions.

Bryson (cited in Bringle & Williams, 1979) factor analyzed reported reactions to jealousy and identified the following eight factors: 1) emotional devastation (eg., feeling helpless); 2) reactive retribution (eg., becoming more sexually assertive); 3) arousal (eg., paying more attention to the partner); 4) need for social support (eg., talking with others for advice); 5) intrapunitiveness (eg., blaming self); 6) confrontation (eg.,

confronting partner or the other); 7) anger (eg., wanting to get even); and 8) impression management (eg., trying to make it seem one doesn't care). These eight components were reduced to two dimensions--one reflecting an attempt to aid or stabilize the relationship and the other reflecting an attempt to boost or stabilize one's own ego and feelings of self-esteem. Bryson found that males are more likely to respond with the intrapersonal components involved with boosting or stabilizing their self-esteem whereas females are more likely to respond with the interpersonal components involved with aiding or stabilizing the relationship. Shettel-Neuber, Bryson & Young (1978) report on the experiments which led to these conclusions. Forty females and forty males watched videotapes and were asked to rate the likelihood that they would respond in 36 different ways. The video tape showed a couple sitting together at a party. They are kissing, hugging and talking together. One of the partners then gets up and leaves the room. At this point an old boyfriend or an old girlfriend enters the room and is greeted with a hug by the remaining partner. They sit together and get progressively more intimate with each other. The absent partner then returns and looks at them on the couch. There are four different versions of the tape. The women subjects watched one of two tapes which show the female partner leaving and an old girlfriend entering the scene. In one tape she is attractively dressed and groomed and in the other she is

unattractively dressed and groomed. The male subjects watched one of two tapes showing the male partner leaving and an old boyfriend, who is either attractive or unattractive, enter the scene. Results showed that men were more likely to say that they would start going out with others or become sexually aggressive with others in response to the situation portrayed on the videotape. Women were more likely to say they would feign indifference or try to make themselves more attractive to their partners. The differences were greater when the former friend was attractive. The authors argue that these findings show that situational and sex role factors are more important than personality characteristics in determining the type and intensity of jealous responses.

White (1980) looked at the relationship between one's degree of involvement in a relationship and attempts to induce jealousy in one's partner. He hypothesized that an attempt to induce jealousy was most likely to be done by the partner who is more involved but has weaker control in the relationship as a strategy to increase their control. One hundred and fifty couples were asked to rate their relative degree of involvement in the relationship and were asked to answer questions about how and why they might have attempted to induce jealousy. Five categories of inducement were used to code the responses: 1) increase rewards; 2) bolster self-esteem; 3) test the relationship; 4) revenge; and 5) punishment. Five categories

were used to code the types of inducements reported: 1) talking about past relationships; 2) talking about current relationships; 3) flirting; 4) dating or sexual contact with others; and 5) lying about the existence of a rival. Each partner also rated their degree of involvement as being much more, more, equally, less, or much less than their partner's. Results indicated that women were significantly more likely to report jealousy inducement than men. While no effect for the level of involvement was found for men, women who were more involved were almost twice as likely to report inducement than those women who were less or equally involved. For both sexes, the most frequently reported motives for inducing jealousy were to test the relationship (39.7%) and to increase rewards (30.1%). The most frequently reported method of inducement was to talk about current attractions to others (51.4%). According to White the finding that women are more likely than men to induce jealousy is probably due to their poorer power status in society. He argues that jealousy may be more a reflection of the power relationships between two people in a couple than of a disposition within an individual.

Francis (1977) had 15 couples fill out questionnaires after a structured interview, designed to elicit jealousy, was conducted. The questionnaires dealt with relationships and jealousy and included the SRJS. She found that for men jealousy is associated more with situations where there is sexual

involvement between one's partner and a third party and a comparison of oneself with a rival. Women indicated that jealousy was more associated with situations where the partner talks with another person on the phone or in person, the partner kisses another, or spends more time with a rival. Francis also found data which suggest that males are more likely to repress or deny awareness of jealous feelings while females tend to be more sensitive to jealousy evoking situations.

Teismann & Mosher (1978) set up role-playing situations in which couples had to discuss jealousy and other conflict issues. They rated the couples' interpersonal communication styles using a coding scheme with 36 categories. They hypothesized that men would use more rejecting verbal acts and women would use more coercive verbal acts while discussing jealousy issues. This was based on ideas by Bernard (1971) and Reik (1957) who suggested that jealous women fight to win their partners back while jealous men withdraw from and reject their partners. Teismann & Mosher also examined the notion (again based on ideas from Bernard and Reik) that for women jealousy centers around time, attention and resource issues while for men jealousy has a more sexual context. The authors found that more rejecting and coercive verbal behaviours were used in jealous conflict situations than non-jealous conflict situations and that this was true for both sexes. However, women were found to be more likely to express jealousy in terms of time and attention loss

whereas men were more likely to express jealousy over sexual matters.

Bringle, Evenbeck & Schmedel (Note 7) hypothesized that a tendency toward high jealousy (as measured by the SRJS) would be disruptive to people's marriages. They looked at the relationship between jealousy intensity and marital satisfaction. They found that highly jealous couples reported poorer expectations for outcomes with relationships outside of their marriage. This indicated to the authors that jealous people tend to be more dependent upon their primary relationships. For men, but not for women, the estimate of marital satisfaction was correlated with the estimate of the partner's jealousy level.

Bringle & Williams (1979) looked at the similarity of results between parents and their children on the the SRJS and two other personality measures--the Repression-Sensitization Scale and the Mehrabian Screening-Nonscreening Scale. They found that jealous people are more likely to be sensitizers (ie., people who have a lower threshold for emotional stimuli) and nonscreeners (ie., people who are more easily aroused in complex stimulus environments). Parent-child similarities for these two personality dimensions were found most frequently between parents and female children. A similarity between parents and children of both sexes was found for the tendency to be jealous and the way in which jealousy was reported to be expressed.

A

The main findings of qualitative differences in sexual jealousy expression between women and men can be summarized as follows. Women tend to get jealous over issues of time or attention loss whereas men tend to get jealous over sexual issues. Women are more likely to attempt inducement of jealousy in their partners than are men. The latter finding has been related to the poorer power status of women in society. The last finding of note is that men are more likely than women to repress or deny sexual jealous feelings.

While the studies reviewed in this section on psychological research offer interesting and suggestive data on the quantitative and qualitative aspects of sexual jealousy the majority of them share a drawback which hinders the credibility of their findings; namely, they have not yet demonstrated a sufficiently valid means of measuring jealousy. Despite this shortcoming a number of the studies attempt to demonstrate certain correlates of jealousy. It should be noted that the Self-Report Jealousy Scale was shown to have internal reliability and some construct validity but it has not yet been evaluated in terms of discriminant or predictive validity. As well, the scales developed to date have another shortcoming which jeopardizes their utility. All of the jealousy questionnaires, with the exception of the Tipton et al. study (1978; Note 2), have asked people questions which include the word jealousy. It has been pointed out, however, that jealousy

has different meanings for different people (Bringle et al., Note 1; Note 6), is often denied (Freud, 1922/1958; Aronson & Pines, Note 5), and is often most explicitly denied by those who are most jealous (Clanton & Smith, 1977). Although Tipton et al. measure jealousy more indirectly, they do not provide data on the reliability or validity of their measure. As a result, the findings of researchers such as Bringle et al. (Note 1, Note 6) and by White (1980, Note 4), may have been distorted by their use of tests using the word jealousy. Jaremko & Lindsey's (1979) finding that the SRJS was significantly and negatively correlated with social desirability can be interpreted as an indication that jealousy is seen as a negative attribute. On this basis it was thought that a less biased jealousy scale, that did not mention the word jealousy, should and could be developed by tapping the purported characteristics of jealous individuals. The description of the construction and evaluation of such a scale follows below.

II. Construction and evaluation of a sexual jealousy inventory

Construction of the Zander Jealousy Inventory

The clinical and research literatures on sexual or romantic jealousy repeatedly report that jealous people have certain social and dispositional characteristics. Regardless of the particular perspectives presented by various authors, certain characteristics tend to be mentioned with greater frequency than others. What follows below is a listing of the most commonly mentioned social and dispositional characteristics of jealous people and the literature sources which identified them: 1) an overdependency on others--(Beecher & Beecher, 1971; Berscheid & Fei, 1977; Clanton & Smith, 1977; Fleming & Washburn, 1978; Hoaken, 1976; Klimeck, 1979; Mazur, 1977; Shepherd, 1961; and Tipton et al., 1978); 2) feelings of insecurity and inadequacy--(Berscheid & Fei, 1977; Bowman, 1965; Clanton & Smith, 1977; Enoch, Trethowen & Barker, 1967; Fleming & Washburn, 1978; Hoaken, 1976; Jones, 1930; Klimeck, 1979; Langfeldt, 1961; Mazur, 1977; Mead, 1977; Shepherd, 1961; Skolnick, 1978; Speilman, 1971; and Tipton et al., 1978); 3) moodiness and anxiety--(Blood & Blood, 1978; Bringle et al.,

Note 1, Note 6; Davitz, 1969; Langfeldt, 1961; Mooney, 1965; Schmideberg, 1953; Spielman, 1971; and Tipton et al., 1978); 4) possessiveness--(Blood & Blood, 1978; Enoch et al., 1967; Fleming & Washburn, 1978; Hoaken, 1976; Mazur, 1977; Schmideberg, 1953; Spielman, 1971; and Vcllmer, 1946/1977); 5) oversensitivity and suspiciousness--(Beecher & Beecher, 1971; Bowman, 1965; Enoch et al., 1967; Hoaken, 1976; Jones, 1930; Langfeldt, 1961; and Spielman, 1971); and 6) a belief in socially defined relationship roles--(Bernard, 1971, 1977; Davis, 1936/1977; Ellis, 1954, 1977; Fleming & Washburn, 1978; Gilmartin, 1977; Mazur, 1977; Mead, 1977; Skolnick, 1978; and Whitehurst, 1977). Another significant, though somewhat less frequently mentioned characteristic, is competitiveness or attention seeking behaviour (Beecher & Beecher, 1971; Downing, 1977; Ellis, 1954; and Schmideberg, 1953).

On the basis of the seven main characteristics a total of 71 statements were generated from 1) the ideas expressed by the above authors; 2) the scales developed by Tipton et al. (1978; Note 2) and Aronson & Pines (Note 5); 3) the Jackson Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1967); and 4) the Gordon Personal Profile Inventory (Gordon, 1978). The statements are presented in Appendix A and are grouped according to the characteristics they are designed to tap. Some items are grouped under two headings because they logically appear to reflect two characteristics. Extra statements, which did not fit into any of

the defined categories, were included as potentially relevant items. To establish some content validity for the statements they were presented, in mixed order, to five professionals working in the areas of relationship counseling and/or academic clinical psychology. These professionals were asked to rate the items on how likely they thought it would be that jealous people would identify a statement as being characteristic of their way of thinking, feeling or behaving to a greater degree than nonjealous people. The rating was done on a five point scale from very unlikely (1) to very likely (5). Thirty-two items which received an average rating of 3.6 or higher were retained for the inventory. Retained items are marked with asterisks in Appendix A. An additional item--"I like to know what my partner/spouse is doing when we're apart"--was added after being suggested by one of the raters. The 33 items were then compiled into an inventory which was named the Zander Jealousy Inventory (ZJI).

Evaluation of the Zander Jealousy Inventory

The general purpose of the studies which follow are to establish whether or not the characteristics listed above allow for the establishment of a reliable and valid inventory to measure sexual jealousy. The Zander Jealousy Inventory is to be evaluated in terms of its internal reliability and convergent,

discriminant and concurrent validities as they relate to the construct validity of the inventory (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955/1967; Allen & Yen, 1979). The use of the Self-Report Jealousy Scale (Bringle et al., Note 1, Note 6) as the tool to demonstrate the convergent validity bears some comment at this point. As previously mentioned, this scale is the only jealousy measuring tool that has been shown to have internal consistency, test-retest reliability and some construct validity. An important consideration of the SRJS is that it makes no distinction between envy and jealousy. Only seven of the twenty items on the scale belong to the factor identified as sexual jealousy by Bringle et al.. It is expected that a higher correlation will exist between the ZJI and this factor than with the other factors, as the items in the ZJI are derived from a review of the literature on sexual or romantic jealousy. The other factors identified by Bringle et al. in the SRJS (family, social and work jealousy) appear to reflect envy more than jealousy as it is currently conceptualized. Another consideration which will, it is predicted, attenuate the degree of relationship between the ZJI and SRJS is the fact that the latter scale asks respondents to directly rate how jealous they think they would be in different situations. The weaknesses of this style of questioning have been reviewed in Chapter I. On these bases the SRJS may not be the best means of evaluating the new inventory but currently, it is the best objective jealousy

scale available.

Aside from evaluating the status of the new inventory the first study attempts to examine some of the demographic factors which have been associated with jealousy--age, sex, number of siblings, and number of relationships. Sex has been included to examine the possible differences between males and females on the inventory. As mentioned earlier, the traditional view that women are the more jealous sex has been blamed on the patriarchal control of societies and the practice of monogamy (Bernard, 1977; Mead, 1977; Skolnick, 1978; White, 1980). Bringle et al. (Note 1, Note 6) report no significant differences between female and male scores on their jealousy scale but they did find an association between feminine traits and jealousy. Francis (1977) found data which suggested that males deny or repress their jealous feelings to a greater degree than women who are more likely to be sensitive to jealousy evoking situations. With these issues in mind the ZJI will be examined for possible sex differences. Age has been included to examine whether or not jealousy decreases with age on the new inventory and the SRJS. It is generally regarded within the psychoanalytic/psychiatric literature that romantic or sexual jealousy occurs with greater frequency in the middle years of life (Enoch et al., 1967; Mooney, 1965). This is usually the case with people who have been diagnosed as having neurotic or delusional jealousy. Researchers in psychology, who have looked

at more standard populations (eg., college students and couples attending workshops), have found that jealousy decreases with age (Aronson & Pines, Note 5; Constantine & Constantine, 1974). The number of siblings in the subjects' families is being examined to see if any relationship exists between this factor and jealousy scores. No evidence has been found to support the idea that a relationship does exist but little data has been gathered (Clanton & Smith, 1977; Langfeldt, 1961; Vauhkonen, 1968). The number of past relationships is being examined to investigate Fenichel's (1945) contention that, because of strong narcissistic needs, jealous people have an inability to develop lasting love attachments and would therefore have a greater number of relationships than nonjealous people. Relationship status is being examined to see if one's current status differentially affects one's jealousy scores.

The second study includes two subscales from the Jackson Personality Research Form--Endurance and Play--to evaluate the discriminant validity of the new inventory (Jackson, 1967). According to Jackson (1970), a test should not only correlate highly with conceptually similar measures but it should also not correlate highly with theoretically unrelated measures. Thus the Endurance and Play subscales were chosen to provide a test of the discriminant validity of the inventory as they appear to be conceptually unrelated to jealousy.

The third study evaluates the concurrent validity of the new inventory. For this purpose couples were asked to rate their partners on a series of questions thought to be related to jealousy and these ratings were then compared with the partner's scores on the jealousy scales. Although a predictive criterion-related means of establishing this validity for the new inventory would have been preferable, the ethical problems of experimentally manipulating and measuring jealousy made the present concurrent method more expedient, if less effective.

Experiment 1

Method

Subjects

A total of 150 undergraduate students, enrolled in psychology courses at Simon Fraser University, served as the subjects for the initial pilot study of the inventory. The mean age of all subjects was 22.6 with an age range from 18 to 44 years. The 88 female subjects ranged in age from 18 to 44 with a mean age of 22.8 years, and the 62 male subjects ranged in age from 18 to 35 with a mean of 22.4 years.

Materials

1) Zander Jealousy Inventory. The inventory is made up of the 33 statements derived in the manner described above. Each item is scored on a scale from "not at all characteristic of me" (1) to "extremely characteristic of me" (5). The total score can range from 33 to 165 with higher scores designed to indicate greater jealousy (see Appendix B).

2) Self-Report Jealousy Scale. The SRJS consists of 20 items scored from "not very jealous" (1) to "very jealous" (9) with a

total score range of 20 to 180. Based on 651 subjects from a college population the SRJS was found to have a mean score of 94.2 with a standard deviation of 30.0 (see Appendix C).

3) Social Desirability Scale. This scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) is included to evaluate the degree to which a self-representational response bias confounds with the overall ZJI, its individual items and the SRJS. The inclusion of such an evaluation is a necessary step in the development of a new inventory (Jackson, 1970). The scale consists of 33 questions and has a true-false response format (see Appendix D).

4) Demographic items. As previously mentioned, questions on sex, age, number of siblings, number of relationships and present relationship status were included (see Appendix E).

The materials were compiled into a questionnaire package in the following order: 1) the Zander Jealousy Inventory (ZJI); 2) demographic items; 3) the Social Desirability Scale (SDS); and 4) the Self-Report Jealousy Scale (SRJS).

Procedure

The questionnaire package was administered to subjects in small tutorial groups or singly in an office. Subjects were told that the researcher was interested in relationships and were asked to read the package instructions and to refrain from discussing the questions. They were informed that they could obtain their individual results at a later date. The package

took approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Results and Conclusions

Means, standard deviations and alpha coefficients of the ZJI and SRJS are presented for females, males and the total sample in Table 1. Both the ZJI and the SRJS have total sample reliability coefficients just below .90. The mean item-total correlation coefficient of the ZJI was .38. A t-test of the difference between female and male mean scores on the ZJI (107.3 versus 98.2, respectively) showed significance, $t(148) = -3.55$, $p < .001$, whereas a test of the female and male mean scores on the SRJS (94.9 versus 88.2, respectively) showed no significant difference, $t(148) = -1.61$, $p > .10$.

An analysis of the individual items in the ZJI was based on the Differential Reliability Index (DRI), described by Jackson (1970). The DRI procedure was used to compare the item-total correlations with the item-desirability correlations (see Table 2). The computed DRI is intended to reflect the degree of item content saturation with social desirability removed. Those items which clearly correlate more highly with social desirability than with the original scale are not useful for measuring the construct the original scale was designed for. As can be seen from Table 2, two of the ZJI items correlated more with social desirability than they did with the total inventory. In this study, items considered worth retaining had a DRI of .20

Table 1--Means, standard deviations and reliability coefficients
of the ZJI and SRJS

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Alpha</u> <u>coefficient</u>
<u>Zander Jealousy Inventory</u>			
All subjects	103.6	16.1	.87
Females	107.3	17.0	.88
Males	98.2	13.1	.81
<u>Self-Report Jealousy Scale</u>			
All subjects	92.1	25.4	.89
Females	94.9	25.3	.88
Males	88.2	25.2	.90

Table 2--Differential reliability index of ZJI items

<u>item #</u>	<u>item-ZJI r</u>	<u>item-SDS r</u>	<u>DRI</u>
1	.45	.11	.44
*2	.42	-.29	.30
3	.44	.10	.43
4	.45	.27	.36
5	.29	.18	.23
*6	.13	-.16	()
7	.35	.21	.28
8	.25	.04	.25
9	.35	.06	.34
*10	.26	-.19	.18
*11	.17	-.15	.08
12	.46	.19	.42
13	.36	.17	.32
*14	.15	.20	()
15	.43	-.17	.39
16	.34	-.18	.29
17	.49	.08	.48
*18	.36	.26	.25
19	.24	.13	.20
20	.46	.01	.46
21	.35	-.06	.34

*22	.31	.27	.15
23	.53	.29	.44
24	.60	.16	.59
25	.37	-.13	.35
26	.51	-.20	.47
27	.54	-.06	.54
28	.41	-.27	.31
29	.35	.23	.26
*30	.40	.28	.29
31	.42	.12	.40
32	.60	.06	.60
33	.40	-.24	.32

*--indicates item is to be eliminated

or above and the DRI exceeded their item-desirability correlation by .03 or above. The latter cut-off point was arbitrarily chosen as no set rules exist for the selection of items on the basis of the DRI. The items which failed to meet the criteria for retention are marked with asterisks in Table 2.

In order to examine whether the pattern of shared variance of the items would reveal distinct factors, a factor analysis with Varimax rotation was performed on the ZJI. By examining the residual correlations it was found that a two factor solution best fit the data. The items making up the factors and their factor loadings are presented in Table 3. The first factor appears to reflect the preferences and beliefs that jealous people may bring with them into relationships while the second factor appears to reflect emotional sensitivity. When female and male subjects were compared in terms of their relative mean scores on the two factors it was found that women scored significantly higher than men on the emotional sensitivity factor (40.6 versus 35.3, respectively), $t(148) = -3.74$, $p < .001$, whereas there was no significant difference between their mean scores on the preference and belief factor (66.6 versus 62.9, respectively), $t(148) = -1.93$, $p > .05$. The emotional sensitivity factor therefore accounts for the women's significantly higher scores on the total ZJI.

Pearson product-moment correlations of the Zander Jealousy Inventory with the Self-Report Jealousy Scale and the

Table 3--ZJI items and factor loadings of the two factor solution

<u>item#</u>	<u>item</u>	<u>factor loading</u>
Factor 1		
24	I like my partner/spouse to spend most of his/her free time with me	.746
1	I like to spend the majority of my free time with my partner/spouse	.681
22	My partner/spouse satisfies most of my emotional needs	.635
18	I am very much in love with my partner/spouse	.623
32	I like to know what my partner/spouse is doing when we're apart	.611
4	I believe that life-long monogamous relationships are the best kind	.545
13	When my partner/spouse and I are together then I prefer to be alone with him/her	.531
5	My partner/spouse satisfies most of my intellectual needs	.528
30	My partner/spouse satisfies most of my recreational needs	.521
3	I like to think of my partner/spouse as an extension of myself	.495
9	My happiness often depends on how my partner/spouse is	

feeling	.485
12 Marriage/cohabitation should only happen between two people who are prepared to be faithful to each other	.474
14 My partner/spouse satisfies my sexual needs	.472
27 I find myself feeling resentful if my partner/spouse spends a lot of time with friends rather than with me	.457
20 I sometimes find myself imagining all kinds of things my partner/spouse may be doing while we're apart	.427
17 I tend to get strongly attached to people	.423
7 I believe that there is an ideal mate for me	.417
8 I know by my partner's/spouse's behaviour whether or not she/he is sexually interested in a person of the same sex as me	.315
29 I believe that sexual relations should be had only with someone you feel emotionally intimate with	.313
19 My partner's/spouse's behaviour around members of the same sex as me tells me a lot about how she/he is feeling about me	.274
 Factor 2	
26 My feelings are easily hurt	.782
2 I get depressed easily	.769
23 I get upset easily	.745
33 I probably have more ups and downs in moods than most people	.744

28 I tense up easily	.704
15 I can be very sensitive about what other people think about me	.584
16 My imagination can get carried away sometimes	.543
10 I feel inferior to others in many respects	.524
25 I sometimes feel that I am not receiving enough attention from my partner/spouse	.462
31 I am an emotional person	.460
21 When I talk about someone I like a lot I have a hard time hiding my feelings	.358
27 I find myself feeling resentful if my partner/spouse spends a lot of time with friends rather than with me	.350
6 It is important for me to have a job or career that will bring me prestige and recognition from others	.346
11 I like to be the centre of attention in a group	.292

Social Desirability Scale showed that it was significantly and positively correlated with the SRJS, $r = .53$, $p < .001$, and was not significantly correlated with the SDS, $r = .04$, $p > .10$. As predicted the ZJI correlated more positively with the sexual jealousy factor of the SRJS than with the family, social or work factors (see Table 4). The female and male samples' correlations of the ZJI with the SRJS both showed significance but the male coefficient was lower, $r = .37$ for males versus $r = .60$ for females. Following computational guidelines found in Bruning & Kintz (1968), the difference between these correlations was tested and found to be nonsignificant, $z = 1.80$, $p > .05$. Correlations between the ZJI and the SDS were nonsignificant for the female and male samples. The SRJS was found to be significantly and negatively correlated with the SDS for females, males and the total sample (all of the above correlations are presented in Table 4).

To examine the relationship between age and scores on the ZJI, and scores on the SRJS, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed (see Table 4). The overall and female ZJI scores were negatively and significantly correlated with age whereas the male ZJI scores were negatively but nonsignificantly related to age. The same pattern of results was found for the correlations between age and the overall, female and male SRJS scores.

Table 4--Pearson correlation coefficients between the ZJI, SDS, SRJS, SRJS subscales and age

	<u>All Subjects</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>
	<u>n=150</u>	<u>n=88</u>	<u>n=62</u>
ZJI with SRJS	.53***	.60***	.37**
ZJI with sexual	.56***	.61***	.48***
ZJI with family	.32***	.36**	.20
ZJI with social	.37***	.43***	.20
ZJI with work	.23**	.28**	.11
ZJI with SDS	.04	.12	-.06
SRJS with SDS	-.25***	-.21*	-.29*
ZJI with age	-.31***	-.39***	-.17
SRJS with age	-.20**	-.23*	-.16

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

The other demographic items evaluated were the number of siblings, number of relationships and present relationship status (see Appendix E). The correlation between the number of siblings and the scores on the ZJI for all subjects was nonsignificant, $r = -.09$, $p > .10$. The method used to obtain an estimate of subjects' number of relationships proved to be ambiguous and this data was not analyzed. The ambiguity was reflected in the fact that a subject, for example, could have had a romantic, cohabiting and married relationship with one person but the experimenter would have counted these as three separate relationships because this kind of information was not recorded by the method used. As well, the relationship between subjects' present relationship status and their jealousy scores was not evaluated because the majority of subjects fell within only two of the nine relationship status categories (see Appendix E). As a result, an examination of the effect of present relationship status on ZJI scores was not possible.

To summarize, the ZJI showed itself to have a sufficient degree of internal reliability as reflected by the overall alpha coefficient of .87 and by the mean item-scale correlation of .38. Females scored significantly higher than males on the ZJI and their significantly higher scores on the emotional sensitivity factor accounted for this sex difference. The convergent validity of the ZJI with the SRJS was established and, as predicted, the ZJI correlated most significantly with

the sexual jealousy factor of the SRJS. The ZJI showed itself to be nonsignificantly related to social desirability whereas the SRJS was shown to be significantly prone to this response bias. The latter result is consistent with Jareńko & Lindsey's (1979) finding and contrasts with the Bringle et al. (Note 6) result. The existence of a substantial degree of internal consistency and convergent validity for the ZJI was a promising step in the development of the inventory and indicated that a further evaluation of the ZJI was justified.

Experiment 2

On the basis of the DRI item analysis certain modifications of the ZJI were made. The eight items shown to have the poorest content saturation relative to social desirability were deleted and a new form of the ZJI was prepared for the second study (see Appendix F). The primary purpose of the second study was to establish discriminant validity for the ZJI and to examine whether or not the patterns established in the first study--convergent validity, internal reliability, factor structure, a negative correlation between age and jealousy scores, and the sex differences--would be repeated. Due to the lack of significance in the relationship between number of siblings and jealousy scores, the difficulty in obtaining a reliable estimate of the number of relationships, and the insufficient numbers to evaluate relationship status these three demographic variables were deleted from further testing.

Method

Subjects

A new sample of 97 undergraduate students from Simon Fraser University, served as the subjects in this study. The mean age of all subjects was 25.9 with an age range from 19 to 51 years. The 69 female subjects ranged in age from 19 to 51 with a mean of 25.3 years. The 28 male subjects ranged in age from 19 to 42 with a mean of 27.4 years.

Materials

1) Zander Jealousy Inventory. The ZJI now consisted of 25 items which were scored in the same manner as in Experiment 1. The possible total scores now ranged from 25 to 125 with higher scores again designed to indicate greater jealousy. (Appendix F).

2) Self-Report Jealousy Scale. The SRJS and its four factors were again used to evaluate the convergent validity of the ZJI and the relative merits of the scales (Appendix C).

3) Social Desirability Scale. The SDS was included to evaluate the self-representational biases of the new ZJI and the SRJS (Appendix D).

4) Endurance and Play Scales. These subscales of the Jackson Personality Research Form are made up of 16 questions each and have a true-false response format. The Endurance scale was developed to reflect a willingness to stay with problems, and a patient, persevering work style. The Play scale was designed to

reflect an easy going and fun-loving approach to life (Jackson, 1967). In the present study these two scales were combined into one, with questions from each appearing in alternating order. They were included to evaluate the discriminant validity of the ZJI (Appendix G).

The materials were compiled into a questionnaire package in the following order: 1) ZJI; 2) SDS; 3) Endurance and Play scales; and 4) SRJS.

Procedure

The questionnaire package was administered to subjects in small tutorial groups or singly in an office. Subjects were told that the package asked questions about their relationships with important people in their lives and with the world around them. The latter instruction was included to account for the addition of the Endurance and Play scales. The instructions to refrain from discussing the questions and to read the directions were again given. Subjects were informed that individual results could be obtained at a later date. The package took approximately 30 minutes to complete.

Results and Conclusions

Means, standard deviations and alpha coefficients of the ZJI and the SRJS are presented for females, males and the total sample in Table 5. The reliability coefficient of the ZJI decreased to .81 in this study and was particularly lower for

the male sample ($\alpha=.72$). The mean item-total correlation coefficient for the ZJI was .35. The SRJS again demonstrated high internal consistency. A t-test of the difference between female and male mean scores on the ZJI (79.9 versus 74.5, respectively) proved significant, $t(95)=-1.95$, $p<.05$, whereas a t-test of the difference between female and male mean scores on the SRJS (98.0 versus 93.0, respectively) showed no significant difference, $t(95)=-.7$, $p>.10$.

A factor analysis with Varimax rotation was performed on the new ZJI. Again, a two factor solution best fit the data. The items making up the factors and their factor loadings are presented in Table 6. This time the first factor appears to reflect emotional sensitivity and the second factor appears to reflect the preferences and beliefs jealous people may bring with them into relationships. Once again women scored significantly higher than men on the emotional sensitivity factor (46.8 versus 42.8, respectively), $t(95)=-2.2$, $p<.001$, and there was no significant difference between their mean scores on the preference and belief factor (38.0 versus 36.7, respectively), $t(95)=.76$, $p>.10$.

Table 5--Means, standard deviations and reliability coefficients of the ZJI and SRJS

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Alpha <u>Coefficient</u>
<u>Zander Jealousy Inventory</u>			
All subjects	78.5	11.6	.81
Females	79.9	11.9	.84
Males	74.9	10.4	.72
<u>Self-Report Jealousy Scale</u>			
All subjects	96.6	31.6	.93
Females	98.0	33.5	.93
Males	93.0	26.6	.90

Table 6--Items and factor loadings of the two factor solution

<u>item #</u>	<u>item</u>	<u>factor loading</u>
Factor 1		
21	I get upset easily	.789
16	My feelings are easily hurt	.689
13	My imagination can get carried away sometimes	.623
25	I probably have more ups and downs in moods than most people	.574
9	I tense up easily	.562
17	I sometimes find myself imagining all kinds of things my partner/spouse may be doing while we're apart	.531
24	I like to know what my partner/spouse is doing when we're apart	.488
22	I find myself feeling resentful if my partner/ spouse spends a lot of time with friends rather than with me	.475
3	I am an emotional person	.459
18	When I talk about someone I like a lot I have a hard time hiding my feelings	.433
19	I sometimes feel that I am not receiving enough attention from my partner/spouse	.433
12	I can be very sensitive about what other	

people think of me	.406
11 When my partner/spouse and I are together then I prefer to be alone with him/her	.315
15 My partner's/spouse's behaviour around members of the same sex as me tells me a lot about how she/he is feeling about me	.304
14 I tend to get strongly attached to people	.261
Factor 2	
6 I believe that there is an ideal mate for me	.708
20 I like my partner/spouse to spend most of his/her free time with me	.687
1 I like to spend the majority of my free time with my partner/spouse	.593
23 I believe that sexual relations should only be had with someone you feel emotionally intimate with	.553
2 I like to think of my partner/spouse as an extension of myself	.538
5 My partner/spouse satisfies most of my intellectual needs	.535
4 I believe that life-long monogamous relationships are the best kind	.524
10 Marriage/cohabitation should only happen between two people who are prepared to be	

faithful to each other	.502
8 My happiness often depends on how my partner/spouse is feeling	.420
15 My partner's/spouse's behaviour around members of the same sex as me tells me a lot about how she/he is feeling about me	.333
24 I like to know what my partner/spouse is doing when we're apart	.310
22 I find myself feeling resentful if my partner/spouse spends more time with friends rather than with me	.275

Item 7--"I know by my partner's/spouse's behaviour whether or not she/he is sexually interested in a person of the same sex as me"--did not obtain a factor loading above .250 for either factor.

The Pearson correlations between the ZJI and the Endurance and Play scales for the total, female and male samples were all nonsignificant (see Table 7). This result provides evidence of discriminant validity for the new ZJI. Pearson correlations between the ZJI and the SRJS and SDS showed it to be significantly and positively correlated with the SRJS, $r=.52$, $p<.001$, and not significantly correlated with the SDS, $r=.06$, $p>.10$. These correlations and the ones discussed below are all presented in Table 7. The correlation of the ZJI with the SRJS for the female sample was significant and positive, $r=.56$, $p<.001$, but the correlation for males failed to reach significance, $r=.36$, $p>.05$. (It should be noted that this coefficient is comparable to the significant correlation coefficient found between male ZJI and SRJS scores in the first study.) A test of the difference between the female and male correlation coefficients was again nonsignificant, $z=1.08$, $p>.05$. As in the first study, the ZJI correlated more positively with the sexual jealousy factor of the SRJS than with the other factors. This was true for the male and female samples as well. Once again the SRJS was found to be significantly and negatively correlated with the SDS. As in the first study, age correlated negatively and significantly with the overall and female ZJI scores. The male ZJI scores were negatively but nonsignificantly correlated with age. In contrast to the first study, however, the correlations between age and the overall, female and male

Table 7--Pearson correlation coefficients between the ZJI, SRJS, Endurance and Play scales, SRJS subscales, SDS and age

	All		
	<u>subjects</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>
	<u>n=97</u>	<u>n=69</u>	<u>n=28</u>
ZJI with Endurance	-.15	-.13	-.09
ZJI with Play	.10	.03	.27
ZJI with SRJS	.52***	.56***	.36
ZJI with sexual	.60***	.63***	.54***
ZJI with family	.27**	.32**	-.02
ZJI with social	.42***	.46***	.25
ZJI with work	.19	.16	.19
ZJI with SDS	.06	.05	.13
SRJS with SDS	-.21*	-.21	-.25
ZJI with age	-.40***	-.42***	-.25
SRJS with age	-.09	-.14	.12

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

SRJS scores were not all negative and were all nonsignificant (see Table 7).

In summary, the results from this second study showed that the new ZJI had a sufficient degree of internal consistency as demonstrated by the overall alpha coefficient of .81 and the mean item-total correlation of .35. The same factor structure as in study one was found for the new ZJI and females scored significantly higher once again on the emotional sensitivity factor. The desired discriminant validity of the new ZJI was demonstrated by the lack of significant correlations between it and the Endurance and Play scales. The new ZJI showed convergent validity with the SRJS and in particular with the latter's sexual jealousy subscale. As in the first study, social desirability was found to be a confounding factor for the SRJS and not the ZJI. Finally, age was once again found to be negatively correlated with ZJI scores but this pattern did not hold for the SRJS. The results from these first two studies of the ZJI show consistent patterns with regard to the reliability and validity of the inventory.

Experiment 3

The criterion-related validity of the ZJI still remains to be established. Study Three is designed to test this validity of the ZJI, as well as to provide further information on the pattern of results with the inventory.

Method

Subjects

Thirty couples were contacted by telephone after they had signed their names and telephone numbers on sign-up sheets posted throughout Simon Fraser University. These sheets asked for married or cohabiting couples, who had been living together for at least one year, to fill out a questionnaire on relationships. Couples were offered \$10.00 for filling out the questionnaire package. Approximately 50% of the subjects were students, and the other 50% consisted of people who (1) were home caretakers, or (2) worked full time. The mean age of the 60 subjects was 29.0, with an age range of 19 to 48. The 30 females ranged in age from 19 to 48, with a mean of 28.5 years. The 30 males ranged in age from 23 to 37, with a mean of 30.0 years.

Materials

The same materials presented to subjects in Experiment 2 were presented to the couples in this study. The one addition was a set of four questions designed to measure the partner's perception of the other partner's role in the relationship. These questions are discussed below and presented in Appendix H.

Question 1--"Have you ever had (or are you now having) relationships with other people which annoyed or upset your partner/spouse?"--was included to test the hypothesis that people scoring high on the ZJI and SRJS would be more likely to get upset or annoyed over relationships their partners have with others outside of the primary relationship.

Question 2--"In general, how dependent upon you is your partner/spouse?"--was adapted from White (1977, Note 4), and was designed to test the hypothesis that people scoring higher on the jealousy scales would be rated as being higher on dependency by their partners.

Question 3--"In general, would you say that your partner/spouse is less involved, equally involved or more involved than you are in the relationship?"--was based the work of White (1980) who found that women were more likely to attempt inducement of jealousy in their partners when they were more involved in the relationship. White did not find this pattern for men. It was therefore predicted that the female partners, and possibly males, who were rated as more involved in the

relationship, would score higher on the jealousy scale.

Question 4--"How jealous a person is your partner/spouse?"--provided a straight-forward examination of the hypothesis that those partners who scored high on the jealousy scales would be rated high in jealousy by their partners.

The materials were compiled into a package in the same order as in Experiment 2, with the inclusion of the four partner perception questions placed prior to the SRJS. As well, couples were asked to estimate the number of years they had been together as it was hypothesized that jealousy scores would decrease as years together increased.

Procedure

Couples were seen individually or in pairs in a large tutorial room. Couples were seated so as not to face each other while filling out the package, and the set of instructions given to the subjects in Experiment 2 were repeated. After completion of the questionnaire package, the experimenter discussed the purpose of the study with the couples and answered their questions.

Results and Conclusions

Means, standard deviations and alpha coefficients of the ZJI are presented in Table 8. The SRJS again showed higher internal consistency than the ZJI. The mean item-total correlation for the ZJI in this study was .37. The difference in

mean scores between females and males (80.8 versus 70.6, respectively) was again significant for the ZJI, $t=-3.8$, $p<.001$, and nonsignificant for the difference in mean female and male SRJS scores (88.1 versus 74.2, respectively), $t=-1.68$, $p>.10$. The overall reliability coefficient of the ZJI is .80, but this time the alpha is considerably lower for females than it was in the previous study ($\alpha=.77$).

A factor analysis with Varimax rotation again produced a two factor solution (see Table 9). The factors are similar in content to the factors obtained in the previous factor analyses. As in the previous two studies women scored significantly higher than men on the emotional sensitivity factor (39.9 versus 32.3, respectively), $t(58)=-4.16$, $p<.001$, and there was no significant difference between their mean scores on the preference and belief factor (37.0 versus 33.7, respectively) $t(58)=-1.74$, $p>.08$. Once again it is the emotional sensitivity factor which accounts for women's significantly higher overall ZJI scores.

The primary purpose of Experiment 3 was to establish some level of concurrent validity for the ZJI. The results from the correlations of the four partner perception questions with the ZJI scores showed no significant correlations for males and females (see Table 10). A similar evaluation of the SRJS showed it to be significantly and positively correlated with Question 4--"How jealous a person is your partner/spouse?"-- for both males and females, $r=.39$, $p<.05$ for both samples. For males,

Table 8--Means, standard deviations and reliability coefficients of the ZJI and SRJS

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Alpha coefficient</u>
<u>Zander Jealousy Inventory</u>			
All subjects	75.7	11.5	.80
Females	80.8	10.5	.77
Males	70.6	10.3	.75
<u>Self-Report Jealousy Scale</u>			
All Subjects	81.1	32.7	.94
Females	88.1	30.1	.92
Males	74.2	34.1	.95

Table 9--ZJI items and factor loadings of the two factor solution

<u>item #</u>	<u>item</u>	<u>factor loading</u>
Factor 1		
16	My feelings are easily hurt	.771
21	I get upset easily	.720
25	I probably have more ups and downs in moods than most people	.705
9	I tense up easily	.596
3	I am an emotional person	.581
13	My imagination can get carried away sometimes	.562
12	I can be very sensitive about what other people think of me	.504
22	I find myself feeling resentful if my partner/spouse spends more time with friends rather than with me	.485
14	I tend to get strongly attached to people	.474
19	I sometimes feel that I am not receiving enough attention from my partner/spouse	.438
17	I sometimes find myself imagining all kinds of things my partner/spouse may be doing while we're apart	.338

24 I like to know what my partner/spouse is doing when we're apart	.337
15 My partner's/spouse's behaviour around members of the same sex as me tells me a lot about how he/she is feeling about me	.314

Factor 2

10 Marriage/cohabitation should only happen between two people who are prepared to be faithful to each other	.729
20 I like my partner/spouse to spend most of his/her free time with me	.699
1 I like to spend the majority of my free time with my partner/spouse	.672
4 I believe that life-long monogamous relationships are the best kind	.664
6 I believe that there is an ideal mate for me	.651
5 My partner/spouse satisfies most of my intellectual needs	.452
23 I believe that sexual relations should only be had with someone you feel emotionally intimate with	.433
2 I like to think of my partner/spouse as an extension of myself	.431
8 My happiness often depends on how my partner/	

spouse is feeling	.429
22 I find myself feeling resentful if my partner/ spouse spends a lot of time with friends rather than with me	.400
24 I like to know what my partner/spouse is doing when we're apart	.367

Items 7, 11, and 18 did not attain factor loadings of .250 or above for either factor.

Table 10--Pearson correlations between jealousy scores
and partner perception questions--between sex

	Correlations of female jealousy scores with male ratings of partner perception questions		Correlations of male jealousy scores with female ratings of partner perception questions	
	ZJI <u>scores</u>	SRJS <u>scores</u>	ZJI <u>scores</u>	SRJS <u>scores</u>
<u>Questions</u>				
Annoyance	.09	.02	.19	.16
Dependency	.32	.06	.17	.47**
Involvement	.25	.08	-.09	-.14
Jealousy	.33	.39*	.34	.39*

*p<.05

**p<.01

their SRJS scores were significantly and positively correlated with their partner's ratings on Question 2--"In general, how dependent upon you is your partner/spouse?"-- , $r=.47$, $p<.01$.

Another set of correlations explored was the relationship between subjects' ZJI and SRJS scores, and their own ratings of their partners. Regarding the perception ratings, it seemed possible, that based on the projective aspects of sexual jealousy, individuals scoring high on the ZJI and SRJS would label their partners as being high on the four questions. These correlations (presented in Table 11) demonstrated two significant effects. Female ratings of their partners on the dependency and jealousy questions (Questions 2 and 4) were positively and significantly correlated with their scores on the SRJS, $r=.41$, $p<.05$ and $r=.43$, $p<.05$, respectively. The couples' estimate of their years together did not correlate significantly with scores on the ZJI for any of the samples (see Table 12).

Once again the ZJI was 1) significantly and positively correlated with the SRJS for females, males and the total sample; 2) more significantly and positively correlated with the sexual factor of the SRJS than with the other factors; and 3) nonsignificantly correlated with the SDS (See Table 12). For this sample, the SRJS was significantly and negatively correlated with the SDS for the total and male samples only. The ZJI was found to correlate significantly and negatively with the Endurance Scale for the male sample, $r=.39$, $p<.05$, but not for

Table 11--Pearson correlations between jealousy scores and partner perception questions--within sex

	Correlations of female jealousy scores with female ratings of partner perception questions		Correlations of male jealousy scores with male ratings of partner perception questions	
	ZJI <u>scores</u>	SRJS <u>scores</u>	ZJI <u>scores</u>	SRJS <u>scores</u>
<u>Question</u>				
Annoyance	-.23	-.16	.00	.25
Dependency	-.06	.41*	.05	.18
Involvement	.26	.04	.33	.09
Jealousy	.03	.43*	.04	.29

*p<.05

Table 12--Pearson correlation coefficients between the ZJI, SRJS, SRJS subscales, SDS, years together, Endurance and Play scales and age

	All subjects <u>(n=60)</u>	Females <u>(n=30)</u>	Males <u>(n=30)</u>
ZJI with SRJS	.53***	.50**	.50**
ZJI with sexual	.56***	.59***	.50**
ZJI with family	.39***	.28	.40*
ZJI with social	.38***	.30	.42*
ZJI with work	.43***	.24	.48**
ZJI with SDS	.01	.29	-.23
SRJS with SDS	-.26*	-.01	-.48**
SRJS with years tog.	.05	-.07	.22
ZJI with years tog.	.11	.05	.12
ZJI with Endurance	-.22	-.07	-.39*
ZJI with Play	.12	.17	.20
ZJI with age	-.40***	-.37*	-.40*
SRJS with age	-.03	.05	-.07

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

the female or the total samples. Age was again significantly and negatively correlated with the ZJI for the overall, female and male samples. As in the second study, the SRJS did not show this pattern (see Table 12).

In summary, the ZJI was again found to be internally consistent as shown by the overall coefficient alpha of .80 and the mean item-total correlation of .37. The factor structure was essentially identical to the factor structure of the first two studies and women, once again, scored significantly higher on the emotional sensitivity factor. The attempt to demonstrate concurrent validity for the ZJI on the basis of the four criteria questions was not successful. Although the magnitude of the correlations between Question 4 and the ZJI were .33 and .34, for females and males respectively, they were not statistically significant. On the other hand, the SRJS scores were significantly and positively correlated with question 4 (correlation coefficients were .39 for both sexes). As well, the correlation between male SRJS scores and female ratings of Question 2 was significant (see Table 10). When looking at the within sex correlation coefficients between SRJS scores and the criteria questions (Table 11) it was found that female SRJS scores correlated positively and significantly with female ratings of the criteria questions 2 and 4--the same questions which contributed to the establishment of some concurrent validity for the SRJS. The latter result suggests that a

projective process may be functioning in relation to these questions. The same pattern, however, did not occur for the male sample.

The other patterns of findings in study three--convergent and discriminant validity for the ZJI, the lack of a significant correlation with the SDS, and a negative relation between age and ZJI scores--were consistent with the results from the first two studies. The degree of consistency of the correlations between the various scales in all three studies is shown in Table 13. The way in which the results from the studies relate to the original hypothesis and the area of scale development is discussed below.

Table 13--Summary of Pearson correlation coefficients from Experiments I, II, and III

	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>
<u>ZJI with SRJS</u>			
All subjects	.53***	.52***	.53***
Females	.60***	.56***	.50**
Males	.37**	.36	.50**
<u>ZJI with sexual</u>			
All subjects	.56***	.60***	.56***
Females	.61***	.63***	.59***
Males	.48***	.54***	.50**
<u>ZJI with family</u>			
All subjects	.32***	.27**	.39***
Females	.36***	.32**	.28
Males	.20	-.02	.40*
<u>ZJI with social</u>			
All subjects	.37***	.42***	.38***
Females	.43***	.46***	.30
Males	.20	.25	.42*
<u>ZJI with work</u>			

All subjects	.23**	.19	.43***
Females	.28***	.16	.24
Males	.11	.19	.48**
<u>ZJI with SDS</u>			
All subjects	.04	.06	.01
Females	.12	.05	.29
Males	-.06	.13	-.23
<u>SRJS with SDS</u>			
All subjects	-.25***	-.21*	-.26*
Females	-.21*	-.21	-.01
Males	-.29*	-.25	-.48**
<u>ZJI with age</u>			
All subjects	-.31***	-.40***	-.40***
Females	-.39***	-.42***	-.37*
Males	-.17	-.25	-.40*
<u>SRJS with age</u>			
All subjects	-.20***	-.09	-.03
Females	-.23*	-.14	.05
Males	-.16	.12	-.07
<u>ZJI with Endur.</u>			
All subjects		-.15	-.22
Females		-.13	-.07
Males		-.09	-.39*
<u>ZJI with Play</u>			
All subjects		.10	.12

Females	-03	-17
Males	-27	-20

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

III. Discussion

The original hypothesis, that the characteristics of jealous people described in the literature allow for the establishment of a reliable and valid inventory, is supported in part, by the results of the three studies with the Zander Jealousy Inventory. The item-test correlations, internal consistency measures, convergent, discriminant and concurrent validities all contribute to the establishment of the construct validity of a test of this nature. Construct validity of a test is defined as the degree to which the test measures the theoretical construct it was designed to measure (Allen & Yen, 1979; Cronbach & Meehl, 1955/1967). A proper evaluation of the Zander Jealousy Inventory requires that each of the reliability and validity results be discussed in terms of how they contribute to the construct validity of the test, i.e., the degree to which they support the hypothesis that the ZJI measures sexual jealousy.

The item-test correlations and the reliability coefficients both indicate the degree of internal consistency of the inventory. The lower bound internal reliability coefficients were sufficiently high to consider the forms of the ZJI to be homogeneous in what they measure (Jackson, 1970). To support the

construct validity of the ZJI, the item-total correlations must be consistently high (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955/1967). The three studies showed some items to have consistently high or low item-total correlations whereas others were inconsistent in this regard. It is clear from this analysis that the item pool of the ZJI must be modified and tested several times with several subject samples before the desired consistency is attained. The present item pool of the ZJI reflects only certain characteristics, and many more items might be generated and tested from all of the personality characteristics said to be related to sexual jealousy. The test-retest reliability of the inventory has yet to be established as well.

It was predicted and found in the three studies that the Zander Jealousy Inventory correlated significantly with the Self-Report Jealousy Scale. This test confirms the convergent validity of the ZJI. As discussed above, certain properties of the SRJS are believed to have limited the degree of the correlation. Since according to operational definitions, the SRJS appears to measure envy rather than jealousy in 13 of its 20 questions, it was predicted that the ZJI would correlate most highly with the 7 questions related to sexual jealousy. This expectation was confirmed in all three studies, and added to the convergent validity of the inventory. The SRJS, as well, measures jealousy by asking how jealous people would be in certain situations. The observation of the frequent denial of

jealousy has been discussed above. The SRJS, and not the ZJI, was found to be significantly and negatively correlated with the Social Desirability Scale in all three studies, and this pattern was always true to a greater degree for men than for women. The Social Desirability Scale is intended to measure a self-representational response bias (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964), and the above result can be interpreted as confirming the negative valence for the word jealousy. Thus it appears that responses to the SRJS were confounded with the need for social approval. This may also account for some of the unshared variance between the ZJI and the SRJS, especially for the male samples.

The fact that the ZJI correlated significantly with all four subscales of the SRJS, and not just the sexual jealousy subscale, requires some comment. The SRJS was developed by asking 100 people to describe situations in which they had been jealous. Bringle et al. (Note 1) note that, despite operational distinctions between envy and jealousy, people do attribute jealousy to situations which would operationally be defined as envy. It was the present author's experience that subjects frequently had difficulty filling out the SRJS because they found that the word jealousy did not apply. No records were kept of the number of subjects who had this difficulty, but it did demonstrate that people had different definitions of jealousy. In order to complete the SRJS, however, subjects were forced to

respond to the situations in terms of jealousy. Thus people who may have identified situations as being envy-eliciting (or any other emotion) may have cognitively altered their definitions to comply with the demands of the SRJS. If this was the case, then it may explain the observed correlations between the envy questions of the SRJS and the ZJI. On the other hand, it may be that envy and jealousy are not completely distinct constructs, and people who frequently experience these emotions share many of the same characteristics.

As for discriminant validity, the Zander Jealousy Inventory was found to correlate nonsignificantly with the Endurance and Play Scales (Jackson, 1967) for the total and female samples in Experiments 2 and 3. The only correlation that did reach significance was between the ZJI and the Endurance Scale for the male sample in Experiment 3. Since this result did not occur in Experiment 2, a plausible explanation may be that this result was due to the particular sample of males in the third study. Nonetheless this result necessitates the further examination of the discriminant validity of the inventory. Whereas the Endurance and Play Scales provide sufficient initial measures of the discriminant validity of the ZJI because they appear to be conceptually unrelated to jealousy, further validation of the inventory could include other scales which measure constructs conceptually closer to jealousy. This would provide evidence that the ZJI is not measuring a number of traits whose

nomicological networks might cluster more closely to the construct of sexual jealousy than do the Endurance or Play scales.

Nonetheless, these preliminary results with the ZJI do establish a degree of discriminant validity for the inventory.

As demonstrated by the nonsignificant correlations between the four criterion questions and the Zander Jealousy Inventory in Experiment 3, the concurrent validity of the ZJI was not established. In fact, the Self-Report Jealousy Scale was shown to be significantly correlated with the jealousy question for the female and male samples and with the dependency question for the male sample only. The latter result provides some evidence of the concurrent validity for the SRJS. For females, however, their dependency and jealousy criteria question ratings (Questions 2 & 4) were correlated significantly with their own ZJI scores. The latter result weakens the evidence of concurrent validity for the SRJS. The lack of concurrent validity of the ZJI in this particular study can be interpreted in a number of different ways following guidelines from Cronbach and Meehl (1955/1967). According to these authors, a negative result such as the one above can be due to one or more problems: (1) "The test does not measure the construct adequately"; (2) "The theoretical network which generated the hypothesis is incorrect"; and (3) "The experimental design failed to test the hypothesis properly" (p. 70). These problems can be used to evaluate both the criterion questions and the Zander Jealousy

Inventory.

All three of the above perspectives on negative results apply to the four criterion questions. The questions were primarily generated on the basis of their apparent face validity. It was assumed that jealous partners in relationships are perceived by their partners as being (1) annoyed or upset by certain of the latter's relationships with others; (2) high in dependency; (3) equally or more involved in the relationship; and (4) high in jealousy. In addition to questioning the logical assumptions on which the questions are based, one could argue that there was little empirical evidence to support their use as criterion variables. Questions 2 and 3, dealing with levels of dependency and involvement, were derived from studies by White (1977, 1980, Note 4) discussed earlier. As previously mentioned, however, White's method of measuring jealousy has yet to be validated. Thus, while the criterion questions appeared sufficient to test the hypothesis adequately they were founded on questionable empirical and theoretical grounds.

According to Allen and Yen (1979), concurrent validity coefficients "tend to underestimate a predictive-validity coefficient" and therefore are not usually the preferable method of establishing criterion-related validity (p. 97). In this context, the best way to establish the construct validity of the ZJI would be to relate it to behaviourally defined observations of jealous people along with self and significant other reports

(Cronbach & Meehl, 1955/1967). The ethical problems of experimentally manipulating sexual jealousy are apparent and thus the establishment of predictive criterion-related validity for the ZJI awaits the development of an ethical, behavioural measure.

As for the Zander Jealousy Inventory, the establishment of internal reliability, and convergent and discriminant validities for the test eliminate the possibility that the experimental design used or the theoretical network upon which it is based are responsible for its incomplete demonstration of construct validity. It is more likely that the third problem, an inadequate measurement of the construct, is responsible. As was discussed in relation to the item-total correlations, the present item pool of the ZJI is limited in that it reflects only some and not all of the theoretically derived characteristics of sexually jealous people. In fact, the form of the ZJI used in Experiments 2 and 3 only reflects five of the original seven characteristics associated with jealousy, and then only to a limited degree. A larger pool of items from each of the characteristics needs to be developed and tested several times on several subject samples in order to properly evaluate the theoretically based structure of the inventory; i.e., identifying the characteristics which contribute most to the tendency to be jealous.

The two factor solutions from the factor analyses of the Zander Jealousy Inventory consisted of what may be labelled (1) an Emotional Sensitivity Factor, and (2) a Preference and Belief Factor. Although these two factors do not directly reflect the characteristics from which the items were derived, they are both consistent with two of the four defining components of jealousy; namely, the affective, and beliefs and perceptions components. The situational and behavioural aspects of jealousy were not measured by the inventory.

The demographic factors examined in the studies contributed minimally to the construct validity of the ZJI. The finding that women scored significantly higher on the emotional sensitivity factor appears to be consistent with the suggestion by Francis (1977) that women are more sensitive about jealousy issues while men tend to deny or repress their feelings about jealousy; and with Spence & Helmreich's (1978) finding that women score higher than men on scales which measure emotional vulnerability. The attempt to evaluate the connection between jealousy and the variables of present relationship status, years together, number of relationships and the number of siblings proved premature as no definite theoretically based predictions could have been made about the direction of the correlations between these variables and the ZJI. As Campbell & Fiske (1959/1967) state: "We believe that before one can test the relationship between a specific test and other traits, one must have some confidence in one's

measure of that trait." (p. 128). In other words, the construct validity of the ZJI must be established before variables associated with jealousy may be properly evaluated. An exception to this caveat is the variable of age. It has been found that, within a non-clinical population, reported jealousy decreases as age increases (Constantine & Constantine, 1974; Aronson & Pines, Note 4). This stable finding is consistent with the results of the three studies which found that ZJI scores decreased as the age of subjects increased. This result does add to the construct validity of the ZJI.

How do the studies on the ZJI relate to the theoretical and observational work of psychoanalysts/psychiatrists and social psychologists? At this point the ZJI has not revealed much in the way of relevant information on the etiological and typological theories of these groups. Many of the questions concerning sexual jealousy may be fully explored in future studies once the construct validity of the ZJI is more firmly established. This holds true, as well, for the application of the ZJI to research on the qualitative sex differences in sexual jealousy expression. The fact that women scored significantly higher than men on the ZJI might lead one to conclude that women are indeed the more jealous sex. What seems clear, however, is that women are not the more jealous sex but are more self-disclosing about emotional issues (Cozby, 1973). This quantitative question--which sex is the more jealous?--is

probably never going to be answered as the real issue seems to be the need for a fuller understanding of social influences on interpersonal relationships.

In conclusion, the Zander Jealousy Inventory has shown itself to have a sufficient degree of reliability and validity to warrant its further development on the basis of literature-derived characteristics. A sexual jealousy scale, free from a self-representational bias, may prove useful, not only for theoretical examinations of the sexual jealousy construct, but also as a diagnostic tool in clinical work such as relationship counselling, where jealousy denial may prove to be a hinderance to change.

IV. Appendices

Appendix A--Original characteristics and items list

A. Overdependency on others

1. I have many interests that do not include my partner/spouse
2. *My partner/spouse satisfies most of my intellectual needs
3. *My happiness often depends on how my partner/spouse is feeling
4. *My partner/spouse satisfies most of my sexual needs
5. *I tend to get strongly attached to people
6. I like to make as many friends as I can
7. I make close friends easily
8. *My partner/spouse satisfies most of my emotional needs
9. I don't need the company of others to be happy
10. *I like my partner/spouse to spend most of her/his free time with me
11. *I sometimes feel that I am not receiving enough attention from my partner/spouse
12. I have many friends outside of my relationship with my partner/spouse

13. I share my personal concerns with many people aside from my partner/spouse

14. *My partner/spouse satisfies most of my recreational needs

B. Insecurity and inadequacy

1. I have very few doubts about my social competence

2. I feel good about my physical appearance

3. *I feel inferior to others in many respects

4. I generally feel secure about my relationship with my partner/spouse

5. I am fairly self-confident about obtaining those things in life which are important to me

6. I feel that I am a self-confident person

C. Moodiness and anxiety

1. *I get depressed easily

2. I get upset when people have points of view which differ from mine

3. I often get angry when people tease me

4. I find myself feeling quite ill at ease when I am meeting new people

5. I get impatient easily

6. Sometimes I feel so nervous that I begin to get all choked up

7. *I get upset easily
8. *I probably have more ups and downs in moods than most people
9. I generally feel uncertain about what to do or say when I'm with a group of people
10. *My feelings are easily hurt
11. *I tense up easily
12. I sometimes feel timid in the presence of others whom I regard as my superiors
13. *I am an emotional person

D. Possessiveness

1. *I like to spend the majority of my free time with my partner/spouse
2. *I like to think of my partner/spouse as an extension of myself
3. Some little things do annoy me--like when friends help themselves to some food that I am eating
4. *When my partner/spouse and I are together then I prefer to be alone with him/her
- * 5. I like to share things with my friends
6. I like my partner/spouse to involve me in most of her/his interests
7. I find it difficult sometimes to share things without

worrying about how much is going to be taken

8. *I like my partner/spouse to spend most of his/her free time with me
9. *I find myself feeling resentful if my partner/spouse spends a lot of time with friends rather than with me

E. Oversensitivity and suspiciousness

1. I get upset when people have points of view which differ from mine
2. I often get angry when people tease me
3. *I know by my partner's/spouse's behaviour whether or not she/he is sexually interested in a person of the same sex as me
4. I sometimes think that people are planning something about me behind my back
5. I like to observe and analyze the behaviour of others
6. *I can be very sensitive about what other people think of me
7. *My imagination can get carried away sometimes
8. *My partner's/spouse's behaviour around members of the same sex as me tells me a lot about how she/he is feeling about me
9. *I sometimes find myself imagining all kinds of things my partner/spouse may be doing while we're apart
10. *I get upset easily

11. *My feelings are easily hurt

F. A belief in socially defined relationship roles

1. *I believe that life-long monogamous relationships are the best kind
2. *I believe that there is an ideal mate for me
3. *Marriage/cohabitation should only happen between two people who are prepared to be faithful to each other
4. *I am very much in love with my partner/spouse
5. *I believe that sexual relations should only be had with someone you feel emotionally intimate with

G. Competitiveness-attention seeking

1. I enjoy working in situations involving skill and competition
2. I enjoy working in groups more than by myself
3. *It is important for me to have a job or career that will bring me prestige and recognition from others
4. I like to be able to do things better than other people can
5. *I like to be the centre of attention in a group
6. I like to be independent of others in deciding what I want to do
7. I sometimes like to supervise and direct the actions of other people

8. I enjoy competitive activities
9. I would like to be a recognized specialist in a job, profession or field of endeavour
10. The main satisfaction I expect I would get from a full-time job is the work itself and not being around people
11. I like working where I won't be bothered by others

H. Extra statements

1. Talking about feelings is one of the best ways to understand another person
2. When I'm in disagreement with my partner/spouse my opinion usually prevails
3. I find it easy to talk about my feelings with my partner/spouse
4. When I'm with my partner/spouse I usually go along with whatever suggestions she/he makes
5. *When I talk about someone I like very much I have a hard time hiding my feelings
6. My partner/spouse is open with me about other sexual attractions/experiences
- * 7. I am open with my partner/spouse about other sexual attractions/experiences

Appendix B--The Zander Jealousy Inventory

This section asks you questions about your current relationship with a partner or spouse. If you are not currently in a relationship could you answer the questions as if you are now in a relationship.

The statements which follow on the next page concern feelings, thoughts and behaviours. You are to rate how characteristic you find these statements to be of the way in which you feel, think or behave.

The example which follows is to familiarize you with the rating system and is not to be answered.

Example - "I eat lots of junk food"

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all characteristic of me	slightly characteristic of me	moderately characteristic of me	very characteristic of me	extremely characteristic of me

You are to choose a letter from A to E which corresponds to how characteristic of yourself you find each statement. The appropriate letter space is then to be filled out on the computer sheet provided.

1. I like to spend the majority of my free time with my partner/spouse

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

2. I get depressed easily

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

3. I like to think of my partner/spouse as an extension of myself

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

4. I believe that life-long monogamous relationships are the best kind

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

5. My partner/spouse satisfies most of my intellectual needs

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

6. It is important for me to have a job or career that will bring me prestige and recognition from others

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

7. I believe that there is an ideal mate for me

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

8. I know by my partner's/spouse's behaviour whether or not she/he is sexually interested in a person of the same sex as me

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

9. My happiness often depends on how my partner/spouse is feeling

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

10. I feel inferior to others in many respects

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

11. I like to be the center of attention in a group

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

12. Marriage/cohabitation should only happen between two people who are prepared to be faithful to each other

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

13. When my partner/spouse and I are together than I prefer to be alone with him/her

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

14. My partner/spouse satisfies my sexual needs

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

15. I can be very sensitive about what other people think of me

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

16. My imagination can get carried away sometimes

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

17. I tend to get strongly attached to people

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

18. I am very much in love with my partner/spouse

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

19. My partner's/spouse's behaviour around members of the same sex as me tells me a lot about how she/he is feeling about me

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

20. I sometimes find myself imagining all kinds of things my partner may be doing while we're apart

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

21. When I talk about someone I like a lot I have a hard time hiding my feelings

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

22. My partner spouse satisfies most of my emotional needs

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

23. I get upset easily

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

24. I like my partner/spouse to spend most of his/her free time with me

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

25. I sometimes feel that I am not receiving enough attention from my partner/spouse

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

26. My feelings are easily hurt

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

27. I find myself feeling resentful if my partner/spouse spends a lot of time with other friends rather than with me

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

28. I tense up easily

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

29. I believe that sexual relations should be had only with someone you feel emotionally intimate with

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

30. My spouse/partner satisfies most of my recreational needs

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

31. I am an emotional person

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

32. I like to know what my partner is doing when we're apart

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

33. I probably have more ups and downs in moods than most people

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

Appendix C--The Self-Report Jealousy Scale

Below are 20 situations in which you may have been involved, or in which you could be involved. Rate them with regard to how jealous you would be if you were confronted with the situation by placing a check mark in a space on the scale.

1. You find out your spouse is having an affair.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

2. Spouse or steady looks at another.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

3. A close friend obtains goals which you value.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

4. Another person gets the promotion for which you were qualified.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

5. A friend is smarter and gets higher grades.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

6. Someone else gets the praise or credit for something you did.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

7. A spouse or steady spends increasingly more time with others.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

8. An outsider becomes close to your children.

Not Very Jealous : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : 8 : 9 : Very Jealous

9. A group of people who would not include you in their activities.

Not Very Jealous : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : 8 : 9 : Very Jealous

10. You are stood up, and then learn that your date was out with another person.

Not Very Jealous : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : 8 : 9 : Very Jealous

11. Friends who have more money and are able to buy clothes, etc.

Not Very Jealous : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : 8 : 9 : Very Jealous

12. A brother or sister excels in school.

Not Very Jealous : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : 8 : 9 : Very Jealous

13. A classmate has superior athletic abilities.

Not Very Jealous : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : 8 : 9 : Very Jealous

14. A brother or sister receiving presents, and you don't get any.

Not Very Jealous : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : 8 : 9 : Very Jealous

15. Your steady date expresses a desire to date others.

Not Very Jealous : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : 8 : 9 : Very Jealous

16. Your brother or sister is given more freedom, such as staying up later, or driving the car.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

17. Another person is flirting with your date or spouse.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

18. A classmate gets more attention from a teacher.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

19. Your brother or sister seems to be receiving more affection and/or attention from your parents.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

20. A spouse or steady spends increasingly more time in outside activities.

Not Very Jealous : : : : : : : : : : Very Jealous

Appendix D--The Social Desirability Scale

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates. 1. T (true) 2. F (false)
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
1. T 2. F
3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. 1. T 2. F
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone. 1. T 2. F
5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
1. T 2. F
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. 1. T 2. F
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress. 1. T 2. F
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant. 1. T 2. F
9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it. 1. T 2. F
10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. 1. T 2. F
11. I like to gossip at times. 1. T 2. F
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. 1. T 2. F
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
1. T 2. F
14. I can remember playing sick to get out of something. 1. T 2. F
15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
1. T 2. F
16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. 1. T 2. F

17. I always try to practice what I preach. 1. T 2. F
18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed obnoxious people. 1. T 2. F
19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget. 1. T 2. F
20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it. 1. T 2. F
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. 1. T 2. F
22. At times I have really insisted on having my own way. 1. T 2. F
23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. 1. T 2. F
24. I would never think of letting anyone else be punished for my wrongdoings. 1. T 2. F
25. I never resent being asked to return a favor. 1. T 2. F
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. 1. T 2. F
27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. 1. T 2. F
28. There have been times when I was quite envious of the good fortune of others. 1. T 2. F
29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. 1. T 2. F
30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. 1. T 2. F
31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause. 1. T 2. F
32. I sometimes think that when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. 1. T 2. F
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. 1. T 2. F

Appendix E--Demographic items

A) Please list below your brothers and sisters (include step- and foster sisters and brothers) with whom you grew up. List them from oldest to youngest specifying their sex (male or female) and current age. Put yourself in the list where you belong - writing SELF and your age.

<u>SEX</u>	<u>AGE</u>	<u>SEX</u>	<u>AGE</u>
1. _____	_____	5. _____	_____
2. _____	_____	6. _____	_____
3. _____	_____	7. _____	_____
4. _____	_____	8. _____	_____

E) Present occupation: _____
 (Are you a full or part-time student; are you full or part-time employed) _____

C) Present relationship status: (check off one or more, as appropriate)

single and unattached _____

single and dating one romantic partner _____

single and dating two or more romantic partners _____

single and living with a romantic partner _____

married _____

separated _____

divorced _____

widow _____

engaged _____

other (explain) _____

Please indicate below the TYPE (by a check mark) and LENGTH (in years and/or months) of relationships (married, cohabiting and romantic) you had prior to your present relationship status.

<u>Married</u>	<u>Time (in years &/or months)</u>	<u>Romantic</u>	<u>Time (in years &/or months)</u>
1. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.	1. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.
2. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.	2. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.
3. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.	3. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.
4. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.	4. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.
		5. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.
		6. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.
		7. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.
		8. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.
		9. _____	_____ yrs. _____ mos.

Cohabiting Time (in years &/or months)

1. _____ yrs. _____ mos.
 2. _____ yrs. _____ mos.
 3. _____ yrs. _____ mos.
 4. _____ yrs. _____ mos.

Additional information: _____

(If you have not previously been in a relationship please check here _____)

Appendix F--The new form of the Zander Jealousy Inventory

This section asks you questions about your current relationship with a partner or spouse. If you are not currently in a relationship could you answer the questions as if you are now in a relationship.

The statements which follow on the next page concern feelings, thoughts and behaviours. You are to rate how characteristic you find these statements to be of the way in which you feel, think or behave.

The example which follows is to familiarize you with the rating system and is not to be answered.

Example - "I eat lots of junk food"

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic	characteristic	characteristic	characteristic	characteristic
of me	of me	of me	of me	of me

You are to choose a letter from A to E which corresponds to how characteristic of yourself you find each statement. The appropriate letter space is then to be filled out on the computer sheet provided.

1. I like to spend the majority of my free time with my partner/spouse

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

2. I like to think of my partner/spouse as an extension of myself

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

3. I am an emotional person

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

4. I believe that life-long monogamous relationships are the best kind

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

5. My partner/spouse satisfies most of my intellectual needs

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

6. I believe that there is an ideal mate for me

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

7. I know by my partner's/spouse's behaviour whether or not she/he is sexually interested in a person of the same sex as me

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

8. My happiness often depends on how my partner/spouse is feeling

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

9. I tense up easily

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

10. Marriage/cohabitation should only happen between two people who are prepared to be faithful to each other

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

11. When my partner/spouse and I are together then I prefer to be alone with him/her

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

12. I can be very sensitive about what other people think of me

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

13. My imagination can get carried away sometimes

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

14. I tend to get strongly attached to people

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

15. My partner's/spouse's behaviour around members of the same sex as me tells me a lot about how she/he is feeling about me

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

16. My feelings are easily hurt

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

17. I sometimes find myself imagining all kinds of things my partner/spouse may be doing while we're apart

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

18. When I talk about someone I like a lot I have a hard time hiding my feelings

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

19. I sometimes feel that I am not receiving enough attention from my partner/spouse

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

20. I like my partner/spouse to spend most of his/her free time with me

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

21. I get upset easily

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

22. I find myself feeling resentful if my partner/spouse spends a lot of time with other friends rather than with me

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

23. I believe that sexual relations should only be had with someone you feel emotionally intimate with

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

24. I like to know what my partner/spouse is doing when we're apart

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

25. I probably have more ups and downs in moods than most people

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
not at all	slightly	moderately	very	extremely
characteristic				characteristic
of me				of me

Appendix G--Endurance and Play scales

59. I don't have the staying power to do work that must be very accurate.
A. T B. F
60. People consider me a serious, reserved person. A. T B. F
61. When I hit a snag in what I'm doing, I don't stop until I've found a way to get around it. A. T B. F
62. I spend a good deal of my time just having fun. A. T B. F
63. If I run into great difficulties on a project, I usually stop work rather than try to solve them. A. T B. F
64. Most of my friends are serious-minded people. A. T B. F
65. I am willing to work longer at a project than are most people.
A. T B. F
66. At times I get fascinated with some unimportant game and play with it for hours. A. T B. F
67. If I get tired while playing a game, I generally stop playing.
A. T B. F
68. I would prefer a quiet evening with friends to a loud party.
A. T B. F
69. I have spent hours looking for something I needed to complete a project.
A. T B. F
70. Most of my spare moments are spent are spent relaxing and amusing myself. A. T B. F
71. I don't believe in sticking to something when there is little chance of success. A. T B. F

72. Even if I had the money and the time, I wouldn't feel right just playing around. A. T B. F
73. If I want to know the answer to a question, I sometimes look for it for days. A. T B. F
74. Rarely, if ever, do I turn down a chance to have a good time. A. T B. F
75. If I become tired I set my work aside until I am more rested. A. T B. F
76. I only celebrate very special events. A. T B. F
77. I rarely let anything keep me from an important job. A. T B. F
78. I pride myself on being able to see the funny side of every situation. A. T B. F
79. I don't have the energy to do some of the things I would like. A. T B. F
80. I believe in working toward the future rather than spending my time in fun now. A. T B. F
81. I will continue working on a problem even with a severe headache. A. T B. F
82. I try to make my work into a game. A. T B. F
83. When I get to a hard place in my work I usually stop and go back to it later. A. T B. F
84. I never play jokes on people, and prefer not to have them played on me. A. T B. F
85. When other people give up working on a problem, I usually quit too. A. T B. F
86. I often do something for no reason at all except that it sounds like fun. A. T B. F
87. Even when I'm feeling quite ill, I will continue working if it is important. A. T B. F
88. I usually have some reason for the things I do other than just my own amusement. A. T B. F
89. If people want a job done which requires patience, they ask me. A. T B. F
90. I enjoy parties, shows, games - anything for fun. A. T B. F

Appendix H--Partner perception questions

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLOWING QUESTIONS ON THIS SHEET BY CHECKING THE APPROPRIATE SPACE.

A. Have you ever had (or are you now having) relationships with other people which annoyed or upset your partner/spouse?

YES _____ NO _____

B. In general, how dependent upon you is your partner/spouse?

not at all slightly moderately very extremely
dependent
on me

C. In general, would you say that your partner/spouse is...a. less involved _____
b. equally involved _____; OR c. more involved _____; than you
are in the relationship?

D. How jealous a person is your partner/spouse?

not at all slightly moderately very extremely
jealous

Reference notes--unpublished sources

1. Bringle, R., Roach, S., Andler, C., & Evenbeck, S. Measuring the intensity of jealous reactions. Unpublished manuscript listed in JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 9, 1979.
2. Tipton, R., Benedictson, C., Mahoney, J., & Hartnett, J. The development of a scale for the assessment of jealousy. Unpublished manuscript, Virginia Commonwealth Univ., 1977.
3. Bryson, J. Situational determinants of the expression of jealousy. Paper presented at the meeting of the A.P.A., San Francisco, 1977.
4. White, G. Inequality of emotional involvement and jealousy in romantic couples. Paper presented at a meeting of the A.P.A., San Francisco, 1977.
5. Aronson, E., & Pines, A. Exploring sexual jealousy. Unpublished manuscript, Univ. of California, Santa Cruz, 1980.
6. Bringle, R., Roach, S., Andler, C., & Evenbeck, S. Correlates of jealousy. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, 1977.
7. Bringle, R., Evenbeck, S., & Schmedel, K. The role of jealousy in marriage. Paper presented at the meeting of the A.P.A., San Francisco, 1977.

References--published sources

- ✓ Adams, V. Getting at the heart of jealous love. Psychology Today, May, 1980.
- Arnold, M. Emotion and personality (Vol. 1): Psychological aspects. N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1960.
- ✓ Barag, G. A case of pathological jealousy. Psychoanalytical Quarterly, 1949, 18, 1-18.
- ✓ Beecher, M., & Beecher, W. The mark of Cain: An anatomy of jealousy. N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Bernard, J. Jealousy in marriage. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1971, 5, 200-215.
- Bernard, J. Jealousy and marriage. In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.
- Berscheid, E., & Fei, J. Romantic love and sexual jealousy. In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.
- Bleuler, E. [Dementia praecox or the group of schizophrenias]. (J. Zinkin, trans.). N.Y.: International University Press, 1955. (Originally published, 1911.)
- Blood, B., & Blood, M. Marriage (3rd ed.). N.Y.: Free Press, 1978.
- Bowman, H. Marriage for moderns (5th ed.). N.Y.: McGraw Hill, 1965.
- Bingle, R., & Williams, L. Parental-offspring similarity on jealousy and related personality dimensions. Motivation and Emotion. 1979, 3, 265-286.
- Bruning, J., & Kintz, B. Computational handbook of statistics. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1968.
- Campbell, D., & Fiske, D. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. In D. Jackson & S. Messick (Eds.), Problems in human assessment. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1967. (Reprinted from Psychological Bulletin, 1959.)

Clanton, G., & Smith, L. (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.

✓ Cobb, J., & Marks I. Morbid jealousy featuring as obsessive-compulsive neurosis: Treatment by behavioral psychotherapy. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1979, 134, 301-305.

Cronbach, D., & Meehl, P. Construct validity in psychological tests. In D. Jackson & S. Messick (Eds.), Problems in human assessment. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1967. (Reprinted from Psychological Bulletin, 1955.)

Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. The approval motive. N.Y.: J. Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Constantine, L., & Constantine, J. Sexual aspects of multilateral relations. In J. Smith & L. Smith (Eds.), Beyond monogamy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1974.

Davis, K. [Jealousy and sexual property.] In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977. (Reprinted from Social Forces, 1936, 14, 395-405.)

Davitz, J. The language of emotions. N.Y.: Academic Press, 1969.

✓ Docherty, J., & Ellis, J. A new concept and finding in morbid jealousy. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1976, 33, 679-683.

Downing, C. Jealousy: A depth-psychological perspective. In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Ellis, A. The american sexual tragedy. N.Y.: Twayne, 1954.

Ellis, A. Rational and irrational jealousy. In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Enoch, M., Trethowan, W., & Barker, J. Some uncommon psychiatric syndromes. Bristol: J. Wright & Sons, 1967.

✓ Evans, W. The eye of envy and jealousy. Psychoanalytic Review, 1975, 62, 481-492.

✓ Farber, L. On jealousy. Commentary, 1973, 56, 50-58.

Fenichel, O. The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis. London:

Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1945.

Fleming, J., & Washburn, C. For better or worse. N.Y.: Charles Scribners Sons, 1977.

Francis, J. Toward the management of heterosexual jealousy. Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, 1977, 3, 61-69.

Freud, S. [Some neurotic mechanisms in jealousy, paranoia and homosexuality.] In J. Stachey (Ed. and Trans.), The complete psychological works of S. Freud (Vol. 18). London: Hogarth Press, 1955. (Originally published, 1922.)

✓ Gesell, A. Jealousy. American Journal of Psychology, 1906, 17, 437-496.

Gilmartin, B. Jealousy among swingers. In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Gordon, L. The personal profile inventory. N.Y.: The Psychological Corporation, 1978.

Hoaken, P. Jealousy as a symptom of psychiatric disorder. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 1976, 10, 47-51.

Jackson, D. Personality research form. Goshen, N.Y.: Research Psychologists Press, 1967.

Jackson, D. A sequential system for personality scale development. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), Current topics in clinical and community psychology (Vol. 2), N.Y.: Academic Press, 1970.

✓ Jaremko, M., & Lindzey, R. Stress-coping abilities of individuals high and low in jealousy. Psychological Reports, 1979, 44, 547-553.

Jaspers, K. [General psychopathology.] Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963. (Originally published, 1910.)

Jones, E. Jealousy. Psyche, 1930, 11, 41-55.

Klein, M. Envy and gratitude. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1957.

Klimeck, D. Beneath mate selection and marriage. N.Y.: Van Nostand Reinhold, 1979.

- Langfeldt, G. The erotic jealousy syndrome. Acta Psychiatrica et Neurologica Scandinavica, 1961, 36, (Supplementum 151), 7-68.
- Mazur, R. Beyond jealousy and possessiveness. In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.
- Mead, M. Jealousy: Primitive and civilized. In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.
- Mooney, H. Pathological jealousy and psychochemotherapy. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1965, 111, 1023-1042.
- Murdock, G. Social structure. N.Y.: MacMillan, 1949.
- Pao, P. Pathological jealousy. In C. Socarides (Ed.), The world of emotions. N.Y.: International University Press, 1977.
- Reik, T. Of love and lust. N.Y.: Grove Press, 1957.
- Riviere, J. Jealousy as a mechanism of defence. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1932, 13, 414-424.
- Saul, L. Fidelity and infidelity. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippencott, 1967.
- Schachter, S., & Singer, J. Cognitive, social and psychological determinants of emotional state. Psychological Review, 1962, 69, 379-399.
- ✓Schwartzberg, M. Some aspects of jealousy and feeling hurt. Psychoanalytic Review, 1953, 40, 1-16.
- ✓Seidenberg, R. Jealousy: The wish. Psychoanalytic Review, 1952, 39, 345-353.
- Shepherd, M. Morbid jealousy: Some clinical and social aspects of a psychiatric symptom. Journal of Mental Science, 1961, 107, 687-753.
- Shettel-Neuber, J., Bryson, J., & Young, L. Physical attractiveness of the "other person" and jealousy. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1978, 4, 612-615.
- Skolnick, A. The intimate environment: Exploring marriage and the family (2nd ed.). Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1978.

- Speilman, P. Envy and jealousy: An attempt at clarification. Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 1971, 40, 59-82.
- Spence, J., & Helmreich, R. Masculinity and femininity. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1978.
- Stephens, W. The family in cross-cultural perspective. N.Y.: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston, 1963.
- Stinnet, N., & Birdsong, C. The family and alternate lifestyles. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978.
- Teismann, M., & Mosher, D. Jealous conflict in dating couples. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 1211-1216.
- Tellenbach, H. On the nature of jealousy. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 1974, 4, 461-468.
- Tipton, R., Benedictson, C., Mahoney, J., & Hartnett, J. Development of a scale for the assessment of jealousy. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 1217-1218.
- Todd, J., & Dewhurst, K. The Othello syndrome. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disorders, 1955, 122, 367-374.
- Vauhkonen, K. On the pathogenesis of morbid jealousy. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 1968, 44, (Supplementum 202).
- Vollmer, H. [Jealousy in children.] In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977. (Reprinted from American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1946, 16, 660-671.)
- Walster, E., & Walster, G. The social psychology of jealousy. In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.
- White, G. The social psychology of romantic jealousy. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37B, 5449-5450.
- White, G. Inducing jealousy: A power perspective. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1980, 6, 222-227.
- Whitehurst, R. Jealousy and American values. In G. Clanton & L. Smith (Eds.), Jealousy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.