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In order to examine the relationship between jealousy and overall level of self-actualizing, measures of these constructs obtained from four groups of college students, males presently in romantic relationships, males not presently in romantic relationships, females presently in romantic relationships and females not presently in romantic relationships, were compared. Scores obtained from the Inner-directed scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory, a measure of overall level of self-actualizing, and a seven-item jealousy scale were examined separately for each group via 2 by 2 analyses of variance (sex by romantic status) and linear regression analysis. Results of the 2 by 2 analyses of variance revealed the presence of a main effect of sex upon jealousy scores (females scored significantly higher than males) and a main effect of romantic status upon self-actualizing scores (subjects presently romantically involved scored significantly higher than subjects not presently involved romantically). Results of the linear regression analyses proved to be significant for only one of the four groups: a relationship between scores on the jealousy and self-actualizing measures was found to exist for male subjects who reported themselves as presently not involved in a romantic relationship. A similar, yet non-significant, trend was found for the second male group, while a relationship between scores on the jealousy and self-actualizing measures was not found to exist for either of the female
subject groups. Implications of the study and a need for further research investigating jealousy and related factors were discussed.
Introduction

"Everybody in childhood experiences a withdrawal of love and thereby develops the capacity for apprehending similar experiences. Early in life man learns that love directed toward and sustaining him, can be taken away" (Tellenbach, 1974, p. 465).

Little is known about the psychology of jealousy despite the fact that the affect is considered commonplace among humans and is often described as a universal trait (Corzine, 1974; Hupka, Note 1; Skolnick, 1974; Teismann, 1975). References to jealousy have appeared in the literature of the ancient Greeks, the Old Testament and the works of William Shakespeare to cite but a few of the sources which show evidence of the historical prevalence of this construct. Still, although reported upon by other academicians such as anthropologists for over two centuries (Hupka, Note 1), jealousy has been essentially shunned by those who might otherwise examine it from a psychological perspective.

The paucity of psychologically-oriented jealousy research may be partially attributed to the difficulties inherent in such studies, particularly those related to data collection. Direct observation of the jealous situation is restricted by the ethical considerations involving the laboratory production of jealousy (Aronson and Pines, Note 2; Clanton and Smith, 1977). Indirect measures of jealousy and studies which rely upon them are rendered problematic by the scarcity of psychometrically sound, objective instruments (Rusch and Hupka, Note 3), and by the tendency of subjects to deny or otherwise distort
the reporting of their jealousy in the face of questioning by the researcher (Clanton and Smith, 1977; Sokoloff, 1947).

Another factor which directly discourages researchers from the study of jealousy is the confusion that has resulted from the lack of a widely accepted definition of the term. Theorists have not been unified in their consideration of the affect and a commonly agreed upon theory regarding its nature and origin has yet to emerge. It would appear that jealousy means many things to many people; it has been likened to a Rorschach item regarding this apparent ability to evoke a rich variety of images in people and to mean different things to different individuals (Clanton and Smith, 1977). The resulting confusion may be seen in the literature with the appearance of such varied terms as social jealousy, sexual jealousy, family jealousy, work jealousy, pathological jealousy, normal jealousy, -- the list seems limited only by the reader's perserverance.

For the purpose of the proposed study jealousy will be defined as follows:

"...the experience of thoughts and feeling of irritation, displeasure, or the fear of loss when a person expects to have to share another person or aspect of life with a third person, and the actions taken in response to those perceptions" (Daher and Cohen, 1979, p. 480).

This study will especially focus upon the jealousy that is related to and a part of romantic relationships.

The above definition of jealousy differentiates it from envy and rivalry, terms which represent similar yet distinctly different situations than that of the jealous phenomenon. Whereas jealousy primarily centers around the fear of loss of the love-object--someone or something already in one's possession, envy and rivalry imply no possession of the
love-object on the part of the affected individual. Envy may be defined as a "discontented comparison" of oneself with another individual who "possesses" someone or something which the envious individual either wants for his own or wishes the possessor to lose in an "idealized imagining of equality" (Bachelor and Hupka, Note 4). Rivalry involves a situation in which two individuals of supposedly equal status are in competition for the "exclusive" attentions, or "possession," of a third person (love-object) with neither of the rivals presently having favored status.

The question of whether jealousy is normal or abnormal, healthy or pathological is one that necessitates the acquisition of empirically-based data with which to begin formulating an answer. A search of the literature shows a definite lack of empirically-based information regarding jealousy, even though the trait is regarded as part of most intimate relationships. Hupka (Note 1) reports that only five experimental studies are to be found regarding jealousy in the literature of the eighty year period from 1897-1977. White (1976) reports a similarly sparse number of sociological studies involving romantic jealousy, the majority of which feature jealousy not as a variable of major interest, but as a minor part of larger surveys of romantic relationships in general. Most of the existing literature regarding the jealous phenomenon is of a non-experimental or theoretical nature and remains to be validated by experimental effort. This literature has predominantly arisen from the observations and speculations of psychiatric practitioners, typically psychoanalytically oriented, in their work with disturbed individuals. Thus the literature tends to emphasize "the abnormal, irrational nature of jealousy" and tends to "...destroy the idea that
jealousy is a sign of strength, of love, or power and virtue" (Spielman, 1971, p. 75). Most theorists purport that jealousy is not particularly "a sign of ardent love" but rather evidence that something is wrong or amiss in the romantic relationship of two individuals (Bohm, 1967, p. 569).

There are theorists, however, who suggest that jealousy is a potentially useful and beneficial tool. Kingsley Davis (1936) states that jealousy is a necessary and cohesive agent in the maintenance of monogamous society. Seidenberg (1967) proposes that jealousy, if not taken to extremes, may be a playful part of "...the titillation, the foreplay between partners" (p. 587). Wagner (1976) claims that jealousy may even be seen at times as a sign of love, sanity or honesty and that society may actually find it more threatening for an individual not to be jealous than to be so. Indeed, much of popular belief typically has held that jealous behavior is an outward sign of the love of one individual for another.

Very few, if any, questions regarding the jealous affect have been concretely answered to date. The purpose of this study is to explore the relation between jealousy and various personality traits, particularly those dimensions considered to play an important role in the self-actualizing, or on-going growth, of the individual (Shostrom, 1972). Whereas previous consideration of jealousy has tended to treat the construct as a sign of pathology, use of dimensions related to self-actualizing will aid in the exploration of jealousy and its relation to positive mental health. A majority of authors and theorists have tended to view jealousy from a psychoanalytic perspective, emphasizing negative aspects of the affect with little or no regard for its role in the normal
personality. The literature shows no evidence of studies which have attempted to examine the relation between jealousy and healthy personality traits. This writer feels that such research is warranted in order to aid in the extension of the knowledge and understanding of jealousy.
Review of the Literature

Jealousy

Theories about jealousy abound. However, as Adams (1980) notes, "Most are derived from on-the-spot observations by anthropologists, armchair speculation by sociologists or conclusions reached by psychoanalysts treating emotionally disturbed patients" (p. 38). Issues central to the understanding of jealousy—particularly those pertaining to the nature and origin of the affect—remain subject to debate largely as the result of the insufficient experimental consideration given this subject to date. This is also particularly true regarding the question of jealousy's relation to the healthy personality, which, with other than a few scattered exceptions, has been curiously absent from the literature.

A key issue in the understanding of jealousy is centered upon whether the trait is instinctive or whether it is acquired by the individual through learning. Important not only to theorists and researchers, this question is also relevant to those interested in the management of their own jealous thoughts and actions. For as Clanton and Smith (1977) state:

"If jealousy is instinctive, a function of our animal nature, then it must be very resistant to conscious efforts toward its modification and control...if, on the other hand, jealousy is learned, if it is a function of our nurture in human society, then we might be more optimistic about the possibility of relearning or changing the behaviors and even the feelings which flow from jealousy" (p. 6).
Theorists are divided on this matter. William James (1952) flatly asserts jealousy to be "unquestionably instinctive." He is joined by theorists such as Podolsky (1954) and Havelock Ellis (1936) who describe jealousy not only as instinctive, but also as "incompatible with civilization." Others, including John B. Watson (1924), insist that jealousy is an acquired trait, either via active learning processes or through self-talk regarding past experiences (A. Ellis, 1972).

The majority of the contributors to the literature, perhaps as a direct result of their psychoanalytic orientation, regard the affect in a negative manner and tend to portray jealousy as pathological in nature. Many of these theorists link the nature and origins of the jealous attitude to various intra-personal stresses and unresolved conflicts.

Freud (1922) attributes the roots of jealousy to the Oedipal/Electra strivings of the child and to intense, but normal, competition among siblings for the attentions and affections of the parents. According to Freudian theory, the child is discontent by nature with less than exclusive "possession" of the favored parent and, therefore, inevitably prone to the occurrence of jealous feelings. These feelings are manifested as jealous attitudes and actions which are directed toward the rival--either parent or sibling--and carried into adult life as a pre-disposition toward the necessity of guarding personal relationships from outside intrusion. The adult jealous attitude becomes an attempt by the individual to avoid the pain and grief surrounding the loss of the love-object of adult life which would re-evoking the childhood Oedipal/Electra situation.

Freud states that jealousy may also arise in adulthood as a result of the individual's struggle with his own unacceptable thoughts.
or urges. Projected jealousy, an advanced form of the competitive jealousy described above, results as the individual attempts to resolve his part in his feelings or thoughts of unfaithfulness, or his homosexual learnings. In each case the person with the unacceptable thoughts projects them onto the partner and jealousy defends the relationship from break-up, thereby reaffirming his own faithfulness. In the case of unacceptable homosexual urges, the urges are projected onto the partner and the intruder--the object of the homosexual urges--is rejected in favor of the relationship; thus allowing the individual to demonstrate both his heterosexuality and his faithfulness to the partner.

Two other intra-personal mechanisms which have received relatively considerable mention in association with the formation of the jealous attitude are narcissism and self-esteem. Adler (1928) considers jealousy to be a product of the sense of inferiority that results from the continual power struggle each individual faces with his world from the beginnings of infancy. Jones (1948) believes jealousy stems from an underlying sense of inferiority on the part of the individual, a lack of self-confidence and the fear that these will be discovered by others. According to Sullivan (1956), jealous feelings arise from the fear of an unfavorable comparison by the love-object of a rival and oneself. Low self-esteem perpetuates this fear and leads the individual to conclude that the love-object will inevitably choose another to replace him. Loss of the love-object may even imply loss of one's self-esteem (Bohm, 1967), in which case the individual is unable to face such loss of love.
Fenichel (1945) states that a person's jealous feelings may be linked to the inability of this individual to develop a genuine love for others due to the intermingling of his own narcissistic needs with his outside relations. Bohn (1967) notes that the love of the jealous person is often not based upon altruistic motives, but is thought to be more of a possessive desire. The jealous relationship is one in which the partner is treated as property by the jealous individual, continually threatening the stability of the relationship (Francis, 1977). Thus, the jealous person may be one who is trying to satisfy his urge to be loved rather than his need to love--his need for reassurance, domination and lack of frustration (Bohm, 1967; Francis, 1977; Hoaken, 1976).

White (1976) examined the role of self-esteem in the formation of jealousy and proposed a model of the jealous experience. According to White's model, jealousy initiates itself as a threat to self-esteem which ultimately fosters perceptions by the individual of potential threat to his romantic relationship. Inevitably fights or arguments occur between the jealous person and his partner regarding the jealous individual's fears related to secondary relationships held by the partner. An examination of the validity of this model was undertaken through the administration of a number of personality scales developed by the researcher to 150 romantically involved couples. The scales measured variables hypothesized by White to serve as predictors of jealousy. White's analysis of the data led the researcher to revise his jealousy model as feelings of inadequacy failed to exhibit the expected influence on the jealous person's perceived threat to his relationship and did not seem to correlate with anger. The model was
revised to include the jealous individual's estimate of the degree of rival-partner attraction, a component White hypothesized to affect feelings of anger, inadequacy and perceived threat, as well as the degree of dependency upon the love-object. According to White, degree of dependence by the jealous individual upon the love-object elicits exclusivity needs--attachment to partner--and influences levels of fear and anger affected by outside relationships. If threat to relationship and degree of dependence are mutually high, subsequent discussions between partners regarding extraneous relationships lead to fights and a greater sense of inadequacy on the part of the affected individual unless the partner can successfully convince him that secondary relationships need not imply dissatisfaction with or threaten the first.

Little other research has been conducted in an attempt to explore the origins of the jealous attitude. Five studies conducted between 1927 and 1937 attempted to examine possible causes of the jealous attitude among young siblings, but without the benefit of a distinction between jealousy and envy, or jealousy and rivalry (Foster, 1972; Levy, 1936; McFarland, 1937; Ross, 1931; Sewall, 1930). These studies present results which are generally consistent with one another and, as such, offer a somewhat unified consideration of jealousy in children. The results of these studies indicate that female children are slightly more prone to jealousy than males, that the jealous individual is most apt to be the eldest child in the family and that jealousy is commonplace across demographic variables such as income, intelligence and national origin. The research, though limited--these studies were predominantly statistical surveys of the case records from clinics
operated by institutes for juvenile research, also indicated that parental attitudes and variables seem to have an effect on the jealousy of their offspring. One of these researchers concluded that jealousy did not seem to be an inborn trait, but "in general the natural product of the environmental situation in which it is the child's misfortune to be placed" (Foster, 1927, p. 64).

The literature offers only one other study pertaining to the origins of jealous reactions. Bringle and Williams (1979) investigated whether or not the jealousy or conflict observed in childhood results in an adult who is highly jealous in either social or sexual situations. Paid volunteers from college-level courses were administered measures of jealousy and two personality dimensions, along with items surveying demographic information regarding their ages, sex, birth order, size of family and frequency of jealousy. After completion of the questionnaires containing these items and measures, similar questionnaires were mailed to the parents of the subjects. An analysis of the data revealed familial similarity for jealousy and personality dimensions was found most frequently between parents and female offspring. In addition, results showed that jealous persons typically respond to threatening situations or stimuli through avoidance and are higher in arousability than non-jealous individuals. In view of these findings, Bringle and Williams suggested that jealousy may have different origins and possibly serve different purposes for the sexes. Females seem to be most susceptible to parental attempts at guiding the socialization of their offspring and to emotional insecurity in and dependency upon interpersonal relationships, both of which have been associated with jealousy (Berschied and Fei, 1977; White, 1976). Males, on the other hand, seem more immune
to parental direction and modeling and are typically viewed as better able
to initiate alternative relationships, thus less dependent than the
female on a single relationship. It was also suggested by the researchers
that perceptual screening and a high level of arousability are necessary
antecedents to the jealousy experience, while the strength of the
emotional experience may be dependent upon the perceptual screening
tendencies of the individual.

The possibility of sex differences regarding jealousy has also
interested other researchers and appears to be the most popular area
of jealousy research. Gottschalk (1933) investigated the jealousy of
25 men and 27 women who were experiencing such feelings over their
spouses' extramarital relationships. From his interviews with these
52 subjects of Danish and German nationality Gottschalk concluded that
jealousy is most frequently sexually oriented for males—jealous men
typically worry about another man engaging in sex with their partner,
while female jealousy most often is centered around the woman's fear
of losing the spouse. Denfeld (1974) and Varni (1974) found similar
results in their surveys of jealousy among married couples who indulge
in sexual encounters or relationships outside their marriages.
Consistent with the jealousy of Gottschalk's subjects, when female
"swingers" from these two studies reported jealous feelings, they
usually centered upon a fear of losing their husband to another.
The males in these studies tended to report jealous feelings that were
more concerned with the possibility that their sexual abilities might
not be equal or better than those of another. Males' jealousy seemed
less concerned about losing the spouse and more so about the individual's
own stature. Teismann (1975), in a study on the conflict acts of
jealous and non-jealous couples, also found this sex difference in jealousy in his subjects. Males in the Teismann study were reported as more likely to experience jealousy in sexual terms—images or thoughts of the partner's participation in sexual contact outside the primary relationship. Females, on the other hand, expressed jealousy as a fear of the partner giving too much time or attention to a third party.

White (1976) suggests that the sexual differences in jealousy noted above may be the result of socialization and the traditional dependence, both financial and emotional, upon men that women have been accustomed to throughout most of this century and before. Traditionally, the male has served as the provider and, arguably, the "owner" in the relationship and family. His jealousy may be seen to perform two functions: it acts as a device to protect his property and his self-esteem. Loss of the partner, the spouse, implies loss of property and loss of self-esteem. The female's jealousy, fueled by dependency upon the relationship, serves as a protective device which attempts to keep the relationship intact, often at the expense of this individual's self-esteem. Studies by Kinsey (1953, as cited by White, 1976) and Levinger (1965, 1966, as cited by White, 1976) illustrate the traditionally greater desire or need of the female to maintain status quo in the relationship, even amidst unfaithfulness by the spouse. In these studies, surveys of spouses from broken marriages and of court-ordered interviews from similar proceedings, males were found to more frequently cite infidelity of the partner as a major cause of divorce. Women in these studies were discovered to be more willing to tolerate their spouses' infidelity and more likely
to try to maintain the relationship or reconcile with the unfaithful partner.

With societal trends toward the independence and liberalization of women and attitudes toward them, the sexual differences in jealousy noted above may also become subject to change, as indicated in a study by Bringle et al. (Note 5). These researchers studied the relationship between jealousy and sex roles by correlating measures of jealousy from an instrument of their own construction with scales that measured attitudes toward women, androgeny, feminine interests and social reliability. Results obtained from scores by 90 college undergraduate volunteers indicated a moderate and significant correlation between measures of androgeny and intensity of jealous reactions and a slight negative correlation between measures of jealousy and attitudes toward women. The results also suggested that feminine subjects report more intense reactions than those individuals who hold contemporary, profeminist views of women. The latter were found to be less likely to report intense jealousy. Thus, it would appear that as women evolve from their traditional feminine roles toward more contemporary or independent roles so might the affects associated with their outdated models, including that of the jealous affect.

Bringle and Evenbeck (1979) examined the influence of jealousy on marital outcomes in an attempt to study the success of jealous persons in marriage. Married couples were administered questionnaires which included measures of jealous reactions and attitudinal variables, along with items assessing demographic variables of the participants. Results of the study showed that more jealous couples tended to view their marriages as less positive and that couples' ratings of their
marriages were most sensitive to the male's perception of the wife's jealousy. Neither the wife's actual jealousy nor her estimate of her husband's jealousy affected the female's rating of her marriage. Regarding actual or measured jealousy, marriages were reported as less positive when wives were dissimilar to their husbands in the propensity toward jealous reactions. The study also showed that highly jealous individuals tended to report poorer potential outcomes--alternative relationships--outside their marriages, suggesting the highly jealous individual's dependency upon the primary relationship.

A relationship between jealousy and dependency upon the primary relationship is also indicated by the results from a study by White (1980), who investigated subjects' tendencies to deliberately induce jealousy in their romantic partners. White studied the hypothesis that jealousy may be used as a power tactic by an individual whose romantic partner is in a relative position of power--i.e., has a "relatively more available or attractive alternative relationship" (p. 222). The high-power partner is considered to be less dependent upon the primary relationship, thus, allowing the low-power partner to believe that he or she is more involved in the relationship (more dependent). The hypothesis was studied through administration of questionnaires surveying motives, techniques and frequency of inducement to 150 romantically involved couples who answered newspaper advertisements and were paid for their participation. Results of the survey showed that 73 subjects reported deliberately inducing jealousy, with females much more likely to report inducement than males (31.3% to 17.3%). More involved females were almost twice as likely to report inducement than those females who considered themselves to be less or equally involved in the romantic relationship as their partner.
A content analysis of all responses showed no evidence that level of involvement was related to motives for jealousy inducement, but females were shown to be more likely to report inducing jealousy in order to gain a specific reward—i.e., more time or attention with partner—than for other motives such as bolstering self-esteem revenge purposes or for punishment.

Only a handful of studies have investigated the potential relationships between jealousy and other psychological or attitudinal variables. Corzine (1974) examined whether or not non-jealous adults display more integrative personality characteristics than jealous adults by splitting subjects into two groups on the basis of their identification of themselves as either jealous or non-jealous. Subjects were then asked to perform a Q-sorting, the separation of items representing characteristics of the subject himself into groups, of traits representing concepts such as drives, anxiety level, organic change, repression, autonomy, need-satisfaction and environmental conditioning. Results of the study showed statistically significant differences for integrative criteria between jealous and non-jealous adults, between jealous and non-jealous females and between jealous males and jealous females. Corzine concluded from these results that non-jealous adults possess more integrative personality characteristics than jealous adults.

Bringle et al. (Note 5) compared subjects' scores on measures of jealousy to those obtained from other psychological measures including self-esteem, locus of control, life satisfaction, anxiety, Machiavellianism, dogmatism and social desirability. An analysis of the data indicated that subjects who were likely to report intense jealous
reactions also tended to score low on self-esteem, be dissatisfied with life and were more apt to be externally controlled than those who reported less jealousy. Intensely jealous individuals were also likely to be subject to higher levels of anxiety and slightly malevolent in their attitude toward the world. Relationships were not found to exist in subjects between social desirability and jealousy, however, results indicated that jealous individuals tended to be dogmatic in their views.

Jealousy: Summary of the Literature

The preceding review of the literature reveals that consideration of the jealous affect has been largely disorganized and somewhat sporadic. Only recently has the amount of attention given this construct increased significantly. Early studies of jealousy focused upon the sibling rivalry of small children, while later studies have tended to survey sexual and jealous attitudes and differences among partners in romantic pairings. Only recently have empiricists become interested in potential relationships between jealousy and co-existing personality traits.

As a whole, the literature serves to portray jealousy as a negative or undesirable trait. The individual's jealous feelings have been associated with low self-esteem, an underlying sense of inferiority, as well as a lack of self confidence. Jealousy has also been linked by some theorists with exaggerated or extreme self-love (narcissim) and an inability to develop genuine and/or altruistic feelings of love for others. Recent studies further indicate that the jealous person may also be dogmatic, proffer traditional attitudes toward the female and her role in the world and may be somewhat malevolent in his or her view toward the world in general. An overview of the jealous
individual suggests that he or she is likely to be highly susceptible
to external control, anxiety prone, dissatisfied with life and feels
dependent upon his or her relationship if romantically involved.

Self-Actualizing

Organismic personality theorists have proposed that the individual
is motivated by one sovereign drive rather than a constellation of
interacting motivational forces (Hall and Lindzey, 1970, p. 300).
Goldstein (1939) was among the first to refer to this sovereign force
as "self-actualization," or the growing process of the organism.

Since Goldstein many theorists, most notably Maslow (1970), have
conceptualized self-actualization as a fixed state attained by few
individuals. Actualization in this respect represents an individual's
realization of his human potential along with continual positive mental
health and psychological adjustment. Shostrom (1972) has proposed use
of the term "self-actualizing" in lieu of self-actualization, preferring to focus upon the process of becoming versus a fixed state of
attainment. According to Shostrom, self-actualizing represents the
individual's movement toward human fullness, or the experience and
expression of his total being. The actualizing person is described
as one who is willing to take the risk of being himself and responding
according to his feelings of the moment rather than the rigid patterns
of the past or inflexible goals of the future. This individual is
oriented toward listening, accepting and acting upon his feelings
rather than behavior based upon "shoulds," "have to's" or "rights and
wrongs" (Paxton, 1976). Shostrom et al. (1976) also describes the
self-actualizing person as one who invokes a lifestyle centered upon
honesty, awareness, freedom and trust. This lifestyle differs dramatically from that of the non-actualizer, or manipulating individual, whose lifestyle instead revolves around deception, incongruency of self, unawareness, control and distrust.

Shostrom's theory of self-actualizing is centered upon the concepts of polarities, inner-directedness and time competence. A polarity is defined as "a continuum with discrete variations, from a central zero-point of constriction of feeling, to fullness of feeling at the outward extremes" (Shostrom et al., 1976, p. 4). The actualizing individual rhythmically expresses polarity feelings, flowing along the continua of anger-love and strength-weakness. This contrasts with the non-actualizing individual who, more rigid in his emotional expression, attempts to deny the necessary relationships between anger and love, and strength and weakness. Such an individual favors expression of part of the emotional continuum at the expense of another and will deny or constrict expression of the latter. Thus, this person may deny his weakness in order to appear strong and competent, or withhold his anger to facilitate a picture of himself as a loving and caring individual. The self-actualizing individual, however, recognizes the necessity of expression of all parts of the continuum and allows himself to express the weaker side of himself along with the strong, or the angry part of himself as well as the loving. In this way he may achieve congruence in his emotional expression and experience his total human being. Likewise, he is inner-directed and derives his motivation for emotional expression and/or behavior from within rather than from external sources of influence. Time competence, yet another characteristic of the actualizing individual, refers to
the ability to be present-oriented versus living with past guilt, resentment and regrets and/or future plans, expectations predictions and fears (Shostrom, 1974).

Self-Actualizing and the Relationship Sequence

Shostrom et al. (1976) describe four stages in the development of romantic relationships: the Eros stage, the Empathy stage, the Friendship stage and the Agape stage. Each of these stages is characterized by a particular dimension of love from which it takes its name.

The Eros stage is the first stage of romance and marriage and includes such aspects as inquisitiveness, jealousy and exclusiveness, along with sexual or carnal desire. Of particular interest is jealousy, which Shostrom et al. (1976) proposed:

"is a very important element in romantic love. New spouses are very concerned about extra attentions given their partners by members of the other sex, and such attentions easily stimulate reversion to early oral dependent behavior and defensive mechanisms" (p. 263).

These authors describe the actualizing relationship or marriage as one in which the partners acknowledge needs of the other without passing earlier projections, dependencies and defensiveness onto the partner. The manipulative, or non-actualizing, Eros relationship on the other hand is characterized by overdependency and defensiveness—both manipulative forms of selfishness.

The stage following Eros in the relationship sequence proposed by Shostrom is distinguished by the empathy dimension, or "the ability to feel deeply the separateness and masculine or feminine nature of the opposite partner" (Shostrom et al., 1976, p. 264). The Empathy stage features compassion, appreciation and tolerance for the
uniqueness of the partner. During this stage of development the actualizing relationship is best described as one of mutually respecting individuals in contact. In contrast, the manipulative empathic relationship often finds one partner assuming responsibility for the growth and change of the other.

The Friendship stage is third in Shostrum's developmental sequence and is built upon foundations of eros and empathy. This stage is described as the "maturing years" and is seen as a time in which the partners seek to increase their common interests. In the manipulative version of this stage one partner continually attempts to absorb the other in attending to his or her own needs—personal demands replace consideration of and interest in the other. Actualizing couples, however, have found identity within themselves by this stage of their relationship and now begin to seek mutually nourishing relationships with the spouse and others outside the relationship.

The fourth or final stage in the relationship sequence focuses upon the dimension of agape. Agape is a helping, nurturing form of love much like that which God supposedly has for man (Shestron et al., 1976). It "...involves an identification with nature and an appreciation of man's humaneness, as well as an appreciation of his potentialities" (Shestron et al., 1976, p. 265). In the actualizing pair, agape is evident as each partner accepts and encourages the self-interests of the other. Agape is an altruistic love and the actualizing partner is thought to find a sense of completion in the spontaneous joy and achievements of the other (Shestron et al., 1976). Non-actualizing couples tend instead to play God with one another during this stage. The need to be needed characterizes their
relationship as one partner seems reluctant to allow the other to seek nourishment outside the relationship for fear of their loss to another. The idea that the partner could possibly have his or her dependency needs fulfilled by another is extremely threatening to the non-actualizing individual.

Shostrom et al. (1976) do not claim these to be absolute developmental stages, nor absolute in sequence. Rather, their realization is dependent upon experiences of individual partners during their own developmental years. Formulation of these stages, however, does allow the differences between actualizing and non-actualizing relationships to be more clearly seen. The actualizing relationship is portrayed across the developmental sequence as one in which partners have a basic appreciation for each other's unique separateness, and of being mutually respecting individuals in contact. The actualizing partner acknowledges both his and his partner's strengths, limitations and needs while respecting and accepting them. Together they develop their relationship with its beginnings in a romantic, sexual sort of attraction and follow it through the formulation of mutual empathy, mature friendship and compatibility to an ultimate stage of love based upon unconditional acceptance and regard for the other—a non-selfseeking type of love. In contrast, the non-actualizing relationship is based upon a manipulative style of interaction which includes jealousy, exclusiveness, dependency, defensiveness and incongruency of self among the individuals within the relationship. As this union continues, one partner often assumes responsibility for the other's growth and change and attempts to guide these in a manipulative manner. One partner's identity may
become dependent upon the other while acceptance within the relationship becomes highly conditional.

Jealousy and Self-Actualizing

As noted above, jealousy and exclusivity are characteristics of the manipulative, or non-actualizing, relationship. Actualizing relationships are centered upon a style of relating which focuses on acceptance or tolerance of the other and the other's needs. The actualizing individual is not threatened by the idea that another may satisfy the unmet dependency needs of his partner and does not allow this to reflect upon himself. Instead he or she overcomes any defensiveness and encourages the partner to pursue self-interests, even those outside the primary relationship. The actualizing relationship promotes and stimulates self-support rather than excessive expectations and dependencies.

Self-actualizing has been conceptualized as a process of positive psychological adjustment. It has been described as "...a process of moving toward full humanness, not perfection" and only as coming about through acceptance of "...one's limitations and losses and by accepting one's lack of growth in specific areas" (Knapp, 1976, p. xvi). Self-actualizing individuals are described as having the ability to balance their greatness with an acknowledgement of their potential for failure (Knapp, 1976). These individuals differ significantly from normal and psychiatric populations in ego satisfaction, self-esteem, inner-directedness and other indicators of adjustment such as frustration level, anxiety and ability to develop intimate relationships (Fox, Knapp and Michael, 1968, as cited in Shostrom, Knapp and Knapp, 1976).
The jealous individual is portrayed in the literature as one who continually is on guard in his romantic relationship for outside threat in the guise of potential romantic intruders (Bohm, 1967; Daher and Cohen, 1979; Freud, 1922; White, 1976). He or she suffers from a lowered sense of self-esteem and a dependency upon the romantic pairing that is fostered by a perceived lack of viable alternatives outside the relationship which is in turn promoted by a lack of self-confidence and/or underlying sense of inferiority (Adler, 1928; Berscheid and Fei, 1977; Jones, 1948; Sullivan, 1956; White, 1976).

Statement of the Problem

The intent of this study was to examine the relationship between jealousy and self-actualizing in order to determine the accuracy of earlier descriptions of jealousy and jealous characteristics. From these descriptions it would appear that self-actualizing tendencies (i.e., independence, a sense of self-esteem and self-worth, trust and encouragement of the partner to seek fulfillment both inside and outside the primary relationship) are not congruent with jealousy.

A second goal of the study was to examine the effect of sex and romantic status upon the relationship between jealousy and self-actualizing. It has been suggested that there are sexual differences regarding the jealous phenomenon and that different origins and purposes of jealousy may exist for the respective sexes. Romantic status of the participants in the study was examined in order to assess whether or not present participation in a romantic relationship is a necessary condition for jealousy as it relates to romantic situations, or whether past experiences are sufficient for an individual,
though not currently romantically involved, to experience and/or acknowledge high levels of romantic jealousy.

The following hypothesis was tested:

Individuals who display higher levels of self-actualizing will report themselves as less likely to react in a jealous manner than will individuals who display lower levels of self-actualizing.
Method

Subjects

Subjects were sought from graduate and undergraduate level courses at Western Kentucky University. Sixty-one males and 63 female college students agreed to participate in the study. Although many other students also were invited to participate, the sample group was formed from the 124 men and women who, at the personal request of the experimenter, volunteered to complete a set of questionnaires.

The subjects were selected for inclusion in the sample on the basis of availability and their responses to items surveying sexual orientation (partner preference) and level of romantic experience (number of intimate romantic relationships). Only those volunteers who expressed themselves to be heterosexual in orientation and having participated in at least one intimate relationship were included in the sample group.

The mean age for males in the study was 23.49 years of age and 20.63 for females, with an overall subject mean of 22.04. Level of romantic experience ranged from present to previous participation in one romantic relationship to experience in over thirty such relationships.

Materials

Three instruments were used in the study: The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (Shostrom, 1974), The Romantic Jealousy-Envy Scale
(Rusch and Hupka, Note 3) and a short questionnaire designed by the experimenter to survey demographic information including age, sex, sexual/romantic orientation and level of experience in romantic relationships (Appendix A).

The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). The POI (Shostrom, 1974) is a normative-based, psychological measure which is designed to examine intrapersonal aspects of self-actualizing. The items of this self-report measure are considered to reflect significant value judgements and behaviors viewed by clinical practitioners and personality theorists to be of importance in the development of self-actualizing individuals (Shostrom, Knapp and Knapp, 1976).

The POI contains 150 two-choice comparative value-judgement items. The format of the inventory is non-ipsative, with scores on one scale in general not dependent upon responses to other scales. Instead, scale scores are normatively-based and a high score on a particular scale is considered to reflect a greater degree of actualizing along the lines of that dimension than would be represented by a lower score.

Twelve different categories are utilized in the scoring of the POI: two major ratio scores and ten subscales (Appendix B). The major scores are interpreted in terms of a Time ratio (time competence/time incompetence) and a Support ratio (inner-directed/other-directed ratio). The Time ratio assesses the degree to which the individual is reality oriented in the present and able to bring past experiences and future goals and expectations into meaningful continuity (Knapp, 1976). The Support ratio defines the relative autonomy of the individual by gauging the balance between other-directedness and inner-directedness (Knapp, 1976). Other-directed persons tend to be dependent individuals
while inner-directed persons are primarily seen as self-willed. The self-actualizing individual transcends this dichotomy and integrates both orientations, with this transcendence expressed in an optimal ratio between inner- and other-directedness (Shostrom, Knapp and Knapp, 1976).

For the purposes of the present study, an estimate of subjects' overall level of self-actualizing was required. Scores obtained from subjects' responses on the Inner-directed scale (I) of the POI were utilized as this estimate. The Inner-directed scale is considered to be the best single estimate of overall level of self-actualizing (Shostrom, 1974) and is recommended for use in studies employing correlational or other statistical analyses in view of the statistical complexities associated with ratio scores in general. The I-scale consists of 127 statement pairs which represent inner- and other-directed beliefs and behaviors. Subjects are instructed to choose between these beliefs in accordance to which statement most closely reflects their own values and beliefs. From these responses a single score is generated indicating present overall level of self-actualizing.

Reliability studies of the POI have found reliability coefficients of .91 and .93 (Shostrom, 1964). Validation evidence for the instrument has been obtained from a number of studies in which the POI was found to successfully discriminate between clinically diagnosed self-actualizing and non-actualizing individuals (Shostrom, Knapp and Knapp, 1976).

Studies have also yielded generally high reliability coefficients for the Inner-directed scale of the POI. In the manual for the instrument, Knapp (1976) reports three separate studies which evidenced coefficients over .77. Wise and Davis (1975, as cited in Knapp, 1976)
tested 172 university students with the scale and found a test-retest reliability coefficient of .88 upon re-administration of the instrument after a two week period. A second study incorporating the test-retest method produced a reliability coefficient of .77 upon retesting 48 college students following a one week interval (Klavetter and Mogar, 1967, as cited in Knapp, 1976). Kaats (cited in Knapp, 1976) found an internal consistency coefficient of .80 for the scale, based upon Cronbach's alpha.

The Romantic Jealousy-Envy Scale. The Romantic Jealousy-Envy Scale (Rusch and Hupka, Note 3) was used to assess subjects' level of jealousy. Originally developed as a measure of jealousy, the scale since has been relabeled as a jealousy-envy measure upon a re-examination of its item-content and in view of the conceptual differences between jealousy and envy (Bachelor and Hupka, Note 4). The scale was chosen for use in this study because of the overall lack of "pure" jealousy measures and the apparent unwillingness or inability of authors of other instruments to provide the experimenter with information regarding the psychometric properties of their measures, as well as evidence of reliability and validity.

After three factor analytic studies, the Rusch-Hupka scale currently consists of 27 items (Appendix C), which are grouped into six factors labeled Threat to Exclusive Companionship, Self-depreciation-Envy, Dependency, Sexual Possessiveness, Competition-Vindictiveness and Trust (Hupka, Note 6). The scale is scored via a six point, Likert-type scoring system, with individual item scores summed to provide an overall measure of jealousy-envy. Higher scores are considered indicative of greater levels of jealousy-envy present than are those represented by lower scores.
Validation evidence for the scale has been obtained through a "test-independent criterion" approach: test scores for subjects were correlated with clinical ratings by seventeen therapists on a four point, Likert-type scale which ranged from "Extremely Jealous" to "Not Jealous At All." Independent ratings by therapists (i.e., perceived jealousy) correlated ($r = .51$) with performance of subjects (i.e., self-reported jealousy) on the romantic jealousy-envy scale. The approach was repeated with 31 married couples, with each partner independently rating the mate's level of jealousy before applying the measure to his or her own level of the affect. The Pearson-product moment correlation between independent ratings and subjects' estimates for the scale, based upon the Spearman-Brown calculation for the 106 respondents of both sample groups, was $r = .85$ (Bachelor and Hupka, Note 4).

In order to ensure a homogeneous measure of jealousy, it was necessary to eliminate certain items from the scoring of the Rusch-Hupka scale. Items which, on the basis of an analysis of their content, did not seem to measure jealousy were dropped from scoring consideration. In this manner, seven items were selected which were thought to relate exclusively to jealousy and jealousy-evoking situations. These items were found on two factors within the jealousy-envy scale: four from the "Threat to Exclusive Companionship" factor and all three of the items comprising the "Sexual Possessiveness" factor. As interpreted by Rusch and Hupka, these factors seemingly correspond to the adopted definition of jealousy of this study. A second analysis of the content of all ten items forming these two factors, however, further lent encouragement to use of only the seven items first selected as a measure of jealousy. These seven items seem to be appropriately interpreted as "pure" jealousy items: items which relate predominantly to jealousy-
evoking situations and the jealous affect. The remaining three items from these factors are more readily interpreted as measures of other affects such as loneliness and depression—-affects that, while conceivably related to the jealous situation, are not necessarily part of the jealous affect.

All items from the "Threat to Exclusive Companionship" and the "Sexual Possessiveness" factors were analyzed for homogeneity and an item-correlational analysis was run. Results of the factor analysis indicated the presence of two factors accounting for the total scale (ten items) variance. The seven items first selected via content analysis loaded on one of the factors and accounted for most of the total variance. The remaining three items, those thought to correspond to extraneous affects, formed a second factor and accounted for a much smaller part of the scale variance. A second factor analysis of the proposed seven-item jealousy measure (factor one) suggested it to be unifactorial. An item correlational analysis of the seven items showed high internal consistency and produced a generally high coefficient alpha. Based on these analyses, the seven items were considered an adequate measure of present level of jealousy in subjects. These items may be found in Appendix D.

Procedure

After obtaining volunteers for the study, a cover sheet explaining the nature and purpose of the project was provided to potential subjects (Appendix E). The cover sheet stressed the strictly voluntary nature of participation, as well as a guarantee of anonymity for all participants. After reading this information, those individuals who did not wish to participate further were allowed to quietly leave.
The instruments were administered to the remaining subjects in 60 minute sessions which were scheduled during regular class hours. Participants were asked to maintain anonymity and to respond to all items in such a way as to reflect their own true feelings, beliefs and behaviors. Inquiries regarding additional instructions for completing the survey materials were answered and subjects were instructed to work at their own paces. Upon completion of the questionnaires, individual subjects were permitted to leave the testing premises.

Participants in the study were given the option of participating in a group debriefing session at a later time. Subjects were told that results of the study would be presented and their questions answered. Individual results and interpretations were not offered due to limitations of time, anonymity restrictions and the size of the sample population necessary for the project.

Design and Analysis of Data

The criterion in the present study was defined as the scores obtained by subjects on the seven item measure of jealousy. The predictor was considered to be overall level of self-actualizing, as measured by the Inner-directed scale of the POI. The nature of the relationship between jealousy and self-actualizing was examined via linear regression analysis, with separate analyses performed for each of the following groups: males not presently involved in romantic relationships (NMR), males presently involved in romantic relationships (MR), females not presently involved in romantic relationships (FNR) and females presently involved in romantic relationships (FR).
Results

A principal component analysis was performed regarding the psychometric characteristics of the ten items comprising the Rusch-Hupka factors entitled "Threat to Exclusive Companionship" and "Sexual Possessiveness." The factor analysis of the ten items indicated the presence of two factors, which accounted for the variance among these items. As expected, the two factors grouped the ten items differently than did the Rusch-Hupka factors and the implications of the difference in these groupings were noted. The seven items first selected by the experimenter via content analysis loaded on one factor and accounted for 84.6 percent of the scale variance (Eigenvalue=3.45671). These items were considered to relate to jealousy and jealousy-evoking situations. The remaining three items formed a second factor and accounted for 15.6 percent of the scale variance (Eigenvalue=.63130). These items were originally excluded from the jealousy measure as they seemingly related to other affects and thus did not exclusively relate to jealousy. An unrotated, principal component analysis of the seven jealousy-related items indicated that a scale consisting of these items would be homogeneous. The items were found to be unifactorial, accounting for over 99.9 percent of the scale variance. An item correlational analysis of the scale produced a coefficient alpha of .79114, indicating high internal consistency for the items. Based on these analyses, the seven-item scale was considered a suitable measure of jealousy for this study.
Obtained means and standard deviations regarding measures of jealousy and self-actualizing for the sample population are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Separate 2 by 2 analyses of variance (sex by romantic status) were performed on the jealousy and self-actualizing scores. Results of these analyses are presented in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. Regarding jealousy, a main effect of sex was found, indicating that female subjects scored significantly higher than males on the jealousy measure. No main effect was evidenced for romantic status, and no interaction between sex and romantic status was found to exist. Regarding self-actualizing scores, a main effect was found for romantic status, indicating that individuals presently involved romantically scored higher on the measure of self-actualizing than individuals not romantically involved. No main effect for self-actualizing scores was found to exist for sex and no interaction was evidenced between sex and romantic status.

A linear regression analysis was performed on scores obtained from the self-actualizing measure and the seven-item jealousy scale. Separate analyses were performed for four groups of subjects: males presently in romantic relationships (MR), males not presently in romantic relationships (MNR), females presently in romantic relationships (FR) and females not presently in romantic relationships (FNR). Results of the regression analysis are presently separately for each group in Table 5.

The hypothesis that subjects who display higher levels of self-actualizing will report themselves as less likely to react in a jealous manner than will individuals who display lower levels of self-actualizing was supported to the desired degree of significance.
TABLE 1

Mean Jealousy Scores and Standard Deviations
for Subjects: Grouped by Sex and Romantic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$=25.30</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$=30.67</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$=27.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s=8.09$</td>
<td>$s=6.36$</td>
<td>$s=7.70$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n=30$</td>
<td>$n=30$</td>
<td>$n=60$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$=27.30</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$=29.97</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$=28.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s=6.15$</td>
<td>$s=4.62$</td>
<td>$s=5.53$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n=31$</td>
<td>$n=33$</td>
<td>$n=64$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$=26.33</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$=30.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s=7.18$</td>
<td>$s=5.48$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n=61$</td>
<td>$n=63$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2

Mean Self-Actualizing Scores and Standard Deviations for Subjects: Grouped by Sex and Romantic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romantic Status</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 87.53 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 85.50 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( s = 10.50 )</td>
<td>( s = 7.69 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 30 )</td>
<td>( n = 30 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Relationship</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 82.39 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 81.70 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( s = 10.01 )</td>
<td>( s = 11.06 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 31 )</td>
<td>( n = 33 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 84.92 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 83.51 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( s = 10.49 )</td>
<td>( s = 9.72 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 61 )</td>
<td>( n = 63 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5445.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>559.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>489.37</td>
<td>489.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Status (RS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>15.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x RS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.65</td>
<td>54.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4885.72</td>
<td>40.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical F \((1,120)=3.92\) .05
### TABLE 4

Analysis of Variance: Self-Actualizing Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>12521.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>692.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.62</td>
<td>61.62</td>
<td>0.6251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Status (RS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>632.04</td>
<td>632.04</td>
<td>6.3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x RS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.0812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11829.31</td>
<td>98.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical F $(1,120)=3.92$
TABLE 5
Results of Linear Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females-Relationship</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.8635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females-No Relationship</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.9818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males-Relationship</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>62.79</td>
<td>.0920</td>
<td>.1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males-No Relationship</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>35.99</td>
<td>.2205</td>
<td>.0077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for only one of the four groups of subjects. A relationship between
scores on the jealousy measure and overall level of self-actualizing,
as measured by the Inner-directed scale of the POI, was found to exist
for male subjects who reported themselves as presently not involved in
a romantic relationship. The relation between the criterion (level
of jealousy) and predictor (level of actualizing) was determined to
be negative, as evidenced by the obtained weighting coefficient of
-0.31340. The percent of variance in the criterion accounted for by
the predictor was 22.05 (p=.0077).

Regarding male subjects who reported themselves to presently be
involved in a romantic relationship, a trend toward support for the
hypothesis was evidenced. The percent of variance accounted for in
this group's criterion scores by the measure of self-actualizing was
\( \hat{\rho} = 0.20 \) (\( p=0.1032 \)). A weighting coefficient of -0.23606 was
obtained for this group.

A relationship between scores on the jealousy and self-actualizing
measures was not found to exist for either of the female subject groups.
This finding must be tempered, however, by the possibility of a ceiling
effect regarding the scores obtained from female subjects on the jealousy
measure. An overall mean for females of 30.3 was found, with a cor-
responding standard deviation of 5.48, compared to an overall mean of
26.33 with a standard deviation of 7.18. Considering the limited range
of scores possible on the seven-item jealousy measure (7-42), it is
conceivable that the measure was not sensitive enough to accurately
assess the existence of the hypothesized relationship between jealousy
and self-actualizing for the female sample groups.
Discussion

The results of this exploratory study suggest that a significant relationship between scores obtained from a measure of jealousy and those from a measure of self-actualizing exists for males who are not presently involved in a romantic relationship. The relationship between these scores may be described as negative: males in this group (MNR) who scored higher on the measure of self-actualizing recorded lower scores on the jealousy measure than males in the group who scored lower on the self-actualizing measure. A similar trend was evidenced in the scores obtained from the jealousy and self-actualizing measures for the second male group: males presently involved in romantic relationship (MR). Results for the MR group were not considered significant at the p=.05 level, however; and it could not be determined whether additional subjects would strengthen or diminish the obtained trend. No relationship was found to exist between scores obtained from the jealousy and self-actualizing measures for either of the female subject groups: females not presently in a romantic relationship (FNR) and females presently involved in a romantic relationship (FR). Mean levels of jealousy, as measured by a seven-item jealousy scale, did not differ significantly across corresponding overall levels of self-actualizing for either group. A relationship between jealousy scores and those from the self-actualizing measure could not be ruled out due to the limited range of scores obtainable from the jealousy measure and the uncertain likelihood of a ceiling effect acting upon these scores for the female groups.
In view of these results, it appears that a relationship between jealousy and corresponding levels of self-actualizing exists for college males not presently involved in romantic relationships, and similarly may exist for college males who are presently involved romantically. The findings of the study indicate that males in these groups who display higher levels of self-actualizing responses report themselves as less likely to react in a jealous manner than do males who display lower levels of self-actualizing. This does not seem to be true of college females as there appears to be no relationship between self-actualizing and level of jealousy in these individuals.

Results of the study also suggest that romantic status is not an important factor in the overall level of jealousy present. The analysis of variance of the jealousy scores of individuals who were either presently involved romantically or not presently in a romantic relationship showed no significant difference between the jealousy scores of these two groups.

The performance of the male subjects in this study suggests that high levels of jealousy are not commonplace for the self-actualizing male, but perhaps more closely aligned with the behavior of the non-actualizing individual. However, as self-actualizing is conceptualized as a process of becoming and not a fixed state of attainment, so, too, might the jealous affect be considered part of the continuum on which the actualizing relationship develops toward fullness and mutuality of love and trust of one partner for the other. Shostrom et al. (1976) picture jealousy as part of the romantic relationship in its earliest stages. Similarly, the presence of high levels of jealousy may also serve as an indicator that the individual is in the early stages.
of his own development process toward human fullness—i.e., self-actualizing.

While the expected relationship between self-actualizing and jealousy was not evidenced for the female participants in this study, the measure of jealousy used may preclude dismissal of the existence of such a relationship. Further research involving these constructs is required and a more sensitive measure of jealousy, more so than a seven-item measure can afford, may be necessary to more adequately study the relationship between jealousy and self-actualizing for this group. Should further research fail to support the hypothesized relationship between jealousy and self-actualizing for female subjects, one explanation may lie in the differences in socialization for the respective sexes. Females traditionally have been dependent upon the romantic relationship, both financially and emotionally, and social and parental attitudes seemingly have been geared toward keeping them so. Males, on the other hand, have been accustomed to enjoying more freedom financially and, perhaps, emotionally, and are less dependent on a single relationship. Not surprisingly, sociological surveys have suggested jealousy in females to frequently center upon fear of losing the partner, while the affect in males seems most related to fear of losing face. Female jealousy may be described, at least in part, as related to emotional and economic survival. Male jealousy appears more ego-related. It would thus seem that male jealousy would best relate to corresponding levels of self-actualizing, while the jealousy of females less so or perhaps not at all. This is complicated by the changing roles of female in society and the trend of many women to adopt other than traditional attitudes. It is conceivable that the contemporary woman is less likely to
experience high levels of jealousy than her traditionally-based counterpart in accordance to the greater levels of personal freedom that modern society offers her. While speculatory in nature, the possibility of attitudinal differences for females and resulting differences in overall levels of jealousy suggests further need for additional research in this area.

Though a trend toward the expected relationship between jealousy and self-actualizing was evidenced for males presently involved romantically, it is possible that the relationship does not exist for this group. If so, the relationship between time orientation and self-actualizing may account for the differences between findings for this group and that of males not presently in romantic relationships. Self-actualizing individuals are considered to be those that effectively orient themselves in the present, and not into past experience or unrealistically and continually in the future. Self-actualizing males not presently romantically involved should experience less jealousy due to a lack of anything to presently be jealous about (i.e., a partner to lose). Non-actualizing males not in relationships may experience higher levels of jealousy by re-living past experiences or even pre-living experiences yet to come. The relationship between jealousy and actualizing may not be as strong for the MR group, as evidenced, to a realistic source of potential jealousy whether the individual is strongly oriented in the present (i.e., actualizing) or elsewhere in time (i.e., non-actualizing).

Limitations of this study include the restrictiveness of the size and ages of this population. A more adequate study would need to include a much larger sample selected randomly from the general
population. Regarding females, dividing subjects into groups on the basis of a measure of contemporarism versus traditionalism of sex role attitudes would allow an examination of this factor as it relates to the relationship between jealousy and self-actualizing. Additionally, it would be preferrable to construct a more sensitive measure of jealousy. The inclusion of additional items is necessary to exclude the possibility of extraneous effects (i.e., ceiling effects) on subjects' scores on this measure. In spite of the inherent difficulties, there is relevance in and a need for carefully designed studies of jealousy in order to more fully delineate and understand this affect.
Appendices
APPENDIX A

Background Information

1. Sex: male female

2. Age: ___ years ___ mos.

3. Birthdate: ___-___-___

4. No. of older brothers: ___
   No. of older sisters: ___
   No. of younger brothers: ___
   No. of younger sisters: ___

5. Race: white black
   oriental
   Mexican-American
   other (please specify)

6. Education: less than 12 years high school graduate
   some college
   some post-college
   Ph.D., M.D., etc.
   other (please specify)

7. Sexual orientation/partner preference: heterosexual homosexual bisexual

8. Present marital/relationship status: single/never married divorced
   married separated
   partnered/cohabitating widowed
   previously divorced/
   now married
   other (please specify)

9. If you are married, cohabitating, or in an intimate relationship: how long have you been with your present partner? ___ mos. ___ does not apply

10. What is your present level of commitment in or toward your relationship?
    1 not very committed
    2 somewhat committed
    3 very committed
    4 totally committed

11. How long do you expect this relationship to last?
    1 a very short time
    2 some years
    3 very many years

12. How many romantic relationships have you been in during your lifetime? _____
13. What would you estimate to be your average level of commitment in these relationships?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not very committed</td>
<td>somewhat committed</td>
<td>very committed</td>
<td>totally committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What do you believe the ideal level of commitment of partners in a relationship should be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not very committed</td>
<td>somewhat committed</td>
<td>very committed</td>
<td>totally committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Scales and Subscales of the POI

The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (Shostrom, 1974) is designed to measure intrapersonal aspects of self-actualizing. The POI consists of twelve different scoring categories which include two ratio scores and ten subscale scores. The ratio scores are the Time Ratio, a measure of whether an individual uses time efficiently, and the Support Ratio, a measure of the extent to which the individual derives support mainly from oneself or from others. The Time Ratio is the ratio of Time Incompetence to Time Competence and is derived from scores obtained from the Time Competent scale of the POI. The Time Competent scale is a measure of the individual's ability to tie the past and future to the present in meaningful continuity, or his ability to live more fully in the here-and-now (Shostrom, 1974). The Support Ratio is expressed as a ratio of other orientation to inner orientation and is taken from scores on the Inner Directed scale. This scale is considered indicative of the individual's characteristic or predominant mode of reacting; whether the individual's source of direction is derived primarily from an inner core of principles and character traits or from external sources (Shostrom, 1974).

The ten subscales and the self-actualizing capacities they measure are listed below:

1. **Self-Actualizing Value** - measures affirmation of a primary value of self-actualizing people.

2. **Existentiality** - measures ability to situationally or existentially react without rigid adherence to principles.

3. **Feeling Reactivity** - measures sensitivity of responsiveness to one's own needs and feelings.
4. **Spontaneity** - measures freedom to react spontaneously or to be oneself.

5. **Self-Regard** - measures affirmation of self because of worth or strength.

6. **Self-Acceptance** - measures affirmation or acceptance of self in spite of weaknesses of deficiencies.

7. **Nature of Man** - measures degree of the constructive view of the nature of man, masculinity, femininity.

8. **Synergy** - measures ability to be synergistic, to transcend dichotomies.

9. **Acceptance of Aggression** - measures ability to accept one's natural aggressiveness as opposed to defensiveness, denial and repression of aggression.

10. **Capacity for Intimate Contact** - measures ability to develop contactful intimate relationships with other human beings unencumbered by expectations and obligation.
**APPENDIX C**

**Romantic Jealousy-Envy Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>MODERATELY AGREE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY AGREE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>MODERATELY DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>When I see my lover kissing someone else, my stomach knots up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jealousy is a sign of true love.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I always try to &quot;even the score.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It is somewhat annoying to see others have all the luck in getting the best dating partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I often feel I couldn't exist without him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I have confidence that my lover is not cheating behind my back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>When somebody hugs my lover, I get sick inside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I don't imagine I'll ever have a romantic relationship as good as some I've seen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>It would bother me if my lover frequently had satisfying sexual relations with someone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>When I see an attractive person, I feel inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>When my lover goes out with another wo/man, I become physically upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I feel bad inside when I see my partner kissing someone else at a New Year's party.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Life wouldn't have much meaning without him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>When my partner dances with someone else, I feel very uneasy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My lover is the motivating force in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I often find myself idealizing persons or objects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>When I am away from my mate for any length of time, I do not become suspicious of my mate's whereabouts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I want my lover to enjoy sex only with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I like to flirt now and then in front of my date to keep his/her interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I don't know why, but I usually seem to be the underdog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Losing my lover prevents me from being the person I want to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I feel depressed when my partner speaks favorably about someone of the opposite sex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I feel empty inside when I see a successful relationship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I see my mate as a faithful person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>When my partner is at a party having fun and I'm not there, I feel depressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Most of my friends have a more exciting love life than I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>When my partner pays attention to other people, I feel lonely and left out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Seven-item Jealousy Measure

1. When I see my lover kissing someone else, my stomach knots up.
7. When somebody hugs my lover, I get sick inside.
9. It would bother me if my lover frequently had sexual relations with someone else.
11. When my lover goes out with another man/woman, I become physically upset.
12. I feel bad inside when I see my partner kissing someone else at a New Year's party.
14. When my partner dances with someone else, I feel very uneasy.
18. I want my lover to enjoy sex only with me.
This is a survey designed to assess individual attitudes and values regarding various aspects of romantic relationships. Participation is on a voluntary basis only--please note: you are not required in any way to complete the following survey materials for a grade in this class. Responses to the following items will be kept strictly confidential and, to ensure complete anonymity, you are requested to NOT place your name or other identifying information on any of the survey materials. If you would like feedback regarding the outcome of this project, please notify me in writing by October 1, 1981, and include your name and telephone number. A group feedback session will be arranged at your convenience, during which time overall results of the study will be presented--individual results will not be available due to the strict anonymity requirements adhered to throughout this study.

Contained in the following materials are approximately 200 items which will allow you to express your values and opinions as they relate to various aspects of romantic relationships. Please read each item carefully. You are asked to respond to EACH item, some in various fashion. Some items will require you to respond by selecting one of two statements according to which most accurately reflects your own feelings. Other items may be responded to by placing an 'X' below a phrase which represents the degree to which you agree with or feel about a specific instance or personal trait. Still other items will ask that you respond by filling in a blank or circling the choice most appropriate for you regarding that question.

PLEASE DO NOT leave any statements blank or unanswered--respond to each and every item. DO NOT look back nor ahead at any items, doing so may only cause you to lose your place and leave out items. Pay attention only to the statement to which you are responding to at the time. When you finish, it is important that you look over the survey to ensure that there are no unanswered items. When you are confident of this, please raise your hand and your survey responses will be collected.

Your participation in this survey is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Bob Paul
CEB 408
x3158
Reference Notes
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